



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

World Heritage

41 COM

WHC/17/41.COM.INF.18
Original: English/French

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

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Forty-first session

**Krakow, Poland
2 - 12 July 2017**

SUMMARY RECORDS

RÉSUMÉ DES INTERVENTIONS

PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 41ST SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (KRAKOW, 2017)

OPENING SESSION

1. Opening session
2. Admission of Observers
3. Adoption of the Agenda and the Timetable
 - 3A. Adoption of the Agenda
 - 3B. Adoption of the Timetable

REPORTS

4. Report of the Rapporteur of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016)
5. Reports of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies
 - 5A. Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's decisions
 - 5B. Reports of the Advisory Bodies
 - 5C. World Heritage Convention and sustainable development
6. Follow-up to the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy and Progress report on the World Heritage-related category 2 centres

EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

7. State of conservation of World Heritage properties
 - 7A. State of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 7B. State of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8. Establishment of the World Heritage List and of the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 8A. Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties as of 15 April 2017
 - 8B. Nominations to the World Heritage List
 - 8C. Update of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 8D. Clarifications of property boundaries and areas by States Parties
 - 8E. Review and approval of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value

GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

9. Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List
 - 9A. Progress report on the reflection concerning the Upstream Processes
 - 9B. Progress report on the reflection on processes for mixed nominations

PERIODIC REPORTS

10. Periodic Reports
 - 10A. Report on the Periodic Reporting Reflection (2015-2017) and launch of the third cycle
 - 10B. Follow-up to the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for all regions

WORKING METHODS AND TOOLS

11. Revision of the Operational Guidelines
12. Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods and outcomes of the Ad-hoc working group
 - 12A. Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods: outcomes of the ad-hoc working group
 - 12B. Progress report on the follow-up to the Recommendations of the External Auditor's "Report on the governance of UNESCO and dependent funds, programmes and entities" (Document 38C/23)

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

13. International Assistance
14. Report on the execution of the budget for the biennium 2016-2017 and preparation of the budget for the biennium 2018-2019
15. Other business

CLOSING SESSION

16. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee (2018)
17. Provisional Agenda of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee (2018)
18. Adoption of the Report of Decisions
19. Closing session

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE 41st SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

The 41st session of the World Heritage Committee was held from 2 to 12 July 2017 in Krakow, Poland.

The 21 Members of the World Heritage Committee were present: Angola, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Croatia, Cuba, Finland, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

The elected Members of the Bureau of the 41st session of the Committee were:

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

Vice-Chairpersons: Angola, Kuwait, Peru and Portugal, Republic of Korea

Rapporteur: Mr Juma Muhammad (United Republic of Tanzania)

The following 117 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers:

Albania; Algeria; Andorra; Argentina; Australia; Austria; Bahrain; Bangladesh; Belarus; Belgium; Benin; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Brazil; Bulgaria; Cabo Verde; Cambodia; Cameroon; Canada; Central African Republic; Chile; China; Colombia; Costa Rica; Côte d'Ivoire; Cyprus; Czechia; Democratic Republic of the Congo; Denmark; Ecuador; Egypt; Eritrea; Estonia; Ethiopia; France; Georgia; Germany; Ghana; Greece; Guatemala; Haiti; Holy See; Honduras; Hungary; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Jordan; Kenya; Lesotho; Libya; Lithuania; Madagascar; Malaysia; Mauritania; Mexico; Mongolia; Myanmar; Namibia; Nepal; Netherlands; New Zealand; Niger; Nigeria; Norway; Oman; Pakistan; Palestine; Panama; Papua New Guinea; Qatar; Republic of Moldova; Romania; Russian Federation; Saudi Arabia; Senegal; Serbia; Singapore; Slovakia; Slovenia; South Africa; Spain; Sri Lanka; Sweden; Switzerland; Syrian Arab Republic; Thailand; the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Uganda; Ukraine; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United States of America; Uzbekistan; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); Zambia.

Representatives of the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee, namely the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) also attended the session.

The full list of participants is available [here](#).

The session was conducted in two languages: English and French (the two working languages of the Committee), with additional interpretation in Spanish and Arabic during some sessions.

The World Heritage Centre of UNESCO provided the Secretariat for the meeting.

Sunday 2 July 2017
OPENING CEREMONY

The Ceremony of the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee was held at the Wawel Hill (Krakow, Poland) on Sunday 2 July 2017.

Speeches were delivered by the following dignitaries:

- His Excellency Mr Andrzej Duda, President of the Republic of Poland
- Mr Piotr Gliński, Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Culture and National Heritage
- Ms Irina Bokova UNESCO Director-General of UNESCO
- Mr Michael Worbs, Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO
- Mr Jacek Majchrowski, Mayor of the City of Kraków,
- Mr Jacek Purchla, Chairperson of the 41st Session of the World Heritage Committee

A cultural performance and a reception followed.

FIRST DAY – Monday 3 July 2017

FIRST SESSION

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 1: OPENING OF THE SESSION

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.1](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11111)

The **Chairperson, H.E Mr Jacek Purchla**, welcomed the delegates to the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee following the opening evening of celebration. He welcomed also the Director-General, Ms Irina Bokova and paid tribute to H.E Dr Sok An, Deputy Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Cambodia and Chairperson of the 36th Session of the World Heritage Committee in 2013 who passed away on 15 March 2017. The Chairperson underlined that Dr Sok An was an internationally respected heritage expert who promoted World Heritage and education in cultural diversity throughout his life, and paid tribute to his crucial role as main actor in the international campaign to safeguard Angkor. The Chairperson concluded by recognizing that Dr Sok An would be sorely missed by the entire World Heritage community.

[A minute of silence was observed]

ITEM 2: ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/2](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11112)

Decision: [41 COM 2](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11112)

The **Chairperson** turned to item 2 and the Admission of Observers presented in the bilingual working document 2, in accordance with Article 8 of the Rules of Procedure.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 2 adopted.

ITEM 3: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/3A](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11113)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.3A.Rev](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11113)
[WHC/17/41.COM/3B](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11113)

Decisions: [41 COM 3A](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11113)
[41 COM 3B](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11113)

The **Chairperson** invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mrs Mechtild Rössler, to present the provisional agenda and timetable of the session.

The **Director of the Centre** welcomed all the delegations and thanked the Polish authorities for their warm welcome and excellent opening event the previous night. The Director of the Centre began by recalling that the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session by its Decision 12.B paragraph 22 decided that these World Heritage Committee meetings should be live-streamed, which was considered a very good development, so that colleagues at

home could follow all the debates. It was noted that interpretation of the plenary sessions would be in English and French. Spanish would be provided for some sessions thanks to the Kingdom of Spain, as well as Arabic interpretation thanks to the Fund of the Prince Sultan bin Abdul Aziz for the support of the Arab language and Saudi Arabia.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 3A adopted.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that there were no changes to agenda item 3A since the agenda was adopted at the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee. However, on document 3B (the timetable of the session), it was noted that the day's plenary was also an occasion for a presentation from the World Heritage Young Professionals Forum 2017 to underline the importance of the involvement of young people in the protection of World Heritage in general and also their active participation in the implementation of the Convention. The Director further recalled that due to the number of items on the agenda, Rule 22.2 of the Rules of Procedure granted the Chairperson the possibility to limit the time allowed for each speaker, as required. Interventions were therefore limited to three minutes for Committee Members and two minutes for Observers. Delegates were asked to submit official statements and declarations to the Secretariat in writing so that they could be integrated into the summary records of this session. It was noted that the Bureau would be held every morning from 9 to 9.30 a.m prior to the plenary sessions. The Director reminded the Committee that all amendments to the draft decisions should be submitted beforehand in electronic form to the Rapporteur, which would facilitate and speed up integration of the text into the relevant draft decisions.

La **Délégation de Cuba** commence par remercier la Pologne et Cracovie pour l'accueil, et relève une question concernant la méthode de travail. Reconnaisant la valeur pour le Secretariat et le Comité de pouvoir présenter les projets de décisions et amendements en avance, la délégation souligne le droit des États membres à faire des amendements sur l'écran. De cette manière le débat est plus riche et quelque chose peut évoluer pendant la discussion d'un sujet.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that delegations could make changes to the draft decision on the screen, which is the normal procedure within the World Heritage Committee. Advance amendments would simply save time during the debates.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 3B adopted.

ITEM 4: REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE 40th SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (ISTANBUL/UNESCO, 2016)

Document: NONE
Decision: [41 COM 4](#)

The **Chairperson** introduced Ms Eugene Jo, the Rapporteur (Republic of Korea) of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee, inviting her to present her report highlighting the main issues discussed during the last session.

The **Chairperson** began by recalling that the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee was held in two parts, the first took place in Istanbul (Turkey) from 10 to 17 July 2016 during which 177 decisions were adopted. However, due to unexpected political circumstances in Turkey, the Committee was unable to complete all the work foreseen in Istanbul and the meeting was shortened by three days. The Committee met again in Paris at UNESCO Headquarters from 24 to 26 October to resume the work of the 40th session during which 39 decisions were adopted. The 40th session was generously hosted by the Government of Turkey and chaired by Mrs Lale Ülker. Both in Istanbul and in Paris, representatives from a total of 119 States Parties participated, including 21 Committee Members. There was a total of 2,378 participants including all the States Parties of UNESCO, Advisory Bodies, NGOs and Observers. The 40th session was the 5th year of live streaming, providing everyone

around the world access to the meetings and decisions. The Committee adopted 236 decisions during the entire session. For the World Heritage properties inscribed on the List, 156 state of conservation reports were included in item 7A and 7B, accounting for 15 per cent of the entire World Heritage List. Out of the 156 reports, 58 properties were discussed within the 40th session of the Committee. Before the start of the session there were 48 properties in the World Heritage List in Danger, and during the session one property from Georgia, the Historical Monuments of Mtskheta, was removed from the Danger List, while eight were newly included. Five properties from Libya were inscribed on the Danger List in conformity with Article 11.4 of the Convention in paragraphs 177 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines, including: Archaeological Site of Cyrene, Archaeological site of Leptis Magna, Archaeological site of Sabratha, Old Town of Ghadamès and the Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus. Two more sites, Old Town of Djenné (Mali) and the Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz (Uzbekistan) were also included in the Danger List. Nan Madol: Ceremonial Centre of Eastern Micronesia (Federated States of Micronesia) was newly inscribed on the World Heritage List and at the same time inscribed on the Danger List. The Danger List now counts 55 properties, of which 37 are cultural properties and 18 natural properties. The importance of acknowledging the facts of danger listing was again highlighted. The Committee spoke of the need to promote better understanding of the implications and benefits of being inscribed on the Danger List, and requested that appropriate materials be compiled that would aid in overcoming the negative perception of the Danger List.

The Chairperson then spoke of the emergency situations resulting from conflict that was of the utmost concern in the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties, as the number of properties affected by such situations continued to escalate. Issues of reconstruction, climate change, extractive industries, dams and ground transport infrastructure continued to make up the wide range of problems addressed within the state of conservation reports. Heritage impact assessments, environmental impact assessments and integrated management, decision-making and governance were noted as tools and solutions that could effectively prevent and manage such issues. The 40th session examined 29 nominations of new inscriptions to the World Heritage List. It was recalled that 21 new properties were inscribed on the List and three were transnational nominations involved in the cooperation of multiple States, with three States Parties involved for the Western Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, seven States Parties involved for the Architectural Work of Le Corbusier, and four States Parties involved for the Stećci Medieval Tombstone Graveyards. Two States Parties had their first properties inscribed on the World Heritage List: Antigua Naval Dockyard and Related Archaeological Sites (Antigua and Barbuda), and Nan Madol: Ceremonial Centre of Eastern Micronesia (Micronesia). The World Heritage List now includes 1052 properties, of which 814 cultural, 203 natural and 35 mixed properties located in 165 States Parties. As always, the Committee was heavily charged with a large number of items to examine and discuss, and from the start activated two consultative bodies: a Working Group for the revision of the Operational Guidelines, chaired by Mr Jad Tabet (Lebanon), and a second Working Group to examine the budget, chaired by Professor Lisbeth Condor. The Ad-hoc Working Group created during the 30th session had its mandate extended and met intersessionally to examine issues related to the working methods of evaluation and decision-making processes. The outcomes of the Ad-hoc Working Group were interlinked and connected with the decisions of the items of the Operational Guidelines and the World Heritage Fund.

Ms Eugene Jo The Chairperson further recalled that Article 61 of the Operational Guidelines was amended, which is foreseen to take effect from 2 February 2018 on a trial basis for four years, limiting the number of complete nominations per State Party per year to one and setting a limit of 35 nominations for the annual cycle. The order of priorities for selecting nominations within the annual cycle was also amended. The sustainability of the World Heritage Fund was a main focus of the entire Committee session, not only within the agenda item on the budget but also on the agenda item of the Ad-hoc Working Group regarding workload and working methods of the entire Convention. The universal ratification

of the Convention had now become a reality such that there would be no increase to the World Heritage Fund, whereas the total number of World Heritage properties continued to increase. There was thus a need to address budgetary restraints on conducting the statutory work of the Convention, which should be met with concrete solutions. Many options were explored such as a donors forum, a [Marketplace](#) proposal for the International Assistance Fund, and exploring new working methods for increasing efficiency. The Committee also requested the Secretariat to give priority to conservation and monitoring activities, and increase the proportion of the Fund dedicated to conservation when drawing up the budget for the 2018–2019 biennium of the World Heritage Fund. The policy document on sustainable development, which was adopted at the 20th General Assembly, was met with focused interest from the Committee, and there was a strong inclination towards implementation strategies and plans to be set up that would help put words into action. **The Chairperson** noted that such an enormous amount of work would not have been possible without the dedication and efforts of the Secretariat under the able leadership of Dr Mechtilde Rössler. She concluded by thanking the Advisory Bodies of ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN who maintain the integrity and expertise of the Committee, as well as the hard work and dedication of all the Committee Members. She then congratulated Mr Muhammad Juma (United Republic of Tanzania) for taking up the task of Rapporteur for the present session.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 4 adopted.

ITEM 14: REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2016-2017 AND PREPARATION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2018-2019

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/14](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.14.I](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.14.II](#)

Decision: [41 COM 14](#)

The **Chairperson** recalled that by its Decision 35 COM 12B, the Committee had established a standing Consultative Body for review of the Committee's biennial budget in conformity with Article 20 of the Rules of Procedure. This Consultative Body is open to all States Parties, including States non-members of the Committee, as well as the Advisory Bodies. In addition, the Committee was asked to also establish a Working Group on the Operational Guidelines. However, to avoid a heavy agenda and overlap of the two working groups, it was suggested to reduce the length of these working groups to 3 days. The Chairperson thus proposed that the Budget Working Group meet from Tuesday 4 to Thursday 6 July from 2 to 3 pm. With no comments or objections, the proposal was adopted. The Chairperson further noted that, as per Rule 20.2 of the Rules of procedure, it was the responsibility of the Group to elect its Chairperson.

The **Delegation of Finland** proposed Mr Jésus Enriqu  Garcia of the Philippines to serve as Chairperson of the Budget Working Group.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** seconded the proposal by Finland, supported by **Poland** and **Angola**.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 14 adopted.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the Group would meet from 2-3 p.m. in the Bureau Meeting Room, followed by the Operational Guidelines Group, adding that smaller delegations had expressed a wish that the two meetings were not held in parallel.

ITEM 11: REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/11](#)

Decision: [41 COM 11](#)

The **Chairperson** recalled that It was proposed that a Working Group be established as a Consultative Body in conformity with Article 20.1 of the Rules of Procedure and open to all States Parties, including States non-members of the Committee. The Advisory Bodies would also be able to attend the Working Group as Observers. The Working Group would report back to the Committee at its plenary session. The Chairperson put forward the same proposal for the length of the Operational Guidelines Working Group, i.e. to meet for 3 days from Friday 7 July to Sunday 9 July from 2 to 3 pm.

The **Delegation of Turkey**, as host of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee in Istanbul in 2016, wished to thank Poland for its first-class organization of the present session. The delegation proposed Mr Jad Tabet of Lebanon to chair the Operational Guidelines Working Group.

The **Delegations of Poland, Burkina Faso, Tunisia and Kuwait** supported the proposal.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 11 adopted.

ITEM 12A: FOLLOW-UP TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF EVALUATIONS AND AUDITS ON WORKING METHODS: OUTCOMES OF THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/12A](#)

Decision: [41 COM 12A](#)

The **Chairperson** recalled that at its 38th session in 2014 the Committee had decided to establish an Ad-hoc Working Group to examine the issues related to working methods of the evaluation and decision-making process of nomination and to formulate its recommendations. By its Decision 40 COM 11, the Committee decided to adopt the proposed revision of Paragraph 61 of the Operational Guidelines, and to include Paragraph 68 of the Operational Guidelines and its Annexes to the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group, which would also continued its reflection on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. He further recalled that the Working Group, chaired by Poland, had met several times during the year, and he invited Ms Krystyna Zurek, Ambassador of Poland to UNESCO, to report on its work.

Ms Krystyna Zurek (Poland) recalled that the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group was extended during the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee to further discuss paragraph 68 of the Operational Guidelines and its Annexes, as well as to discuss the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and its Advisory Bodies. It was also decided that the Ad-hoc Working Group would be composed of the Members of the Committee and that at least two open-ended sessions of the Working Group would be held. The Working Group started its work in November 2016. As to the working methods, taking into account the broad mandate and the range of issues to be discussed, it was agreed to divide the work into two sub-groups: one on paragraph 68 of the Operational Guidelines, and the other on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. Ms Katarzyna Piotrowska from the National Heritage Board of Poland had discussions on paragraph 68 and Mr Jésus Enriqu  Garcia (Philippines), agreed to chair the discussions on sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. The Working Group worked on the basis of a schedule of meetings agreed in November in 2016, and it had since met six times monthly, starting from January till the beginning of June. Representatives of the World Heritage Centre also attended the meetings, providing support. Dialogue with the representatives of

ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN was also held. The agenda was based on the discussion papers presented by the Chairs of the two subgroups. During the first meeting, in order to start the discussion from a global perspective, the Chairs asked the World Heritage Centre to make presentations on both issues: on the Tentative List and on the budget and financial situation. Minutes of meetings were widely distributed in order to ensure transparency and to keep States Parties informed on the progress of work of the Ad-hoc Working Group. Open-ended meetings, wherein all States Parties were invited, were held on 24 March and 24 May 2017. The two sub-groups prepared a number of recommendations for the Committee.

Ms Krystyna Zurek highlighted some key points, namely, the sub-group on paragraph 68 discussed the Tentative List in the broadest context possible, as well as its key aspects, completed with presentations by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. After thorough discussions, it was decided to recommend keeping the current mechanism of the registration of the Tentative Lists. The Ad-hoc Working Group also recommended introducing a disclaimer in the decisions of the Committee concerning the Tentative Lists, as well as the Operational Guidelines. Such a disclaimer would further underline the national character of the Tentative List and also ease the current pressures. Other recommendations by the Working Group include: i) to further promote harmonization of the Tentative List at national and regional level; ii) to invite States Parties to engage in dialogue with all stakeholders, as part of the national process of preparing the Tentative List; iii) to encourage States to refrain from including on the Tentative List sites that may potentially raise issues with other States Parties without first trying to solve potential issues through dialogue.

With regard to the sub-group on sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, **Ms Krystyna Zurek** noted that at the beginning of deliberations, an overview of the financial situation of the World Heritage Fund was presented by the World Heritage Centre. Despite significant efforts to increase voluntary funding, the system was now at a breaking point with increasing numbers of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List but with diminishing levels of human and financial resources. It was recognized that this affected the ability to fulfil central objectives and statutory activities under the Convention, such as conservation, international assistance and capacity-building. It was suggested that in order to promote sustainability of the World Heritage Fund an holistic long-term vision and framework was needed. The group worked out an integrated roadmap for the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, outlining the various recommendations and options discussed and presenting them in a phased timeline. This roadmap was annexed to the report of the Ad-hoc Working Group. The group also discussed the importance of full and timely payment from all States Parties, and the idea to develop a comprehensive resource mobilization and communication strategy, but conceded that more time should be devoted to discuss this issue. The group also discussed the feasibility of an optional protocol as a long-term measure. In total, the group prepared 14 recommendations to promote sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. It was also agreed that more time should be devoted to explore the ideas discussed during the meetings. The Working Group proposed to extend the mandate for 2018.

Ms Krystyna Zurek informed the Committee that the outcomes of the Ad-hoc Working Group were presented in document 41 COM 12A, which also contained the draft decisions under item 12A and item 11 on the revisions of Operational Guidelines, and item 14 on the Report of the Execution of the Budget. It was decided to take this innovative approach to facilitate the proceedings during the 41st session when the Committee's two working groups would discuss the draft decisions in the coming days. In conclusion, Ms Zurek thanked the Chairperson, all the members of the Ad-hoc Working Group, as well as those who participated in the open-ended meetings. She hoped that the recommendations proposed would be adopted by the Committee and would contribute to the enhancement of the system of World Heritage protection and strengthen implementation of the Convention, equitably and sustainably.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked Poland for the excellent chairing of the Ad-hoc Working Group, adding that this item would remain open because of the work of the

other two working groups that referenced the budget, the Operational Guidelines and item 12A

The **Chairperson** thus proposed to keep item 12A open to allow for further discussion during the working groups' meetings.

ITEM 5A: REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE'S DECISIONS

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/5A](#)

Decision: [41 COM 5A](#)

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** began by Introducing document 5A, noting that Mr Lazare Eloundou Assomo was recruited as Deputy Director of the Division for Heritage in autumn 2016. His responsibilities include other heritage divisions that are part of the Division of Heritage, as well as the Emergency Preparedness and Response Unit. It was noted that the number of posts financed through regular and extrabudgetary funding sources had decreased notably over the last years, while the number of properties on the World Heritage List had increased to 1,052. The task of the World Heritage Centre thus constantly increased and the situation had become unsustainable. Nevertheless, the Director was pleased to note that a post for Natural Heritage would soon be effective, as requested from the Committee in the past. The Director wished to thank China, Finland, Germany, Japan, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Sweden and Turkey for supporting staff with secondments, Junior Professionals, Associate Experts and non-reimbursable loans or other arrangements.

Regarding the expected results of the 38 C/5, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the activities of the World Heritage Centre were in line with the Medium-Term Strategy 2014–2021 and the Approved Programme and Budget for 2016–2017 of the 38 C/5. It was noted that one Expected Result [of the 38C/5] had been established, i.e. 'tangible heritage was identified, protected, monitored and sustainably managed by Member States, in particular through the effective implementation of the 1972 Convention'. Five very clear performance indicators had been developed to track progress and the achievements of this expected result, which focused on quantitative information. The presentation thus provided concrete examples to illustrate how the World Heritage Centre had worked with the State Parties, the Advisory Bodies and many other stakeholders to achieve this result. The Director of the Centre warmly welcomed the 192nd State Party (South Sudan) and 193rd State Party (Timor Leste) to the World Heritage Convention, and she called on the remaining States Parties to ratify the Convention. Concerning the governing bodies, the key outcomes of the 40th session were as follows: i) the World Heritage Centre prepared 47 documents; ii) the Committee adopted 239 decisions; iii) it examined 156 state of conservation reports; and iv) it inscribed 21 new properties on the World Heritage List. The decisions and the video recordings were available on the [website](#) of the 40th session. Two working groups met during the 40th session: one on the Operational Guidelines and the Budget Working Group, and the Committee in its Decision 40 COM 15 decided to take up the matter on the sustainability of the Fund into the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group, as reported by the Ambassador of Poland. The Director also highlighted the information session held in May 2017, and the Orientation Session held for the Committee Members and other interested parties in May and July 2017 to support State Parties in the preparation of the session.

Regarding capacity-building, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** spoke of a number of activities implemented in all regions of the world. In Africa, the partnership between the Centre and the African World Heritage Fund had been further developed. A Heritage Impact Assessment course was held in December 2016 in Tanzania with over 30 participants from many African countries. In the Asia-Pacific region the UNESCO [Recommendation](#) on the Historic Urban Landscape was presented in national workshops held in Uzbekistan and

Nepal in early 2017; the latter focusing on recovery and reconstruction to enhance capacities of stakeholders to address the challenges after the 2015 earthquake [in Nepal]. In the Europe and North American region, capacity development workshops were organized for site managers and many other stakeholders of 30 World Heritage sites involved in the recently launched initiative ‘UNESCO World Heritage Journeys of Europe’, a project funded by the EU to provide training in defining strategies in developing marketing and sustainable tourism management plans. In the Latin American and Caribbean region, the Third World Heritage Marine Site Managers Conference was held in the Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) in August 2016, which aimed to build capacity on climate adaptation strategies and market-based approaches to encourage sustainable fisheries and further strengthen the sharing of management solutions and best practices among the 49 marine World Heritage sites. During the conference, seven World Heritage marine sites in the Eastern Tropical Pacific region signed an agreement, the [Carta de Punta Suarez](#), to scale up regional cooperation.

Regarding nominations, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reported that there were 21 properties inscribed by the Committee at its 40th session. The World Heritage List reached 1,052 properties, of which 814 cultural, 203 natural and 35 mixed properties. There were currently 55 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It was noted that 182 States Parties had submitted a Tentative List, out of which 176 complied with the requirement of the Operational Guidelines. In the Asia Pacific region, an expert meeting was organized in Kazakhstan in 2016 for the Ferghana-Syrdarya Corridor. Forty-five participants from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan participated and adopted an [Action Plan](#) for the preparation of the nomination file. In the Latin American and Caribbean region, the Trinidad and Tobago National Commission for UNESCO organized a subregional workshop in Port of Spain in November 2016 with the support and participation of the World Heritage Centre, as well as the UNESCO Offices of Havana and Kingston. Regarding sustainable development, the Director of the Centre reported that the General Assembly adopted at its 20th session the integration of sustainable development into the processes of the World Heritage Convention in its Resolution 20 GA13. Further details concerning the implementation of this policy would be presented under agenda item 5C. Nevertheless, the Director highlighted a few examples. For instance, the revised periodic reporting format fully took on board the principles of this policy and the 2030 Agenda, embedding them throughout the questionnaire, as well as the proposed monitoring indicators, the lists and the analytical framework. In Africa, further to the operational Action Plan resulting from the international [conference](#) ‘Safeguarding African World Heritage as a Driver for Sustainable Development’ held in Arusha (Tanzania) in 2016, and the [Ngorongoro Declaration](#), several community-based conservation projects have been launched, including such sites as Island of Saint Louis in Senegal, the Cliff of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons) in Mali, and the Royal Palaces of Abomey in Benin. In addition, the December 2016 [issue](#) of the World Heritage Review was dedicated to African Heritage and to sustainable development, focusing on African World Heritage as a driver for development and community benefits.

Regarding conservation and thematic priorities, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that it would examine 154 State of conservation reports that were prepared by the World Heritage Centre together with the Advisory Bodies, including on 55 sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In Africa, significant progress had been made in the framework of the European Union project on Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative ([CAWHFI](#)), through the allocation of grants to Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda in Gabon, Sangha Trinational in Congo, Cameroon and Central African Republic, and the Dja Faunal Reserve in Cameroon with a view to enhancing the management of these natural properties. As for the Arab region, the conservation of cultural and natural properties in a number of countries was a major challenge owing to conflict situations and an unprecedented level of damage to a number of heritage sites. Nevertheless, a number of activities were carried out, such as the international [expert meeting](#) for the safeguarding of Libyan cultural heritage in May 2016, and the First Aid Support Meeting: Follow-up to the World Heritage Committee Decisions on the Ancient City of Damascus in

November 2016 [\[report\]](#). Other meetings include the International Coordinating Conference on the Safeguarding of Cultural Heritage in the Liberated Areas of Iraq in February 2017 and the Technical Coordination Meeting for the Recovery of Aleppo's Heritage in March 2017. In parallel, the World Heritage Centre continued to mobilize the necessary expertise and extrabudgetary resources to finance projects for Syria, Iraq, Libya and Yemen.

Regarding thematic priorities, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** spoke of a number of meetings on heritage interpretation and memory sites that took place in Rwanda, the Republic of Korea and Poland. In Rwanda, there were two thematic studies currently being elaborated: one on the use of criterion 6, financed by Germany, and another on memory sites and interpretation, financed by the Republic of Korea Funds-in-Trust. On awareness-raising, there are currently 109,000 members registered with the World Heritage Centre website, a surprisingly high number and the most visited UNESCO website with more than 1 million visits every month or 40 per cent of the total visits to the UNESCO website, demonstrating the growing interest in World Heritage issues. The 2016–2017 World Heritage [map](#) was produced in collaboration with National Geographic maps in English, French and Spanish. The Director specifically thanked Poland for its support in the production of this map. With regard to social media, it was noted that it was increasingly being integrated in the communication outreach activities of the Secretariat with twitter, Facebook, and Instagram serving as vehicles for disseminating information about World Heritage news and activities, but also as platforms for capacity-building. For example, an Instagram competition was launched in connection with the promotion of the World Heritage in Europe Today [publication](#). The Director believed that such practices would be further developed, and she noted that the quarterly magazine World Heritage, which has a thematic focus in each issue, is available in print, app and online versions in three languages. As part of awareness-raising activities related to conservation, the September 2016 issue of the review [\[here\]](#) was dedicated to urban heritage, which was prepared in conjunction with and disseminated at the Habitat III Conference in Quito in Ecuador.

Regarding gender equality, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** remarked that it is one of the global priorities of UNESCO and is thus consistently integrated in all the activities carried out within the World Heritage Centre. Two publications on periodic reporting for Europe and North America, respectively, highlighted the importance of gender mainstreaming in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and provided gender disaggregated data with regard to stakeholders involved in World Heritage, while referring to the relevant chapter on achieving gender equality in terms of the sustainable development policy. It was noted that an issue on the topic of gender equality had been covered by the World Heritage review [No.78](#). With regard to synergies with other Conventions, and since the World Heritage Centre was chairing the Cultural Conventions Liaison Group, it encouraged further efforts to reinforce synergies among the six culture Conventions. In addition, a meeting of the Chairpersons of the culture Conventions took place in 2016 (in conjunction with the 1970 Convention). Within the framework of the revision of the periodic reporting format for the World Heritage Centre, and to ensure synergies with the other culture and biodiversity related Convention, other relevant issues would be taken into account in the format. It was noted that the World Heritage Convention is the only biodiversity-related Convention based at UNESCO. The World Heritage Centre also developed a new [webpage](#) in order to better reflect the synergies with other cultural and biodiversity-related conventions and programmes. The Cultural Conventions Liaison Group met to review working methods planning for statutory meetings and coordinate funding and resource mobilization. Synergies were also covered by the meeting of the Chairpersons that focused on two major subjects: i) safeguarding of cultural heritage and cultural diversity in times of conflict; and ii) the role of the Conventions with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre integrated relevant questions about the Second Protocol of The Hague Convention of the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015 and the World Heritage Centre also continues to be assisted by the Common Convention Services Unit (CCS). For this Unit, an evaluation was conducted between April and June 2017 in order to

assess its effectiveness, and it is expected that the evaluation would provide the necessary feedback as regards further guidance in the future. The World Heritage Centre also participated in meetings of the Biodiversity Liaison Group (BLG) with the other biodiversity-related Conventions, which highlighted issues of strategic importance to all the members of the BLG. On 25 January 2017, the BLG members met again through video conference to discuss a number of decisions adopted by the 13th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The World Heritage Centre also supported the Ramsar Convention of Wetlands by joining the 2017 Wetlands Day dedicated to wetlands for disaster risk reduction in 2017, and it also participated in the 2016 IUCN World Heritage Conservation Convention held in Hawaii. It was noted that issue [No.79](#) of the World Heritage review 'Planet at the Crossroads' focused on enhancing links between natural and cultural heritage, which was prepared in conjunction with the IUCN Conservation Congress. The issue also included a joint message from all seven Secretaries of all the biodiversity-related Conventions. Finally, with regard to the follow-up of global decisions of the Committee, the Director informed the Committee that the Secretariat had taken steps to implement several specific decisions adopted by the Committee at its 40th session, which would contribute towards a more informed decision-making process and enhance the sustainability of the Fund, and involve the States Parties of the Convention in the reflection of specific topics. This involved the preparation and launch of an online consultation on the upstream process, an online consultation on the payment of the annual voluntary fee by World Heritage properties, as well as a mapping study concerning advisory services by other Conventions and programmes.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** congratulated the Chairperson on his election, and extended deep appreciation to the Director of the Centre for her excellent work. It wished to draw attention to the activities of the World Heritage Centre related to heritage interpretation under performance indicator 5. The World Heritage policy paper on sustainable development adopted at the 20th General Assembly highlighted the coordination of peace and security. The delegation believed that the most amicable way to achieve this was to actively engage the various stakeholders within the process of constructing interpretation. This would enable all people to connect to heritage by explaining the significance and values embedded in the heritage. With the full recognition of the importance of the interpretation strategy, the Republic of Korea successfully organized two seminars on heritage interpretation in Istanbul and in the Republic of Korea in 2016. In 2017, it is conducting a thematic study on the interpretation of this site of memory, the results of which would be presented in a conference in November [2017]. The delegation further recalled Decision [39 COM 8B.14](#) on the inscription of Sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution and the Committee's recommendation on the interpretation strategy. Thanks to the concerted efforts of all parties involved, the Committee was able to make these recommendations by consensus. However, no tangible progress was noted thus far. With the deadline of the progress report fast approaching, the delegation was deeply concerned about the current state of implementation. Therefore, it urged Japan to implement the Committee's recommendation in good faith, as it had promised, in close cooperation and consultation with the Republic of Korea. To this end, it requested all Committee Members and Advisory Bodies to encourage Japan in these endeavours.

The **Delegation of Poland** wished to present conclusions from its Council of Experts that was held at the House of Wannsee Conference in Berlin on 7 April 2017. It was recalled that the Council of Experts was organized with the presence of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum National Board of Poland, the Polish National Commission of UNESCO, ICCROM, and many other important organizations, whose main conclusion was the Wannsee Memorandum [\[here\]](#) that was recommended for the former concentration camp and extermination centres located beyond the borders of Poland. The following standards recommended were: i) recognition of the practises developed by the Auschwitz-Birkenau Museum, expressing significance for UNESCO's principles of authenticity, integrity of artefacts and archival collections and international cooperation; ii) development of

educational forms that respect the truth, based on international dialogue and cooperation; iii) collecting artefacts that belonged to the victims (name tags, shoes, suitcases, etc.) and archival documentation (documents, photographs, films, maps) and their storing *in situ*; iv) establishing preservation laboratories *in situ*; v) conducting archaeological research on the basis of international cooperation and under rabbinical supervision; vi) functioning of an advisory body patterned after the International Auschwitz Council; vii) performing solid research on the victims as well as the perpetrators; and viii) the obligation to include, in the permanent exhibitions, information materials, as well as clear information on Internet websites about the prisoners deported and killed based on their nationality. Recognition of the above-mentioned practices of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial should be seen as universal, fully reflecting the symbolic significance of this site, as emphasized by its inscription on the World Heritage List. It is also a precondition for remembrance, which should stand as a warning and a lesson for future generations.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated the Chairperson on his chairmanship, and thanked Poland for its warm hospitality and organization. It also thanked Dr Rössler for her comprehensive report, and it praised the World Heritage Centre for its continued efforts to streamline its activities under the continued financial and human constraints. The report rightly underlined several challenges that addressed all the responsible States Parties. Firstly, the delegation noted that over the years, the Committee had witnessed a kind of divorce between the recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies and the final decisions taken by the Committee, which was neither good for the Committee nor the Advisory Bodies, as it undermined the credibility of both. Secondly, there were also problems concerning the regional imbalance in the World Heritage List despite efforts made in this regard. The delegation praised the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their continuous engagement to work with Africa and the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in view of identifying potential future nomination files. Thirdly, for Portugal, one of the main indicators of how effective collective work had been was the way the protection and conservation of World Heritage had been addressed, which was at the heart of the 1972 Convention. Nominations may certainly be part of this effort to protect and preserve heritage, but it should not be a race to inscribe properties on the List no matter what and at whatever cost, which would endanger the credibility of the World Heritage List itself. The delegation appealed for restraint, proposing that States Parties sitting on the Committee refrain from presenting candidatures during their mandate, as had previously been suggested. It was also confident that the Committee would address the State of conservation reports in a responsible and constructive way in the coming days, bearing in mind that collective responsibility must be placed above individual interests. Another very important dimension concerned the inadequate protection, promotion and interpretation of common historical heritage, as mentioned by the Republic of Korea. The history of any country is made up of periods of light and shadow, darkness even. Portugal was no exception. What was important in addressing these histories was to take all these equal components of a common national narrative as a whole, even if it was sometimes difficult to acknowledge certain facts. A heritage property was more than a monument or a site; its significance goes well beyond the place in that it meant different things to people who relate to them in different ways. This was why a correct interpretation of any historical site was so important, as it constituted a powerful means to raise knowledge and awareness, and was thus an important tool to further education and to promote dialogue, inclusiveness, understanding, and ultimately peace. In Bonn, an understanding had been reached that allowed inscription of the major sites, and one that upheld the mutual trust among Members, which was at the heart of the work of the Committee. The delegation congratulated the ratification of South Sudan and Timor Leste to the Convention, making it virtually a universal normative instrument. It was particularly pleased to welcome Timor Leste with whom it shared history, language and deep affection, adding that this strengthened the will to increase cooperation between the communities of Portuguese-speaking countries at UNESCO in various hues of their respective mandates.

The **Delegation of Finland** thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Director of the World Heritage Centre for the comprehensive report and for the impressive amount of work undertaken to implement the Convention. It was particularly pleased about the planned establishment of a P4 post for national heritage that would help address the gap in natural heritage expertise in the World Heritage Centre. It also highlighted the importance of paying continuous attention that sufficient expertise is available at the World Heritage Centre, both for cultural and natural heritage. The delegation was pleased to be able to extend the term of the Finnish JPO Programme in the World Heritage Centre, which was focused on natural heritage in Africa. It welcomed the ongoing work to enhance synergies, both with culture and biodiversity-related Conventions, including the new webpage. The delegation also welcomed the efforts to mainstream sustainable development throughout the activities of the World Heritage Centre. With regard to the credibility of the World Heritage List, the report contained some quite revealing statistics. In more than half of all nominations examined in 2016, the Committee did not follow the recommendations by the Advisory Bodies. It was also noted that 15 State of conservation (SOC) reports in 2016, and 12 State of conservation reports in 2017 came from properties that they were inscribed in previous years, mostly related to a lack of an adequate management plan. By inscribing properties that require SOC reporting in the following year, the Committee was adding to its own workload, as well as the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies, which was hardly sustainable. The delegation believed that the Committee should take better into account the requirements described in the Operational Guidelines in order to maintain the credibility of this Convention. Another concern related to the imbalance of the World Heritage List. For instance, in 2016, only one nomination came from the Africa region, while seven came from Europe and North America. Efforts should focus on supporting nominations from under-represented regions and cultural properties. In that regard, it welcomed the [report](#) of World Heritage in the High Seas, as well as the Arctic Marine Sites [report](#). Finally, with regard to gender equality, the delegation emphasized that this should not only be seen as the number of female participants at meetings or training, but rather as a cross-cutting vision ensuring that all World Heritage site management takes into account and involves genders in an equal manner, including possible benefit-sharing. The delegation concluded by thanking the Polish authorities for the warm hospitality and excellent arrangements.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** congratulated the Chairperson on his election, expressed its appreciation to Poland and the people of Krakow for hosting the 41st session of the Committee, and thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre and her entire staff and Secretariat for the drafting of the reports. The delegation spoke of how protecting the world's heritage has for decades been a core priority for UNESCO. Indonesia remained convinced that culture and development are mutually reinforcing, and that nature conservation constitutes an indispensable component for the present and future of which the Convention is a platform for world action in the protection and conservation of natural and cultural heritage. The delegation took the opportunity to reiterate its belief that strengthening capacity and further developing a multi-stakeholder approach in the protection and conservation of World Heritage should guide the World Heritage Centre in its future activities. It was delighted to note several activities that gave effect to the mitigation of climate change, and it encouraged the World Heritage Centre to expand activities in this area. Particular attention should be given, not only to the identification of impacts of climate change, but also to developing capacities to minimize such impacts. Raising awareness, notably among youth and local communities, would also make a difference in efforts to preserve World Heritage. It also asked the World Heritage Centre to increase efforts in raising awareness on the importance of the World Heritage Convention. It was noted that the World Heritage Centre had in 2016 assisted Indonesia in developing tourism strategies for the Subak System in recognition of the Balinese irrigation system in the Balinese cultural landscape. The strategy aimed at promoting on site tourism while minimizing its negative impacts and threats to local participation in the preservation of the site. It looked forward to seeing similar approaches to other World Heritage sites in Indonesia and elsewhere in the world.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** congratulated the Chairperson and thanked the Government and people of Poland for their warm welcome. It also congratulated the World Heritage Centre for the report and the excellent work done with limited resources, as well as the strategic partnerships formed with key stakeholders. In Africa, it was pleased with the cooperation between the World Heritage Centre and the Africa World Heritage Foundation, and it commended the efforts by the Centre in addressing key African priorities, namely, sustainable development and heritage, capacity-building, youth participation, and heritage protection and management of sites in times of conflict. The delegation hoped that this work and other efforts would result in more African properties being inscribed on the World Heritage List. Nevertheless, capacity development, particularly in the preparation of nominations, was still a gap that required filling. It thanked the governments that provided extrabudgetary support to programmes in Africa, as well as to the Africa World Heritage Fund. It welcomed the synergies formed with other culture Conventions, as this facilitated a more holistic view on heritage issues, particularly in Zimbabwe where a department of heritage was recently established. With reference to the call by the Republic of Korea, the delegation called upon the World Heritage Centre to work with the concerned States Parties to ensure implementation of the decisions made in Bonn.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** félicite le président et la Gouvernement polonais pour la grande qualité et l'organisation de l'accueil. La délégation souhaite également féliciter le Centre du patrimoine mondial, avec à sa tête Mme Rössler, pour la qualité du travail qui a été fait. Elle félicite notamment les directions d'ouverture vers la jeunesse, vers l'égalité entre les genres et dans la direction de la protection du patrimoine dans des situations difficiles. La Tunisie témoigne de sa reconnaissance et de son appréciation de toutes les bonnes dispositions qu'elle a trouvées auprès du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Celle-ci a eu un soutien en matière d'appui technique quant à la formation des compétences. La Tunisie, à travers ce soutien du Centre, a élargi cela pour toute la région dans la direction de la construction et la consolidation des capacités et d'expertise en matière de conservation du patrimoine. La délégation se félicite également de la coopération technique autour de quelques sites sur la Liste indicative que la Tunisie souhaite voir évoluer, notamment sur le site de l'île de Djerba. De plus, la présence en force et soulignée du Centre lors des festivités à Paris des 20 ans de l'inscription du site de Dougga lui a énormément fait plaisir.

The **Delegation of Peru** congratulated the Chairperson and thanked the Secretariat for the detailed report presented, which it believed was also a product of a report based on a functional structure of indicators. In particular, it wished to highlight the implementation of training activities at the regional level that focused on priorities identified by the Committee relating to the conservation of sites. With regard to the conservation indicator, the report highlighted the crucial work in this regard in that there is a continuous dialogue between the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the State Party, resulting in the safeguarding of the universal value of certain sites, while strengthening the credibility of the Committee's work. It recognized the strong relations between the States Parties and the World Heritage Centre, and it expressed gratitude to the team at the World Heritage Centre, especially those that worked in coordination with Peru. On the identification of priorities, it was noted that the draft decision emphasized the holding of three expert meetings on criterion 6 in Korea, Poland and Rwanda. The delegation agreed on the importance of interpretation in the conservation of World Heritage sites, as only the knowledge and meaning of a site could ensure its effective preservation and protection. In this regard, the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea had made reference to Decision 39 COM 8B.14 adopted in Bonn in 2015 referring to the site of the Meiji Industrial Revolution in which the Committee recommended *inter alia* the interpretation of the property with an emphasis on how each site could contribute to the OUV, reflecting one or more phases of industrialization, and that enabled the understanding of the entire history of the site. This was another example of the relevance of interpretation and the importance that this can have in the understanding of a site by the communities as a starting point for its conservation and preservation. In this regard, the delegation awaited the State Party's progress on the

adoption of the recommendation, adding that it was sure it would receive positive news when it is considered at the next session of the Committee.

La **Délégation du Koweït** félicite le président du Comité et le Gouvernement polonais pour l'accueil, et se félicite des activités menées par le Centre du patrimoine dans la région arabe avec les partenaires et les bureaux hors Siège, en particulier le Centre régional du patrimoine mondial dans la région arabe. Ces activités se sont concentrées principalement sur la préservation du patrimoine culturel exposé à la destruction. En conséquence, la délégation appelle le Secrétariat à redoubler ses efforts pour renforcer les capacités des pays arabes qui témoignent de la destruction de leur patrimoine. Concernant le sujet du Japon et la Corée, le Koweït invite les deux pays à entretenir des dialogues dans un esprit de compréhension afin de parvenir à un accord mutuel et à un consensus.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the Chairperson and thanked Poland for its hospitality. It applauded the World Heritage Centre for its work, and it noted that although its workload had increased, its budgets had not, and thus it was important to encourage the World Heritage Centre to continue its mandate. The delegation was particularly heartened that SIDS continued to benefit under specialized programmes despite the budget constraints. It was particularly keen on areas such as climate change, which would be up for discussion during this session of the Committee. Jamaica had the privilege in recent weeks to host the first ever World Heritage Symposium in the Caribbean region that looked specifically at climate change. It was able to benefit from expertise coming from UNESCO and it worked with several site managers from World Heritage sites within the Caribbean. The delegation wished to see more of this happening and it was very encouraged that the World Heritage Centre supported these initiatives in so many ways. It urged the World Heritage Centre to utilize platforms, such as the awareness-building initiatives mentioned. For example, a significant number, amounting to 100,000 members on the World Heritage website, was highlighted. The delegation wondered whether a profile of some of these members existed, adding that creative ways should be found to engage that membership. Moreover, did it include private sector membership? There was thus an opportunity to engage various groups to see how best they could support the work of the World Heritage Centre and, by extension, the work of everyone in terms of efforts to preserve and safeguard the world's heritage for future generations.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Chairperson and the Government and people of Poland for hosting the meeting and for the excellent arrangements. It thanked the Director, Ms Rössler, and her entire team for both the quality of the report and their work while operating under resource constraints. It commended the projects in Africa that aim to build capacity and promote a more representative and balanced World Heritage List. The Marine World Heritage Programme continued to do valuable work. The delegation also appreciated the support to the Philippine application for a particularly sensitive marine area status under the International Maritime Organization (IMO) for Tubbataha Reef's Natural Park, and it appreciated the study on the impacts of climate change on World Heritage coral reefs. It also noted the progress made in utilizing social media for outreach and it encourage further development of innovative approaches. In relation to paragraph 55 of the report, the delegation reiterated the importance of changing the perception of danger listing by bringing to the fore its positive aspects, such as being a catalyst for reinforced support and cooperation, nationally and internationally. It therefore hoped that the information material requested by the Committee in 2016 would be produced as soon as possible, submitting an amendment to the draft decision. The delegation also welcomed discussions to develop greater synergies among UNESCO's culture conventions, adding that the annual meeting of Chairpersons could be built upon and made more strategic and action oriented. It also supported the coordination with UNESCO's Biosphere Reserves and Geoparks, and welcomed the development of guidelines on the complementarity of these designations. The delegation recognized the good work of the Partnerships for Conservation (PACT) Initiative Strategy and noted the existing partnerships listed in the annex of the report. As discussed

by the Ad-hoc Working Group, more effective mobilization of resources was needed to ensure sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. Lastly, with a view to supporting efforts aimed at promoting peace and constructive dialogue among all States Parties, the delegation wished to add its voice to those highlighting the importance of effective follow-up and implementation of Committee decisions, especially those that came about through intense negotiations and very difficult compromises from all sides, as this would strengthen the credibility of the Committee and contribute towards international understanding and building mutual trust and respect, while looking forward together towards a brighter future.

The **Delegation of Turkey** wished the Chairperson a very successful session, and commended the excellent work of the World Heritage Centre despite the well-known financial and personnel difficulties. It also believed that effective implementation of capacity-building strategies, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, was essential in terms of preparing nominations and following post-inscription processes. With reference to the examination of the conservation of properties, the delegation felt that it should not be seen as a burden, as one of the core objectives of the Convention is to ensure an efficient system of collective protection. Also, mainstreaming the sustainable development perspective should be maintained in current and future activities relating to World Heritage, as this paves the way for realizing the 2030 Agenda. A balanced approach between incorporating new thematic areas to the mandate of the Secretariat, while paying attention to the scarce resources and workload, also seemed to be another necessity. The Committee should thus continue efforts to support the World Heritage Centre either through secondments or extrabudgetary resources, bearing in mind UNESCO's global priorities. Additionally, it believed that States Parties' collaboration and constructive dialogue is key to the healthy functioning of the Convention. The implementation of the Committee's recommendations in good time would greatly help in this respect.

La **Délégation du Liban** félicite les autorités polonaises, le Secrétariat et l'équipe du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour leur hospitalité, organisation et professionnalisme. En ce qui concerne la requête du distingué délégué de Corée, le Liban souhaite que la présidence veille à ce que les efforts diplomatiques consentis à Bonn par les 21 pays membres du Comité pour arriver à une résolution consensuelle, y compris le Japon et la Corée, perdurent.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** souligne que le Centre du patrimoine a réalisé effectivement plusieurs activités en Afrique. Elle cite à ce titre le Forum des jeunes d'Afrique francophone sur le patrimoine mondial au Burkina Faso qui a été conjointement organisé avec le Fonds du patrimoine africain. Elle salue cette initiative et cette synergie d'actions entre le Centre et le Fonds du patrimoine africain qui a permis de sensibiliser une cinquantaine de jeunes afin de les impliquer dans la promotion du patrimoine mondial en Afrique. La délégation souligne que le succès de la Convention de 1972 dépendra de l'assistance technique aux États parties et c'est pourquoi le Burkina Faso insiste sur le développement de l'expertise locale et régionale avec l'appui du Centre aussi bien durant le processus d'inscription que pendant l'état de conservation. S'agissant des décisions du Comité et en lien avec ce que l'Ambassadeur de Corée a relevé, la délégation encourage le Centre et les parties concernées à poursuivre leurs efforts pour une mise en œuvre effective des décisions du Comité.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** strongly believed that two global priorities of UNESCO, namely, support to Africa and gender equality, were very important in all fields of work including the 1972 Convention, and it welcomed the Secretariat's efforts in this regard. The delegation also welcomed the Secretariat's capacity-building strategy and it took note with satisfaction the very holistic and regional-based approach that was applied in creating this strategy, taking into account the regions' priorities. Nevertheless, it believed more could be used of UNESCO in capacity-building, adding that more site managers and local authorities should also be involved in this process and in conflict affected areas, perhaps even the military. Regarding the synergies between the culture Conventions, and namely the 1954

Convention, the delegation believed that this was very important. As a Committee Member of both the 1972 and 1954 Conventions, the delegation saw the necessity for coordination and synergy between the two Conventions, adding that there were several very important proposals and initiatives in this regard and the Committee should pay more attention to this issue in the future. With regard to the thematic priorities, it thanked Poland, the Republic of Korea and Rwanda for assisting the Secretariat in elaborating the thematic guidelines, namely, the interpretation of World Heritage, adding that dialogue, good spirit and good faith should prevail. The delegation concluded by highlighting the very important awareness-raising activities that not only increased the visibility of UNESCO and the Convention, but attracted badly needed support from Member States and from private partnerships and institutions. The Secretariat should therefore further strengthen and develop the awareness-raising activities through social media and dedicated websites.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** congratulated the Chairperson and commended the World Heritage Centre for its notable achievements, particularly for the recruitment of the Deputy Director, a friend of Africa, but also towards its efforts to reinforce synergies among the six culture Conventions. The delegation took note of the activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre and its expected results, but it also took note of the results of the Experts Meetings on criterion 6 and on memory sites, and the priority accorded to the African region. It welcomed the proactive role of the World Heritage Centre for enhancing synergies among culture Conventions and programmes, and was also very pleased with the working relations between the World Heritage Centre, the African World Heritage Fund and the Advisory Bodies in terms of technical and material support. Lastly, it supported the intervention by the Republic of Korea and echoed by Burkina Faso encouraging Japan to work together with the World Heritage Centre to ensure the timely implementation of the recommendation.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** soutient le Burkina Faso et insiste sur la bonne marche des rapprochements des synergies entre le Centre du patrimoine et le Fonds du patrimoine africain en ce qui concerne l'objectif de renforcement des capacités, et l'assistance du Centre en ce qui concerne la démarche pour la stratégie de levée des fonds.

The **Delegation of Cuba** thanked the World Heritage Centre for supporting such actions as the organization of the Caribbean meeting on climate change on World Heritage sites, the CELAC [Action Plan](#), and the project for the identification of community tourism in Latin America, which is important in identifying the impact of tourism in the region.

The **Delegation of Japan** spoke in reference to the site of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution, adding that it had respected all the recommendations made by the Committee at the time of its inscription, in particular, it continued its best efforts to produce a progress report for submission by December 2017, as requested by the Committee. The Japanese Government was currently in the process of drafting an appropriate interpretive strategy under the National Conservation Committee of the property with advice from the expert committee on industrial heritage, comprising relevant national and international experts. The delegation reaffirmed its commitment to preparing the interpretive strategy, including appropriate measures such as the establishment of an information centre.

The **Delegation of Germany** thanked Poland and the city of Krakow for its wonderful hosting of the meeting. As the representative of the host country of the 39th session in Bonn, where the Sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution was inscribed, it wished to recall the spirit of consensus and mutual confidence of both concerned parties that formed the basis of the decision and its recommendation. It trusted in that spirit and remained confident of the timely follow-up of the decision and its implementation.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the Committee Members and Observers for the very rich debate and the congratulatory remarks on behalf of colleagues of the World Heritage Centre. With regard to Japan's Meiji sites mentioned by a number of

delegations, the Director remarked that the World Heritage Centre was always ready to facilitate dialogue, adding that the report mentioned under Decision 39 COM 8B.14 was due on 1 December 2017. The Director trusted that all States Parties complied with the Committee's decisions. With regard to Poland's intervention, the Director informed the Committee that the outcome [the Wannsee Memorandum] of the Wannsee Meeting was not only available on the webpage of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Museum but also on the World Heritage Centre [webpage](#) in English and French. With regard to the credibility of the work of the Committee and the Convention, as alluded to by Finland, Poland and Portugal, the Director remarked that there were already provisions in the Operational Guidelines under section II.B that referred to the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List, which specifically encourages those countries that are already well represented to space their nominations, or slow down their rate of submission of nominations. The intention was to provide opportunities for countries from under-represented regions. Concerning the increasing number of inscriptions made against the advice of the Advisory Bodies, the Director remarked that an audit had been presented to the Committee in 2011 discussing this issue in depth. States were thus invited to refer to the auditor's report and the past decisions of the Committee in this regard. With regard to the comments made on the issue of climate change, which is of growing importance not only for States Parties but also for the site managers, the Director thanked Poland for organizing a site manager meeting [during the present meeting], as this was definitely an important issue and had been discussed by the Committee since 2005 in South Africa and in the adoption of the [Climate Change Policy](#) by the General Assembly of States Parties. Nevertheless, the Director remarked that the topic would be discussed further in a separate chapter under item 7 on issues related to climate change, but she acknowledged the interventions by Indonesia, Philippines, Jamaica and Cuba, and welcomed the results of recent meetings held in the Caribbean. The Director of the Centre also thanked the Philippines for reminding the Committee about making better use of 'danger listing' provisions. The idea was to rally support among the whole community on the ground, as well as the international community, especially in sites under threat, and to support the site on the Danger List with the limited resources at UNESCO. Moreover, on 7 July [2017] a specific meeting on the PACT was scheduled to encourage further support by the private sector, and it was hoped that many donors would come to the event and look at the projects for which there was currently no funding. The Director of the Centre also took note of all the points regarding awareness-raising, adding that the World Heritage Centre was trying to improve its activities through the use of its website and social media. With regard to young people and their implication in World Heritage, the Director of the Centre welcomed the results of the meeting in Burkina Faso, as mentioned by Azerbaijan and Finland, and welcomed the Youth Forum to the session who would soon make a statement, as the participation of youth was indeed very important and dear to everyone. Finally, on the issue of synergies, the Director of the Centre understood its importance, not only among the six culture Conventions at UNESCO but also among the biodiversity Conventions mentioned by Finland, and in this regard, she thanked Azerbaijan for financing the military manual, which could be used both for the 1954 and the 1970 Conventions, especially in regions of conflict.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to adopt draft decision 41 COM 5A under point VII of the working document, and asked the Rapporteur if he had received any amendments in this regard.

The **Rapporteur** noted that one amendment had been received on this item from Philippines and Turkey, which was an additional paragraph 6 that reiterates its request to the World Heritage Committee, in consultation with the Advisory Body and the States Parties, to promote better understanding of the implication and benefit of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to develop appropriate information material in this regard with a view to overcoming its negative perception. The information material should highlight the importance of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). Thus, the draft decision would now have eight paragraphs instead of seven. The Rapporteur noted that the Committee in 2016

had taken the same decision in agenda item 7, and he wondered whether the Philippines and Turkey, for the sake of consistency, preferred to keep this amendment in this decision or to take it to decision 7, as in 2016.

The **Delegation of Portugal** fully agreed with the Rapporteur, and thanked the Philippines for joining this suggestion, adding that it made more sense to include it again under decision 7.

The **Chairperson** understood that the Committee would be consistent with the original version.

The **Delegation of Finland** supported the amendment regardless of its placement, as it was very important to understand the intention of the danger listing. It also thanked the Secretariat for the Orientation Session that took place the day before.

With no further interventions, the **Chairperson** noted the clear position for the original text, bearing in mind that the Committee would return to agenda item 7.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked Finland for its appreciation of the important Orientation Session, adding that ICCROM colleagues would use the feedback in the next session.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 5A adopted.

ITEM 5B: REPORT OF THE ADVISORY BODIES

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/5B](#)

Decision: [41 COM 5B](#)

The **Chairperson** invited the representatives of each Advisory Body to make their presentations, beginning with ICOMOS.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** expressed its deepest gratitude to Poland for the organization of this session and for the warm welcome in this beautiful city of Krakow, which together with Quito, (Ecuador) was the first historic town inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978 and the city where ICOMOS was founded in 1965. noted that, regarding the evaluation of nominations to the World Heritage List for the 2020 cycle, ICOMOS evaluated 30 nominations. One nomination submitted on an emergency basis, 12 minor modifications and 7 provisional statements for OUV. The World Heritage Panel met in November 2016 and March 2017 at the ICOMOS Secretariat. The composition of overall information of the panel is available on the ICOMOS [website](#). ICOMOS introduced new changes to the evaluation process. The November panel was divided into three sessions. The first one was devoted to the presentation and discussion of nominations. The second were the meetings with nominating States Parties where issues identified by the panel were presented, and the third was the agreement on provisional decisions and identification of questions and issues to be conveyed to the States Parties. Except for nominations where the decision of non-inscription was agreed in November, which was communicated to relevant States Parties in the interim reports, all final decisions were taken in March. After receiving and assessing additional information provided by States Parties, ICOMOS carefully read and assessed all the information received, even in cases where additional information had not been requested. Reports on advisory missions in the framework of the upstream assistance process were also presented at the World Heritage Panel. ICOMOS thanked the nominating States Parties for their kind availability to attend the meetings and to provide additional information. Heritage and sustainable development was part of ICOMOS efforts related to the UN Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development, particularly the heritage target, and in Istanbul in February 2017 ICOMOS (with the kind support of ICOMOS Turkey) organized an international coordination meeting whose aim was to coordinate and mobilize ICOMOS activities and key partners in the 2017/2018 cycle towards advancing the cause of heritage

as a driver of sustainability. The meeting sought to shape strategies towards mainstreaming cultural heritage within a larger environmental and sustainable discourse, allowing the exchange of information and ideas related to the sustainable development goals.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** spoke of Post-Trauma Recovery, and following Decision 39 COM 7, ICOMOS organized in September 2016 an international workshop on the reconstruction of World Heritage properties. The outcomes allowed to start working on the guidance on post-trauma recovery and reconstruction of properties available on the ICOMOS [website](#). This [document](#) should be considered as provisional with ICOMOS continuing to work with all relevant stakeholders towards the elaboration of guiding principles on reconstructions to present to the Committee. Further information on this issue would be provided by ICOMOS over the next few days. The Representative remarked that cultural heritage was facing new and difficult challenges, among them climate change, the recurrence and severity of natural disasters, intentional destruction of heritage by armed conflict, [infrastructure] development projects, and planned mass tourism for which the current doctrinal and operational tools were sometimes insufficient for an appropriate and timely response. Facing these situations required new approaches with the participation of all relevant stakeholders. Thus, ICOMOS reaffirmed its commitment to protect and conserve the world's cultural heritage to transmit it to future generations. In this regard, ICOMOS expressed sincere gratitude to the States Parties, the Committee, the World Heritage Centre, IUCN, ICCROM and other partner organizations for the common work and the constant support to ICOMOS' activities that sought to protect cultural heritage, to build bridges, and to foster understanding among people and cultures as a means to contribute towards peace, security and equality in the world.

The **Director-General of ICCROM, Mr Stefano De Caro**, expressed thanks to the Chairperson and the Government of Poland for the warm welcome and hospitality. ICCROM was pleased to have the opportunity to present its 2016 activities in favour of the World Heritage Convention. The full report of ICCROM's activities could be found in [document 5B](#). In 2017, ICCROM continued its role in the reactive monitoring process, taking part in five reactive monitoring missions and one advisory mission in Africa, Europe, Latin America, the Arab States and Asia and the Pacific. Participation in these missions not only helped contribute towards better conservation and science, but it also contributed to gaining knowledge that helped to better prepare capacity-building activities. ICCROM also actively participated on reflections on the periodic reporting process. From the Committee's Decision 39 COM 13A, ICCROM was invited by ICOMOS for a second year to attend the ICOMOS World Heritage Evaluation Panel as a non-working member, on an experimental basis. ICCROM and ICOMOS would evaluate this practice and inform the Committee accordingly. ICCROM completed its task of developing its scoping study for policy guidelines for the World Heritage Committee. This work was carried out in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the other Advisory Bodies, presenting its results to the 40th session of the Committee. The World Heritage Centre would now commence the development of the recommended policy compendium, and ICCROM would continue to work with the World Heritage Centre and other Advisory Bodies as part of this process. Mr de Caro was pleased to reiterate ICCROM's commitment to its role as a focal point for capacity-building activities within the Convention. In 2016, a new programme was developed by ICCROM and IUCN, with the financial support of the Ministry of Climate and Environment of Norway. The new programme on World Heritage Leadership will focus on interlinkages of management of cultural and natural heritage and will be carried out in cooperation with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre [read about the first course [here](#)]. He took the opportunity to thank the Norwegian Government for their support of this innovative programme. ICCROM would also continue to collaborate both with category 2 centres and universities around the world in capacity-building activities, as well as coordinating several orientation sessions for Committee Members (the most recent one taking place yesterday). Further results on capacity-building would be presented under agenda item 6 later in the day. In addition, ICCROM also wished to thank the Government of Switzerland for its support over the past

ten years for the capacity-building programme. However, given the need for an enhanced capacity-building of the system, Mr de Caro strongly urged States Parties to work with ICCROM and other capacity-building partners to develop more activities at both the regional and international levels. Of special interest in 2016 was its work on post-conflict recovery. He spoke of the ICCROM-ATHAR partnership with the Louvre-Lens Museum, which co-organized a colloquium in January 2016 on the theme of endangered heritage. The event brought together specialists from international organizations, governments and universities, and based first-hand regional and international experiences as an opportunity for participants to discuss approaches towards recovery by comparing examples from different time periods and regions. Recovery, reconstruction or reconstitution of destroyed heritage has posed technical, scientific and methodological questions, along with ethical, economic and political ones. The colloquium discussed the various viewpoints on the post-conflict reconstruction and the work of international organizations. The proceedings of this workshop would be published in 2017.

The **Director-General of ICCROM** also mentioned the international conference Documenting our Heritage at Risk [more [here](#)] that ICCROM organized in Rome in May 2017 with the support of the Italian Association 'Incontro di Civiltà', in collaboration with UNESCO and ICOMOS, on the topic of documentation as the basis of conservation, the first step in every programme of heritage construction. He also took the opportunity to mention that the ICCROM-ATHAR Centre would be hosting several side events during this present session of the Committee. The first would discuss ICCROM-ATHAR's Action Plan aimed to strengthen cultural heritage and protection in the Arab region (to take place on Friday, 7 July). The second event (the following day) would discuss ICCROM-ATHAR's contributions to the conservation of World Heritage in the Arab region. Finally, Mr de Caro mentioned that this would be his last report to the Committee, as his term as Director-General would come to an end in December 2017. He spoke of his pleasure of representing ICCROM for the past six years as it increased its role within the Convention. He was sure that his successor would continue to emphasize the contribution that ICCROM can make to working with States Parties on safeguarding the world's cultural and natural heritage. He thanked his colleague, Mr Joseph King, who had guided all the issues related to ICCROM's role in the Convention. In addition, Mr Gamini Wijesuriya would also be retiring at the end of 2017. He played an important part in the ICCROM team working on World Heritage for the past 13 years and he was involved in all aspects, including capacity-building, periodic reporting, and state of conservation in reactive monitoring. He had contributed to pioneering work on communities, linking natural and cultural aspects, and given training courses on managing World Heritage, disaster risk management and impact assessment, and people-centred approaches to conservation. Mr de Caro thanked Gamini on behalf of ICCROM for this long service to the Convention.

The **Regional Director for Europe for IUCN, Mr Luc Bas**, remarked that IUCN's Head of the World Heritage Programme with IUCN, Mr Tim Badman, was also on the podium and was available to answer any questions on the report. He then thanked the States Parties for their comments already submitted on document 5A, and noted that IUCN's report on World Heritage in 2016 was set out in [document 5B](#). He also thanked States Parties, as well as the Ad-hoc Working Group, for their strong and continued partnership. IUCN was also grateful for the strong support and the voluntary effort of its IUCN Experts Commissions, as well as its members who underpin its advice to the Committee. Mr Bas then thanked the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM for the strong collaboration throughout the year, and notably for the successful hosting of the Nature-Culture Journey [more [here](#)] at IUCN's four-yearly world conservation congress in Hawaii in September 2016. It was noted that 2016 had seen new World Heritage studies and advice launched on the Arctic, the High Seas, and sustainable development goals in areas covered by overlapping international designations. IUCN would be launching new reports on wilderness and large landscapes and rights-based approaches at side events in the coming days. IUCN also saw wider work on key biodiversity areas as crucial in informing World Heritage successes, but also the challenges. The IUCN

World Heritage Outlook, the flagship global assessment of the state of World Heritage [read more [here](#)], was launched in 2014 and the second report would be published in November 2017. It would not only diagnose the status of each site on the List but also indicate where support is needed. It would also feed into a new and exciting IUCN initiative to recognize good management in a new green list of protected areas and conservation areas. Mr Bas also wished to note the significant work done on culture and nature linkages, noting in particular the significant new programme on [World Heritage Leadership](#) launched jointly with ICCROM and the Government of Norway, as well as the [Connecting Practice](#) programme with ICOMOS. IUCN thanked its partners, including private foundations, governments such as Bahrain, the Republic of Korea, Norway, Monaco, Switzerland and Germany, as well as Jeju province in Korea for supporting its work. IUCN's new global programme for 2017–2020 would also lead to further work in the region on World Heritage. Mr Bas remarked that his colleague, Mr Boris Erg, from IUCN Eastern Europe and Central Asian region, was also here to explore those opportunities.

The **Regional Director of IUCN** also spoke about the key challenge in Europe concerning sufficient implementation. He explained that in the EU, already 18 per cent of the territory was under some form of protection. The issues that remained were secure management, monitoring, and financing, and there were clearly untapped synergies existing between the protection of World Heritage sites and the EU Natura 2000 sites, as well as the Emerald Networks. Almost every natural World Heritage site in Europe overlaps with sites protected under the EU Directives, i.e. more than three million hectares of land and sea enjoyed this joint protection. So action to protect World Heritage sites clearly contributed to targets in the EU Biodiversity Strategy and the Berne Convention. The EU Nature Directives, which underwent a very thorough and difficult review in 2016, have now been secured, and States now had to catch up on lost time to reach the 2020 biodiversity targets in Europe. As World Heritage sites set the highest standards and examples, Mr Bas noted with concern that some sites in Europe were not yet secure in terms of conservation. IUCN would follow these issues very rigorously and constructively. He also spoke of the important responsibility of the Committee in Poland to promote high standards for Europe's World Heritage, and to encourage stronger implementation on the ground where efforts were lagging. Finally, it was noted that Europe could play a fuller role in its international support on World Heritage, as it was rich in experience and capacity, and well represented on the World Heritage List compared to other regions. Its responsibilities also lie in the international cooperation of the Convention, while acknowledging that there were still significant nature conservation sites for possible listing in Europe with some sites where States needed to rediscover their pride in their natural heritage. IUCN believed that World Heritage needed to feature more prominently in Europe's priorities for international cooperation. It was committed to working via its European IUCN States Members, NGOs and the EU to increase support for joint World Heritage as part of IUCN's global efforts.

The **Chairperson** thanked ICOMOS, ICCROM and the IUCN for their presentations, and proposed to return to the discussion and comments on the reports in the afternoon session. He then introduced the World Heritage Young Professionals Forum 2017, recalling that the Forum had begun on 25 June 2017 and was organized by the Polish National Commission for UNESCO and the International Cultural Centre in Krakow. The Young Professionals had worked on the theme 'Memory: Lost and Recovered Heritage'. In order to underline the importance of the involvement of young people in the protection of World Heritage and their active participation in the implementation of the Convention, the Chairperson had suggested that the outcomes of the work of the Forum be delivered at this first plenary session. A short video of their work was first shown.

Members of the UNESCO World Heritage Young Professionals Forum 2017 read a statement entitled, Memory: Lost and Recovered Heritage. They began by expressing gratitude to the President of the Polish National Commission, Dr Jacek Purchla, the Chairperson of the present session, Dr Mechtilde Rössler, Director of the World Heritage

Centre, the Polish National Commission for UNESCO, the International Cultural Centre in Krakow for organizing the Forum, and the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage of Poland for its financial support. Furthermore, special thanks went to the executive team and the groups of experts for their outstanding and relentless efforts. Emphasizing the fundamental value of universal peace enshrined in the Constitution of UNESCO from 1945, and noting the UN Sustainable Development Goals, especially goals 11 and 16, they expressed strong concern regarding the destruction of heritage. They believed in the importance of joint efforts in protecting the heritage of OUV for developing sustainable societies, highlighting the memory potential of World Heritage and firmly believing that memory sites offer tangible evidence of cultural significance in this turbulent world. They were convinced that preserving the identity of a property requires respecting the multitude of evolving ideas, values, practices and perspectives relating to its history. Remembering that, without people, there was no community, and without memory, there was no possibility for sustainable development. It should be the duty of every State Party to put people in the centre of its sustainable development goals. They also stressed that the opinion of local communities, indigenous peoples, artisans and youth should be an important factor when deciding on the conservation or reconstruction of cultural heritage. Acknowledging cultural diversity and the importance of heritage sites for the respective local communities, the involvement in any decision about recovery, reconstruction and further use of heritage sites is of crucial importance. They further stressed the importance of relying on authentic sources in order to avoid the appropriation of memory for political interest or aggressive nationalism, and that there should be limits to reconstruction. Recalling that memory is dynamic, so that space is made for the new memories of future generations, the Young Professionals, as custodians of World Heritage, are strongly committed to intergenerational and transnational responsibility of preserving World Heritage. They called upon UNESCO, as guardians of the heritage Conventions, to consider promoting an integrated approach of guardianship, recovery, preparedness and resilience, combining tangible and intangible heritage, culture and nature. They also called upon UNESCO to welcome efforts to include civil society and indigenous peoples into discussions and processes of the 1972 Convention to further strengthen these efforts, especially concerning the inclusion of youth. They called upon the international community to call on the local community – the keystone of any decision-making process – with regard to discussions on cultural identity and memory, as well as post-disaster management. They called upon States Parties to protect heritage shared across borders by prioritizing transnational serial nominations and itineraries to the World Heritage List so as to facilitate the bridging of cultures, local communities and nations. They further called upon States Parties to facilitate innovations, public/private partnerships, and entrepreneurship for sustainable recovery processes by creating conducive conditions for living management and green energy, and facilitating youth employability in the field of heritage. Lastly, they called upon States Parties to implement educational activities and establish participation mechanisms for local communities with special attention to minorities, indigenous peoples, marginalized groups, people with disabilities and youth. To support these efforts, the participants of the Young Professionals Forum 2017 commit themselves to using the tools and innovations of their generation to maximize their potential and efforts in the spirit of international solidarity, equality and mutual respect. They also commit themselves to actively take part in discussions on social and collective memory in order to transmit cultural values to preserve cultural diversity and to constantly reflect on the values of heritage, considering current and future events. They commit themselves to be in view of current events as a driver of peace, intercultural tolerance and international dialogue, and to oppose any form of political culture or other extremism against people and their natural and cultural, tangible and intangible heritage.

[Close of morning session]

FIRST DAY – Monday 3 July 2017

SECOND SESSION

3.00 p.m. – 6.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 5B: REPORT OF THE ADVISORY BODIES [Continuation.]:

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the reports under item 5B had already been presented during the morning session, and he opened the floor for comments on the reports.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** thanked ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN for the excellent execution of their roles, reaffirming that tremendous responsibility in helping ensure full and effective implementation of the Convention. It took note of the assessments of the Advisory Bodies of the growing complexity of nominations, and it suggested that clarity and comprehensiveness in the evaluation of nominations be given high priority. The delegation was also delighted to note that the upstream process had been implemented to help countries with their nominations. Indonesia had benefitted from the service and the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies since the 40th session of the Committee in their assessment of the State of conservation of the Cultural Landscape of Bali Province, Lorentz National Park, and the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra. It looked forward to further enhancement with the Advisory Bodies so as to strengthen national capacities in protecting and conserving its World Heritage.

The **Delegation of Finland** welcomed the continued and strengthened collaboration among the Advisory Bodies and with Member States, which highlighted the important role that the Advisory Bodies play in supporting the implementation of the Convention during this tight budgetary situation. Despite these budgetary challenges, the Bodies had undertaken a number of activities to support Member States in capacity-building in addition to their statutory work. The delegation was also happy to take part in the discussion concerning the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, keeping in mind that there were new comparative mapping forms and models for the use of advisory services by international instruments and programmes made by the Internal Oversight Service of UNESCO, which may offer certain aspects to discuss and utilize in the future, while not compromising the unique role of Advisory Bodies in implementing the Convention.

The **Delegation of Turkey** appreciated capacity-building activities by the Advisory Bodies with reference to the conservation of World Heritage properties and the preparation of nomination files. It also welcomed the strengthened dialogue and communication with States Parties in evaluating nominations since the 38th Committee session, while aware of the resources and time constraints faced by the Advisory Bodies in the process. However, from the States Parties' point of view, expectations were still high in terms of further exchanging views, especially following reactive monitoring missions and the first World Heritage Panel. The delegation felt that it would be constructive if the recommendations announced by the Advisory Bodies at the first Panel, particularly in the case of ICOMOS, could be open to revision should the State Party provide additional and sufficient information to the second Panel. In the case of a substantial revision in the file, the Advisory Bodies should reflect this in the final recommendation. The delegation also believed that a more relative approach, taking into account the regional and national context of the nomination files, would be beneficial.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the Advisory Bodies on their continued collaboration in the nomination and monitoring of World Heritage sites. It also noted the tremendous investments that the Advisory Bodies continue to make towards the various initiatives, as highlighted in the reports. The delegation wished to draw attention to the very

important and pertinent point in paragraph 58 of the report in which the IUCN highlighted what they described as the 'current workload' with reference to its unsustainability, with the Advisory Bodies of the opinion that they cannot continue along this path. The Committee, and certainly the World Heritage Centre, should thus look at what was implied by this call to action sought by the Advisory Bodies, and the delegation looked forward to a more detailed intervention in this regard in a later session.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** appreciated the warm hospitality extended by the Polish Government and commended the Chairperson for his expert leadership. It thanked the Advisory Bodies for their reports and recognized the important role they play in the system of World Heritage protection. The delegation encouraged ICCROM to continue its good work in producing resource manuals, especially on disaster risk reduction, and wondered whether there were plans to develop online training programmes to reach a wider audience for capacity-building. The delegation also highly appreciated the focus on post-conflict recovery, a long-term strategic issue. Given the growing number and scope of global conflicts today, it was important to be pre-positioned to provide assistance and support when conditions allow for their delivery. It welcomed efforts by ICOMOS to diversify the composition of the World Heritage Panels, which responded to previous comments by Member States to expand interdisciplinary approaches. It also commended the ICOMOS meetings with States Parties to fulfil the requirement adopted by the Committee for appropriate dialogue in the nomination process. The delegation sought ICOMOS's views on how to make the upstream process more effective and equitable. It thanked IUCN for the valuable inputs to discussions on sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, and it was appreciative of initiatives on the World Heritage in the High Seas and managing multi-designated areas. The delegation also sought IUCN's views on the upstream process and how to mainstream it in a credible and efficient way, for instance in complementing the global strategy and addressing gaps in the List. Lastly, it sought to hear from ICOMOS and IUCN regarding dialogue with nominating States Parties, and their views on how it could be improved.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their hard work and efforts to implement the Convention. With regard to the reports of the Advisory Bodies, the delegation spoke of the Connecting Practice programme implemented between ICOMOS and IUCN and the newly launched World Heritage Leadership jointly implemented by ICCROM and IUCN, which showed the importance of linking nature and culture for the sustainable conservation of heritage, and it strongly supported these efforts for setting good guidance. Acknowledging that the interlinkage of cultural attributes in natural heritage and the natural attributes in cultural heritage was almost customarily practised in traditional lifestyles, the delegation noted that this interlinkage was not adequately addressed in official management plans or assistance. Thus, seeking an operational approach for addressing these interlinkages in diverse heritage types was much needed in terms of World Heritage. With regard to strengthening dialogue and communication between ICOMOS and the nominating State Party, the delegation spoke strongly in favour of continuing such a dialogue process. The exchange of substantial information at an early stage gives the State Party great understanding and flexibility in dealing with the different outcomes of the nomination process. However, it understood from the Orientation Session that this practice would go through a reflective period from February 2018. It therefore wished for the process and method of communication to be mutually agreed upon beforehand and in the future between the Advisory Body and the State Party. It had been pointed out in the IUCN report that capacity-building was not supported as a statutory programme of the World Heritage budget since 2012 and that it was solely dependent on extrabudgetary funding. Capacity-building is one of the five strategic objectives of the Convention and therefore the delegation felt that this matter should be seriously addressed within the Budget Working Group meeting.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN for their concise and thorough reports, adding that one of the most important issues underlined in all the reports was the effort to further improve the working methods and cooperation among all

three Advisory Bodies, the States Parties and other stakeholders. The cooperation among the Advisory Bodies, either in the analysis of nominations, the evaluation of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, periodic reporting processes or capacity-building activities, was of the utmost importance that benefitted World Heritage and the States Parties concerned. The delegation took note of the efforts in strengthening the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties, as well as the changes in the evaluation measures introduced by ICOMOS and IUCN, which have helped the work of this Committee. It also believed that the effort to foster the implementation of the upstream process had been very positive and it encouraged the Advisory Bodies and States Parties to persevere in this important avenue. The delegation congratulated ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN for their efforts despite the current budgetary and other constraints, and hoped that it would be possible to enhance these good practices even further in the future.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** salue la contribution des organisations consultatives aux travaux du Comité. La Délégation souligne l'important rôle des organisations et de la collaboration entre les États et les organisations consultatives. Cette collaboration intègre l'exigence de qualité du travail des organisations consultatives pour guider les décisions du Comité, afin de disposer d'un patrimoine mondial qui garde toute sa pertinence. La délégation est consciente de l'accroissement du volume du travail et de la complexité de certaines situations auxquelles les organisations font face. Il souhaite que, dans le cadre de la facilitation du travail avec les États parties, il soit convenu que les missions de terrain soient mieux utilisées pour rationaliser les coûts de ces missions, surtout à égard de la situation financière fragile du Fonds du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** commended the Advisory Bodies for their very informative reports on their activities in 2016. It particularly appreciated and welcomed the decision to involve ICCROM during the ICOMOS World Heritage Evaluation Panel as a non-voting member. Indeed, ICCROM's experience on the conservation and preservation of cultural property should position it well to give appropriate advice on how best to consider the nominations on cultural properties. The delegation also noted and understood the challenges faced by the Advisory Bodies during the evaluation processes in terms of the limited time for further discussion with local experts, the transportation difficulties to some of the larger properties, as well as the difficulties in getting important and necessary data to fully understand the properties under evaluation. Nevertheless, it very much appreciated the efforts made by the Advisory Bodies, despite these difficulties, in strengthening dialogue with third parties, and their readiness to meet with them even on short notice. However, the delegation wished to know what actually happens to the reaction reports of the third parties on active monitoring reports, particularly in cases where the local experts do not agree or do not understand some of the issues presented in the active monitoring mission reports. Are the reports uploaded for public consultation or are they archived? The delegation echoed the remarks made by the Republic of Korea and Burkina Faso to encourage the Advisory Bodies to build mutual understanding on issues threatening the properties.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended the Advisory Bodies for their work despite the difficult and limited resources. In particular, it commended the work done in the upstream process, and particularly the work carried out in Togo in 2016 and Kenya in 2017 by ICOMOS, which helped in building capacity among the experts in the different countries in preparing nominations. The delegation continued to call for improved and appropriate dialogue between Advisory Bodies and States Parties. Too often States Parties feel misunderstood or misrepresented, and it was hoped that this could be minimized. In this regard, it agreed with the recommendations made by Burkina Faso and the Republic of Korea on improving dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies, adding that misunderstandings could also be prevented by increasing the diversity of experts within the Advisory Bodies to include representation from all the world's regions. The delegation hoped that the upcoming directory of World Heritage experts in Africa would help the Advisory Bodies identify African experts that could also be employed in their work.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** s'aligne aux déclarations faites par les autres États parties. Celle-ci félicite le travail développé par les organisations consultatives pour assurer la bonne mise en œuvre de la Convention sur le terrain à travers les missions d'évaluation et les activités de renforcement des capacités. L'Angola encourage le renforcement du dialogue dans le processus d'évaluation et les propositions d'inscription entre les organisations consultatives et les États parties, avec pour but d'améliorer cette représentativité sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. L'Angola reconnaît la complexité grandissante de l'évaluation et le suivi des propositions d'inscriptions, qui est essentiel pour maintenir la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ces biens. En revanche, l'Angola note l'insuffisance des ressources nécessaires pour la bonne mise en œuvre du processus en amont et du travail de terrain. Cette insuffisance pourrait aggraver ce déséquilibre sur la Liste. Par conséquent, elle encourage les organisations consultatives à continuer le développement de leurs capacités dans la mobilisation des ressources financières, et à ce titre, propose un amendement au projet de décision.

La **Délégation du Vietnam** tient d'abord à remercier la Pologne et la ville de Cracovie pour leur hospitalité. Elle remercie les organisations consultatives pour leur contribution à la mise en œuvre de la Convention, et elle apprécie les efforts des organisations pour renforcer la capacité et rendre plus transparente la procédure d'évaluation en ce qui concerne l'état de conservation et les dossiers de nomination. La délégation encourage les organisations à coopérer plus étroitement et approfondir le dialogue avec les États parties

La **Délégation de Cuba** remercie le travail des experts des organes de consultation et leur professionnalisme, et elle rejoint les commentaires du Zimbabwe, d'Angola et du Viet Nam sur l'importance de soutenir une coopération plus forte avec les États membres parce que c'est de ça que s'agit un Comité intergouvernemental. Cuba souligne l'importance de cet aspect afin d'éviter les contradictions, situations difficiles et autre politisation de cet organe important et visible. La délégation indique que le Comité du patrimoine immatériel est dans une même situation. Elle remarque qu'un président d'un organe d'évaluation a du renoncé de sa fonction justement à cause d'une situation difficile. La délégation remarque aussi que seulement 34 % des nominations présentées sont recommandés au Comité. Il est donc nécessaire d'établir une relation plus équilibrée et donner une représentation plus géographiquement équilibrée aux organes d'évaluation.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** salue et félicite les organisations consultatives pour leurs efforts multiples et multiformes, que ce soit pour des missions consultatives ou pour l'évaluation dans le cadre du processus en amont ou de mise en œuvre. Celle-ci souligne plus particulièrement les actions menées en Tunisie par l'ICCROM en dépit de ses moyens limités dans le cadre de la formation des conservateurs et techniciens de Libye. Elle encourage les organismes consultatifs à se doter davantage de moyens financiers et en personnel pour pouvoir étoffer leurs actions. La délégation les encourage à établir plus de confiance avec les États parties même si elle remarque que les organismes travaillent déjà de plus en plus avec les États parties. La Tunisie rejoint le reste des États parties pour demander à ces organismes de s'ouvrir à d'autres pays, notamment au plan de l'expertise, que ce soit dans les pays arabes ou dans les pays africains.

The **Chairperson** noted the important comments and questions, and invited the representatives of the ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN to respond.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** thanked the Committee Members for their interventions and useful suggestions for the future work of ICOMOS. Regarding the questions on the upstream process and how it could be made more equitable and efficient, the Representative agreed that the upstream process had proved to be very useful and it was considered a first aid to establish dialogue between the Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS and the States Parties. ICOMOS was aware however of its limits, as mentioned by some delegates, the most important of which were limited financial resources. Nevertheless, it would do its best to respond to all the requests of upstream assistance, but in some cases the very limited

resources prevented it from being more efficient or or responsive to States Parties. There were several interventions on how to improve dialogue between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies, which ICOMOS was working on, adding that every time it explained changes introduced in the evaluation process, ICOMOS had to clarify that it was on an experimental basis. As previously explained, ICOMOS had introduced a change in the last Panel in November [2016], and when there were no decisions taken in meetings with the nominating States Parties, except for cases where it was clear that it was a non-inscription, it was communicated to the State Party with the interim reports. Nevertheless, ICOMOS was working on improving dialogue, but holding these meetings in the middle of the Panel was a step forward and had been very useful for ICOMOS. It was also hoped that this had been useful to States Parties as well because issues identified by ICOMOS were noted prior to taking the decisional recommendation. Regarding the questions raised by Turkey on what happens between the first and the second Panel, and what happens in cases of substantial revisions to nomination files, the Representative explained that ICOMOS carefully reads and assesses all the information received by the State Party by the 28 February, even in cases when new, additional information was not required. However, it was also true that in some cases, practically new nomination dossiers were received. He further explained that one of the problems was the deadline for receiving additional information, which was set at the 28 February, and on the basis of this timeframe, ICOMOS had to submit the evaluation reports between seven and nine days *after* studying all the documentation. ICOMOS advisers therefore do their best to carefully read all the submitted documents, as well as the additional information in some cases, before reaching the final decision of recommendation, which is taken in March.

With regard to the specific question by the Philippines on online programmes, the **Representative of ICOMOS** admitted that there were no plans for online programmes at the present time, even if there was a lot of information on the websites, not only on the ICOMOS site but also on the other Advisory Bodies' websites, as well as the World Heritage Centre. The Representative nevertheless spoke about the manuals on preparing nominations and on managing both cultural and natural World Heritage properties; a contribution that the Advisory Bodies made together with the World Heritage Centre over the past years. With regard to achieving a better balance and representation, not only on the World Heritage Panel but also in on site missions, he believed that the situation in the Panel had improved. He referred to the information posted on the ICOMOS [website](#) [on the panel] in which the percentages between the number of nominations and the number of experts by region on the World Heritage Panel could be compared. It was noted that there was practically the same percentage of nominations and experts today. In the case of mission experts, ICOMOS obviously always tries to find experts from the region. ICOMOS assured the Committee that it was only in exceptional cases, when there were specific types of heritage, when it sends experts from outside of the region. In practically all the missions, experts come from the same region.

Le **Représentant d'ICCROM, Mr Stefano de Caro**, souligne sa satisfaction quant à la coopération entre les organismes consultatifs dans des programmes comme le Leadership Programme avec l'UICN ou à la participation au panel de l'ICOMOS. Celui-ci revient sur des cas particuliers : la question des Philippines sur l'e-learning, sur le training à distance. C'est quelque chose que l'ICCROM à engager dans son prochain cycle stratégique. Dans le cycle à six ans de l'ICCROM, ce dernier commencera par des « experiments » et cherchera à arriver à une politique véritable sur l'éducation à distance. Dans la tradition de l'ICCROM, il y a toujours eu la formation face-à-face mais l'organisme comprends que la demande en e-learning soit forte. ICCROM reconnaît les compliments fait par la Tunisie sur son travail en Libye. ICCROM remercie la Tunisie et l'Institut national du patrimoine pour l'accueil qui lui a été offert. Elle remercie aussi les Etats-Unis pour l'aide financière, engrangée par le Fonds de l'Ambassadeur des Etats-Unis pour la Libye, qui lui a permis de développer une partie de ce programme, même s'il est tout à fait exceptionnel. De plus, l'ICCROM remercie l'Indonésie pour l'avoir cité à propos de la mission qui a été faite à Bali. En effet, le site de

Bali est maintenant présent dans le Forum des managers des sites. C'est une expérience très intéressante dont ICCROM va tenir compte. Dernièrement, ICCROM voudrait faire une adresse au représentant de l'Indonésie puisque c'est un dossier de l'agrégation à l'ICCROM qui est encore ouvert depuis des années et c'est vraiment un pays que l'ICCROM voudrait voir à la prochaine Assemblée générale.

The **Representative of IUCN** thanked all the Committee Members for their very helpful and constructive interventions and comments, adding that great strides had been made together over the years to better support the Convention, and also to realistically see the current state of play and what's possible and what requires new strategies and new interventions. With regard to Jamaica's question on resources (though a number of States Parties also recognized the limitation of resources as a key issue), the Representative explained that this issue had been addressed at length at the Budget Working Group and the Ad-hoc Working Group, adding that he appreciated the opportunity with the Working Group to have a dialogue on resource mobilization between the meetings of the Committee. Moreover, there was an opportunity under agenda item 12A to return to this issue. However, in very simple terms, he felt that there were two different issues. One issue related to limited resources for statutory work, where it was not possible to find extrabudgetary funding, and thus IUCN had to look at the money available for the statutory work that the Committee requires. The second issue related to having a better approach in terms of partnership to mobilize resources for areas of work that the World Heritage Fund is unable to fund, which includes work on capacity-building. He conceded that the IUCN's capacity-building budget was very small when it existed, and nowhere close to providing the scale of resources demanded by States Parties. The Representative felt that capacity-building and the very exciting new collaboration mentioned by ICCROM were the most promising avenues, and it appreciated the comment made by Indonesia on the need to see the logic of working in World Heritage sites connected to broader capacity-building in countries with regard to connecting World Heritage to the bigger conservation and institutional goals that each country requires.

The **Representative of IUCN** then turned to three points related to better ways to collaborate. The Philippines raised the question of upholding the upstream process, and he remarked once again that this item would be discussed at greater length under agenda item 9A. However, he agreed that there were some very significant challenges in exactly the issue raised by the Philippines on the equity in which the upstream process unfolded. However, there was currently no way to resource it adequately, with the risk of uneven support, i.e. depending on a country's means to ask for the support. Thus, there was a need to look at questions of prioritization and partnerships. This also touched upon the point about diversifying networks, for example, IUCN had been able to make progress with its collaboration with the African World Heritage Fund with currently a full-time member of staff in Senegal to support West Central Africa World Heritage, and with the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage in Bahrain with a full-time member of staff supporting the Arab States, where both regions have limited natural site recognition. It was hoped that with support from the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation work would be carried out in Central Asia; another region where natural sites were under-represented. With regard to ways of improving the dialogue process, IUCN was doing a lot in many ways, but at the limits of what was possible. IUCN encouraged the growing number of delegations to visit the Headquarters [in Gland, Switzerland] and to contact the office. However, the largest issues concerned the need to put more time into the evaluation process because, as mentioned by ICOMOS, there were only two months between the Panels. The IUCN decisions were held open, and further information from States Parties were always requested one month *before* the requisite time (requests are issued at the end of December instead of the end of January), as with ICOMOS. Nevertheless, the time was limited and a number of issues really need much more time.

With regard to the several comments made on optimizing the use of field missions, the **Representative of IUCN** felt that it would be good to think about the different ways to plan

visits so as to ensure that when Advisory Bodies visited a site, they optimized the time spent to have the largest possible impact. IUCN believed that it would be good to look at the other models, apart from Reactive Monitoring Missions, such as advisory missions, but also within the Connecting Practice programme with ICOMOS in which different types of mission collaborations were being explored that could perhaps be more productive to States Parties. The IUCN was therefore happy to engage in a reflection on how missions could work better. With regard to the question by Tanzania about what happens when – at the local level – mission reports were disagreed with or misunderstood, the Representative believed that these were two different types of situations. In the case of a disagreement with the mission report, then normally it was up to the State Party in its follow-up report to present its own perspective to the mission report. In the case of a misunderstanding, and if the recommendations were unclear, the key point would be to make contact with IUCN, as these missions should convey information that is understood and useful.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted three amendments, one received from Jamaica, one from Angola, and one from three States Parties, namely, Philippines, Turkey and Indonesia. The first amendment proposed a slight change in paragraph 3, which would read, 'in particular the concerns surrounding sustained funding of evaluation and monitoring activities'. The second amendment sought to introduce a new paragraph 4, which would read in French, '*Félicite les organisations consultatives pour les efforts consentis pour la mobilisation de ressources financières additionnelles et les encourage à poursuivre dans cet élan*'. In English, this would read, 'Congratulates the Advisory Bodies for their efforts to mobilize additional financial resources and encourages them to continue in their endeavour.' This was followed by an additional paragraph 5, which would read, 'Requests ICOMOS and IUCN to continue to engage in appropriate dialogue and consultation with States Parties to further enhance overall transparency and optimize decision-making in the Committee'.

The **Chairperson** turned to paragraphs 1 and 2, which were duly adopted.

With regard to the third amendment, the **Delegation of Portugal** did not have a problem with the text but with the translation of 'optimize' in the French version.

Le **Délégation du Cuba** soutient la proposition du paragraphe 5.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** supported amendment 5 proposed by the Philippines.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** soutient les amendements 4 et 5.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** and the **Republic of Korea** supported amendment 5.

The **Delegation of Portugal** clarified that it also supported paragraph 5. Its only issue was with the translation between the French and English versions.

Agreeing with Portugal, the **Delegation of the Philippines** proposed removing 'optimize'. It thanked the Committee for its support, clarifying that the paragraph did not include ICCROM because it specifically addressed the evaluation process.

La **Délégation de Cuba** soutient la question posée par Zimbabwe concernant la distribution géographique, ajoutant qu'il est possible d'améliorer la distribution géographique des experts à l'intérieur de ces organes consultatifs. Cuba demande qu'il reste dans le rapport pour éviter de prolonger les débats dans ce projet de décision.

The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraphs 3–5 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 5B adopted as amended.

ITEM 5C: THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/5C](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/17/41/COM/5C)
Decision: [41 COM 5C](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item 5C on the World Heritage Convention and sustainable development, inviting the Secretariat to briefly present the item.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** remarked that this was a very critical document, as mentioned by a number of Members during the debate under item 5A. She invited Ms Nada Al Hassan, the focal point on sustainable development at the World Heritage Centre, to present the item.

Le Secretariat explique que la politique pour l'intégration d'une perspective de développement durable dans le processus de la Convention du patrimoine mondial a été adoptée par la 20^e Assemblée générale des États parties en 2015. Ce document décrit les progrès accomplis dans sa mise en œuvre depuis la 40^e session du Comité, notamment par l'exploitation du grand potentiel du patrimoine mondial à contribuer au développement durable et à concilier, en les renforçant, les liens entre conservation et objectifs généraux du développement durable. Ce faisant, il est entendu que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle des biens ne devrait pas être compromise dans le processus. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial et des organisations consultatives suivent une intégration progressive d'une perspective de développement durable dans les processus de la Convention. Elle explique comment en parallèle, ils tirent parti des synergies nées de l'engagement des États parties en faveur du programme 2020–2030 des Nations Unies ; et là, beaucoup de choses se passent dans les pays qui font parties de la Convention. Des progrès ont été accomplis dans l'ébauche d'un plan d'action pour la mise en œuvre de la politique du développement durable lors d'un atelier organisé par l'Agence fédérale allemande pour la conservation de la nature à Vilm, en Allemagne, en novembre dernier, sur le thème « Patrimoine mondial et développement durable, de la politique à l'action ». Et nombreux sont ceux dans le comité qui, l'année précédente, ont demandé ce travail. Cela a été fait en partenariat avec les organisations consultatives et en collaboration avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial. La preuve, ce développement durable a été intégré dans la révision en cours des questionnaires sur les rapports périodiques. Le développement durable est désormais l'un des piliers du cadre analytique de l'exercice des rapports périodiques. Il y a été intégré de manière à obtenir des données mesurables et pour sensibiliser le public. Un travail est également en cours sur le patrimoine mondial et les approches fondées sur les droits.

Le Secretariat explique qu'en outre, l'UNESCO œuvre à contribuer au programme du développement durable des Nations Unies pour 2020–2030, à travers tous ses programmes et en favorisant les synergies entre les conventions culture qui portent sur le patrimoine culturel en général. Elle met en avant le Rapport mondial de l'UNESCO sur la culture et le développement urbain durable qui a été présenté à la 3^e Conférence des Nations Unies. Ce [Rapport global](#) sur le développement urbain durable a été présenté à la 3^e Conférence des Nations Unies sur le logement et le développement durable urbain (Habitat III) en octobre 2016, à Quito en Équateur. La Commission de statistique de l'ONU a donné comme tâche à l'Institut de statistique de l'UNESCO de suivre l'indicateur 11.4 qui porte sur les dépenses par habitant consacrées à la préservation, à la protection et à la conservation de l'ensemble du patrimoine culturel et naturel. Pour cela, l'Institut de statistique de l'UNESCO a réuni un groupe d'experts sur les statistiques du patrimoine en septembre 2016 pour commencer à mettre au point un système de collecte des données au niveau mondial et développer la méthodologie nécessaire. Bien que cet indicateur concerne l'ensemble du patrimoine culturel et naturel, il est sous-entendu qu'il inclut les statistiques relatives au patrimoine mondial. L'UNESCO est également engagé dans plusieurs activités de renforcement des capacités portant sur la politique de développement durable dans plusieurs pays. Le Secrétariat a des projets opérationnels au Congo, au Mali, au Niger, au Lesotho et en Afrique du Sud, au

Népal, au Bangladesh, au Pakistan, en Albanie et en ex-République yougoslave de Macédoine. La Conférence d'Arusha tenue en Tanzanie en mai 2016 intitulée « La sauvegarde du patrimoine mondial africain, moteur du développement durable », a permis le lancement de plusieurs projets pilotes et à promulguer une dynamique positive dans la région Afrique. **Le Secrétariat** souligne qu'en général, dans les rapports sur l'état de conservation soumis par les États parties cette année, le Centre et les organisations consultatives ont observé une tendance à déployer des initiatives de développement social et/ou économique au détriment de la durabilité. Finalement, elle met en garde qu'il est important de rappeler que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle des biens du patrimoine mondial ne devrait pas être compromise dans la mise en œuvre de la politique sur le développement durable.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted that there was a need for further effort and engagement to ensure that World Heritage properties implement recent Convention policy on sustainable development, incorporating OUV. The Advisory Bodies were pleased to join together to convene the expert workshop on World Heritage and Sustainable Development organized by the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) on the Isle of Vilm on 14-17 November 2016, where this meeting provided a roadmap of opportunities to consider how sustainable development could be mainstreamed into Advisory Body processes [meeting [report](#)]. With a view to advancing the operationalization of the SDGs, particularly targeting 11.4 to strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage and their localization into specific objectives and policy orientation, ICOMOS set up an Ad-hoc Task Force for Sustainable Development at Habitat III in October 2016. The ICOMOS focal point for sustainable development convened a meeting in Istanbul (Turkey) in February 2017 that allowed ICOMOS members and partners to exchange information and ideas, as well as to identify the next steps and the overall distribution of ICOMOS activities in the 2017/2018 cycle, while advancing the course of heritage as a driver of sustainability, in particular, for localizing the implementation of the SDGs. In the weeks following the meeting, based on discussions and comments from ICOMOS members, a draft ICOMOS Action Plan for Cultural Heritage and Localizing the SDGs was prepared. The Action Plan clearly defines the ICOMOS mission within the overall sustainable development agenda and specifies its contribution through concrete action and outputs. It covers a wide range of actions that includes: i) strategies and instruments for advocacy and mainstreaming cultural heritage within the sustainable development agenda; ii) promoting research that can contribute to integrated SDGs with inherited policies and vice versa; iii) providing guidance and support to stakeholders at the national and local level; iv) networking with other organizations; v) preparing a portfolio of successful case studies of cultural heritage and SDG integration; vi) refining monitoring indicators; and vii) developing far-reaching activities.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** also reported that ICOMOS had developed relations with United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), having contributed to the second UCLG Culture Summit in Jeju (Republic of Korea) in May 2017, and together with IUCN, Europa Nostra, the Organization of World Heritage Cities (OWHC), as well as several local governments, had organized a special session on developing a multi-stakeholder platform for localizing target 11.4. It was noted that representatives from IUCN, ICOMOS and UCLG had further discussions since Habitat III in Quito, and continue to develop a joint programme on SDG localization and an indicator framework, while pursuing funding. The activities of ICOMOS, IUCN, OWHC and UNESCO would be presented at a panel 'Localizing the SDGs' this coming evening. It was further reported that IUCN continued to work on developing a framework for incorporating a consistent service benefit, as a key consideration in the management of natural World Heritage sites to achieve sustainable development. IUCN wished to thank BfN for their support in this work. IUCN would also present preliminary results from this work at a side event during the present Committee session on the 7 July at 2 p.m. It was further noted that ICCROM had introduced sustainable development into many of its capacity-building activities and had developed a module of sustainable development that was tested during the implementation of its 'conservation of built heritage' course. In

fact, it was ICCROM's intention to reorient the entire course on the conservation of built heritage around sustainable development concepts. ICCROM's approach has been to promote the importance of the people factor and the well-being of society in conjunction with heritage. Sustainable development approaches were also well-integrated into the new World Heritage Leadership Programme, as sustainable development formed the basis for the links between conservation and cultural and natural heritage. Finally, ICCROM was currently going through a new programme and budget planning process with the intention of placing the SDGs as one of the organizing elements of the entire programme of activities. Taken as a whole, the work of the three Advisory Bodies would ensure that the policy on World Heritage and sustainable development would produce concrete results on the ground.

The **Delegation of Finland** was happy to see this item on sustainable development on the agenda. It considered the relation between sustainable development and World Heritage related activities as inherently intertwined dimensions. According to the new implementation plan of Finland's national World Heritage strategy, sustainable development was taken into account in the protection and management activities of World Heritage sites. The sites also constituted a diverse learning environment, supporting sustainable development and lifelong learning. Furthermore, the responsible parties for World Heritage sites in Finland were encouraged to participate in the national implementation of the UN 2030 Agenda. The delegation was also happy to note the many worldwide activities combining sustainable development and World Heritage. It also welcomed the work by UNESCO Institute for Statistics in contributing to the follow-up of SDGs through indicator 11.4. In addition, the delegation encouraged UNESCO and all States Parties to identify and make visible the many different ways the implementation of the Convention contributed to achieving the SDGs, in particular, in relation to SDG 11 for cultural heritage, but also for SDGs 14 and 15 for natural heritage. It also welcomed the discussions that had taken place to foster peace and security, as part of the three dimensions of sustainable development and referred to in paragraph 24 of the report. In terms of the draft decision and its paragraph 4, the delegation preferred to use the wording used in paragraphs 33 and 34, which highlighted the need to fully respect and protect the OUV of the sites. It thus proposed a new paragraph, highlighting the contributions of the Convention in relation to several SDGs, which had already been submitted to the Secretariat.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** exprime sa satisfaction et son appréciation du travail mené par le Comité du patrimoine mondial sur la question du développement durable et salue l'excellent rapport au Secretariat. La Tunisie est consciente de la sensibilité et de l'extrême importance d'introduire le souci constant du respect du développement durable dans la question conceptuelle, gestionnaire et même prospective de la gestion du patrimoine. C'est une question qui s'applique à beaucoup de sites déjà inscrits et qui pourrait servir vers nouveaux critères quant à l'inscription sur la Liste. La Tunisie remarque l'importance de cette politique pour la politique publique de son pays en indiquant la prochaine Conférence des ambassadeurs à Tunis a pour thème la question de la diplomatie et des objectifs du développement durable. La délégation souhaite également apporter son appréciation pour le projet de décision soumis par le Comité.

The **Delegation of Turkey** thanked the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for their follow-up activities and efforts in integrating the sustainable development perspective into the framework of the 1972 Convention. It was pleased that sustainable development was now one of the pillars of the analytical framework of the periodic reporting exercise. It also welcomed the inclusion of references to local communities, indigenous peoples, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and private entities in the relevant paragraphs of the Operational Guidelines, as they were key to the conservation and management of World Heritage properties and throughout their nomination processes. States Parties should also integrate sustainable development objectives into national processes related to World Heritage, starting with the capacity-building of site managers, which was also part of the Helsinki Action Plan and would demonstrate how to harmonize the

various documents through actions. The delegation wished to highlight three important initiatives that were mentioned in the report, namely, it welcomed the UNESCO category 2 centres, as they could serve as a powerful tool for raising awareness at the local and regional levels. It also welcomed the dedicated [webpage](#) by the World Heritage Centre on this issue, and ICCROM's initiative to include a programme on heritage and sustainable development to ensure that sustainable development concepts were integrated into the larger heritage conservation context. Finally, the delegation looked forward to finalizing the policy guidelines, as it would be an important asset for future deliberations.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** appreciated all the efforts and achievements presented. It also took note that the Committee – in its decision in 2016 – welcomed the adoption of the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy by the General Assembly of the States Parties to the Convention in 2015, while emphasizing the need to achieve an appropriate balance and integration between the protection of OUV and the expected sustainable development objective. It was also noted by the World Heritage Centre – in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies – that the integration of sustainable development perspectives in the Convention would enable all stakeholders involved in its implementation to act with social responsibility. It was on this note that the delegation affirmed that the introduction of this policy, to fully embrace sustainable development, was necessary so as not to be a victim but rather a catalyst for wider change. The delegation also noted the close link and dependence on biological diversity and local cultures within the socio-ecological systems of many World Heritage sites. There was thus a need to review and reinforce government frameworks within the management systems of heritage properties in order to achieve the appropriate balance, integration and harmonization between the protection of their OUV and sustainable development objectives. All negative impacts on the environment and cultural diversity should be indicated, and environmental, social and cultural impact assessment tools should be promoted, particularly with regard to urban development, transport infrastructure, mining, and waste management. It had been two years since the adoption of the policy after a process of several years. If the delays continue there was a danger of making the policy itself obsolete. The delegation therefore encouraged the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to start working on the Operational Guidelines so as to accommodate the processes and procedures of the environmental assessment, as clearly stated in the policy document, as soon as practical, especially as this important work had been on the drawing board for many years. In this regard, the delegation had submitted a draft proposal to the decision to accommodate: i) the support of the State Party of Germany; and ii) a call to operationalize the policy as soon as practical.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** noted that SDG target 11.4 clearly opened the door for a prominent role for the Committee and the Convention to contribute concretely to sustainable development. As it was the Philippines' last session as a Committee Member, it strongly encouraged the remaining Members to promote the Convention's important contributions to the 2030 Agenda as a cornerstone of the Committee's future work. The delegation also wished to enquire about the outcomes of the Experts Meeting on a draft framework for measuring the impact of culture on the SDGs, as referred to in paragraph 36 of the report. It also wondered whether any synergies were being developed with the 2005 Convention. Finally, following Turkey's important remarks on indigenous peoples, the delegation felt strongly that issues involving vulnerable groups, such as PWUDs [persons who use drugs] and women, were emerging and evolving dimensions that should be taken into account by the Committee in the 2030 Agenda.

The **Delegation of Portugal** wished to draw attention to the very important statement made by Tanzania that addressed a number of substantive issues faced by the Committee. It thanked the World Heritage Centre for its work in further mainstreaming sustainable development principles into the processes of the Convention, and it also thanked ICOMOS for its comments. The implementation of the 2030 Agenda when linked to the 1972 Convention required in fact appropriate strategies for long-lasting conservation and

management of World Heritage properties in line with the fundamental principles of human rights, equality and long-term sustainability. The delegation welcomed the process-based approach applied in the limitation of this policy, and it praised the World Heritage Centre and States Parties for considering the integration of sustainable development as one of the pillars of the analytical framework of the periodic reporting exercise. Moreover, Portugal was deeply committed to this new approach, and the sustainability dimension had been integrated into the management of its World Heritage properties, as well as in the context of support of the World Heritage network in close consultation and collaboration with the different stakeholders. The delegation recalled the very timely discussion in 2016 on the need to balance World Heritage and development, and to articulate the three dimensions of sustainable development in the most effective way. It was indeed crucial that these actions – in relation to the World Heritage sites – have a positive effect in improving the living conditions of the communities and the environment, while contributing to sustainable conservation, particularly as there was often tension between the needs of conservation and the legitimate aspirations for greater development by populations who were occasionally living in near poverty levels. These tensions should not, and cannot be ignored. It was thus the government's role to iron out contradictions in policies, and the reason why the perception of positive synergies between historical and cultural heritage and social and economic development had an obvious strategic value in this context. The delegation reiterated that this policy should guide all States Parties to further ensure that the protection and conservation of OUV for all heritage properties is fully aligned with the pursuit of sustainable development objectives.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** acknowledged the marvellous efforts by the Advisory Bodies, as well as the NGOs, BfN and the experts, and also for the important comments made by the Committee Members. It understood that a clearer framework and policy guidelines was still in the process of being established, yet as culture and heritage had been marginalized in the development plan, and owing to the increasing complexity of cultural heritage and sustainable development, it was now imperative to broaden these notions by embracing a holistic approach. This should comprise not only heritage experts, but also various groups of experts from different fields, such as economists, politicians, and environmental groups so as to examine the linkages between these components and how they correlate with one another. This would also create a logical model in which to embed the values-led approach to provide logically linked interventions that are validated, while clearly communicating conclusions and recommendations, and ensuring that objectives are set and options are created and reviewed by analysing their costs and benefits, which would eventually generate targets for effective evaluation. Kuwait was taking the initiative of organizational development and the transformation of its cultural institutions in order to redefine the strategic role of culture and heritage in the development process, while also integrating these activities into the sustainable development goals.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended the Advisory Bodies for their work in raising awareness and building capacities for sustainable development and heritage. It looked forward to the policy guidelines currently under development, which would hopefully enable States Parties to create a multi-stakeholder approach to heritage. The delegation understood that economic imperatives were one of the factors leading to a number of properties becoming World Heritage properties in danger. These imperatives included mining, logging, oil extraction and others, and this conflict between cultural heritage, sustainable development and economic development needed to be resolved quickly. The delegation thus urged for more work in this field, as well as greater support given to countries as they seek areas of development. It endorsed the [Ngorongoro Declaration](#) and its recommendations, and was happy to report that a number of community-based projects for conservation had arisen so as to enable communities surrounding World Heritage sites to be beneficiaries rather than obstacles to the protection of heritage.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** thanked the Secretariat for its comprehensive report on the implementation of the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy, adding that its adoption in 2015 constituted an important step in the history of the implementation of the Convention. Indonesia shared the ideas embedded in the policy that World Heritage conservation and management strategies should incorporate sustainable development perspectives and should thus contribute to the well-being of present and future generations, particularly at the present time when many World Heritage properties were threatened by the effects of climate change and human activities. The delegation appreciated all the work carried out by the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies, the States Parties and other stakeholders in the implementation of the policy. It was also delighted to learn that the operational and field activities that had been conducted had brought about positive results, and it expected that these experiences could be replicated in other World Heritage properties. The delegation encouraged the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to further develop approaches to balance conservation and development so as to help States Parties better implement the Convention and the policy based on their needs and condition.

With no further interventions, the **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to respond.

Le Secrétariat souligne donc une grande énergie au niveau national et un engagement qui est non seulement mû par la politique du développement durable au niveau de la Convention mais surtout par le programme 2020–2030 des Nations Unies. L'objectif était que cette politique soit intégrée dans le *modus operandi* des pays membres de l'ONU. La Finlande avait demandé l'année précédente plus de clarté dans la contribution de la Convention sur l'objectif 11, 14 et 15. Cela a été pris en compte. L'objectif 11 est particulièrement important parce que c'est le seul objectif où l'UNESCO a été mandaté par le système des Nations Unies pour la formulation des indicateurs, et cette intervention donne l'occasion à une explication des propositions qui seront mis en avant par l'UNESCO au niveau de toutes les Conventions culture à partir du biennium prochain. À cette Conférence générale, il sera proposé une priorité transversale pour la mise en œuvre de l'Agenda 2020–2030 qui prendra en compte toutes les Conventions de l'UNESCO et leurs contributions à tous les ODD. Le Secrétariat insiste qu'elle et la Division de la créativité travaille sur un site Web et une organisation de toutes leurs activités pour la mise en œuvre des ODD 11, 14 et 15, mais aussi pour l'ensemble des ODD. Concernant la question des Philippines sur leur réunion, le Secrétariat s'excuse. La réunion devait se tenir en juin mais elle aura lieu en septembre. Cette réunion constituera une approche qui va intégrer la Convention de 2005 et toutes les conventions culture de l'UNESCO. Cette synergie entre les Conventions est importante dans la dynamique 2020–2030. La politique du développement durable dans ce cadre est pionnière dans les Conventions de l'UNESCO. Le Koweït et la Tanzanie ont demandé que les approches soient multidisciplinaires et multisectorielles dans la discussion et la mise en œuvre d'activités. Le travail du patrimoine mondial engage activement les communautés locales, que ce soit à travers les projets opérationnels, à travers les dossiers d'inscription ou à travers les formations. Le Secrétariat souligne que ces pratiques deviennent parties intégrantes de son approche. Cette politique a engendré de nombreux changements dans les pratiques. Tout travail se fait non plus simplement avec des experts du patrimoine mais avec des sociologues, des politologues et anthropologues, comme par exemple pour la reconstruction des villes endommagées par la guerre. Il en va de même pour le site Web de l'UNESCO ; la politique du développement durable fera partie d'un site Web sur tous les ODD. Finalement, la question importante posée par le Zimbabwe sur les exploitations minières, pétrolières, est une question très épineuse et comme le Comité sait déjà, l'exploitation minière est interdite sur les sites du patrimoine mondial. Cela rapporte des complications quant à l'inscription des sites naturels de très grande surface, qui sont ainsi sujet, dans le cas de certains pays en développement, à des politiques nationales qui veulent subvenir aux besoins économiques du pays. L'UICN est déjà présente sur cette question d'exploitation des ressources naturelles et a déjà un guide précis sur ces questions.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted three amendments from Finland, the Philippines and Tanzania. Finland proposed an amendment in paragraph 4, which would read, 'Reiterates the need to achieve the right balance between environmental, social and economic sustainability, while fully respecting and protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage Properties'. The Philippines introduced a new paragraph 5, which read, 'Underscores the important role and contribution to the Convention towards achieving Sustainable Development Goal, Target 11.4, 'strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage'. Paragraph 5 would now become paragraph 6. Finland introduced a new paragraph 7, which would read, 'Welcomes the work by the UNESCO Institute of Statistics for monitoring the Sustainable Development Goal, Target 11.4 through an indicator that reflect the total amount per capital each country spends to protect their natural and cultural heritage, and invites UNESCO and all parties to identify and make visible the many ways in which implementation of the World Heritage Convention contributes to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular SDG 11 for cultural sites and SDGs 14 and 15 for natural sites. Paragraph 6 would now become paragraph 8, and original paragraph 7 would now become paragraph 9. Tanzania introduced two new paragraphs. Paragraph 10 would read, 'Recalling Resolution 20 GA 13 and Decision 40 COM 12 in view of the ever increasing urgency to balance sustainable development and the implementation of the Convention at the site level, urges the World Heritage Centre in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies to finalize a clear framework for the Policy Compendium in order to allow for review of the Operational Guidelines for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018', and paragraph 11 would read, 'Commends the efforts undertaken by the State Party of Germany in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies in pioneering the preparation of a concrete programme of action concerning the operationalization of the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy and calls for the wider collaboration in consolidating these efforts'. Consequently, paragraph 8 would become paragraph 12. The Rapporteur noted that the Secretariat wished to add something concerning paragraph 10 and paragraph 11.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** had a comment regarding timing, as cited in paragraph 10 and presented by Tanzania, and referred to Decision 40 COM 12, explaining that the Secretariat would present the framework for the Policy Compendium at the Committee's 42nd session but that this also concerned a number of other issues not only sustainable development. Thus, in terms of timing, it would be very difficult to immediately change the Operational Guidelines in the same session, as the Committee has to first look at the Policy Compendium, followed by the subsequent Committee session during which the Operational Guidelines would be viewed once there were clear instructions. In another point, regarding paragraph 11, the Director suggested a more specific text, i.e. instead of 'pioneering the preparation of a concrete programme', with its apparent reference to the Vilm workshop, to replace it with 'commend the efforts [...] in organizing the Vilm workshop in November 2016 and initiating a concrete programme'.

La **Délégation de Cuba** fait un point d'ordre. Celle-ci souligne que quand un État membre souhaite faire un point d'ordre la parole doit être donner immédiatement. Cuba désire commencer avec le premier paragraphe, puis le Secrétariat peut donner sa réponse. Dans un souci de clarté, Cuba rappelle à avancer paragraphe par paragraphe.

The **Chairperson** returned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections, paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. He then turned to paragraph 3.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** souhaite se joindre à la Finlande sur le point 4 puisque elle est d'accord pour souligner l'équilibre entre la durabilité environnementale d'une part et sociale et économique d'autre part.

The **Chairperson** duly adopted paragraph 3.

La **Délégation de Cuba** rappelle l'importance d'aller de paragraphe par paragraphe. Cuba demande des clarifications sur le paragraphe 3 concernant le « programme d'actions concrètes ».

Le Secrétariat explique qu'il est en attente de ce document qui doit être présenté à la 42^e session. Celui-ci devait faire le tri de tout ce qui a existé dans l'adoption des décisions du Comité et créer un précédent intéressant pour l'intégrer dans ses activités, de lui donner un nom concret et ensuite examiner son intégration dans les Orientations.

La **Délégation de Cuba** insiste qu'il n'est pas possible d'adopter une décision ou de l'implémenter à partir d'un « programme d'actions concrètes » dont on ne connaît pas le contenu.

The **Chairperson** noted that the deletion of 'concrete programme of action' was more satisfactory, and with no objections, paragraph 3 was adopted. He then turned to paragraphs 4–9, which were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to paragraph 10 and the suggestion by the Director.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee of Decision 40 COM 12, which stated, 'Also requests the World Heritage Centre to submit the first draft Policy Compendium, reviewed by the Working Group, as well as to report on the progress of work for examination to the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018'. She noted that the issue was one of timing as the Committee would not be able to review those issues at the same session as for the Operational Guidelines, as the final Policy Compendium was foreseen for 2019.

With no objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 10 adopted as amended.

La **Délégation de Cuba** remarque de nouveau l'insistance du paragraphe sur le « programme d'actions concrètes » qui n'a pas été clarifié. Cuba propose de supprimer cette mention si la Tanzanie supporte la proposition.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** remarked that paragraph 11 was intended to commend the actions by Germany, but it had no issue with changes to paragraph 10.

La **Délégation de Cuba** remarque que par consistance, le « programme d'actions concrètes » qui est mis en avant doit être supprimé s'il a été enlevé du paragraphe précédent. De plus la délégation maintient que si l'intention du Comité est de féliciter l'Allemagne, cela peut rester dans le rapport du Comité [résumé des interventions].

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** explained that the information provided was contained in [Germany's] report, adding that Germany came to the meeting with this form of action, which Tanzania considered important, i.e. it was not created by Tanzania. However, if there was doubt in the report then the text could be deleted.

Le Secrétariat clarifie qu'il y a certainement un malentendu à cause du langage en anglais qui était le langage initial de l'écriture du rapport. Il explique que le plan d'actions est dirigé vers le futur et n'est pas un plan déjà établi auquel les délégations devraient approuver. Elle propose que, s'il y a un changement, il devrait être fait avec l'optique de clarifier le passage.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** requested to return to paragraph 4 for a clarification in 'Reiterates the need to achieve the right balance between environmental, social and economic sustainability, while fully respecting and protecting the OUV', inquiring whether the sentence implied that the Committee was trying to find the balance between the different aspects of sustainable development, or the balance and integration between the aspects of development and protection.

The **Delegation of Portugal** wished to revert to paragraph 11, noting that Cuba did not wish to undertake any commitment concerning a plan for which it did not know the content, while Tanzania wished to maintain a reference to the generous contribution by Germany. The delegation thus proposed in French, '*Félicite l'État partie de l'Allemagne pour les efforts*

entrepris en collaboration avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives pour leurs efforts concernant la mise en pratique de politique pour le développement durable et appelle à une collaboration plus large pour consolider ses efforts’. In this way, Tanzania would appreciate Germany’s action, while allaying the objections by Cuba.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the proposal by Portugal.

La **Délégation de Cuba** acquiesce de la proposition du Portugal même si elle insiste que les deux versions doivent garder la même signification que ce soit en anglais ou français.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to improve the translation and returned to paragraph 4.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** replied that it was just a question.

The **Chairperson** turned paragraphs 10–12, which were duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 5C adopted as amended.

ITEM 6: FOLLOW-UP TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CAPACITY-BUILDING STRATEGY AND PROGRESS REPORT ON THE WORLD HERITAGE-RELATED CATEGORY 2 CENTRES

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/6](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/whc/17/41.COM/6)

Decision: [41 COM 6](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 6, inviting the Secretariat to present the document.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** remarked that there was a small error in document 5A with the name change of Historic City of Vigan (the Philippines). Presenting working document 6, the Director recalled that the information on the implementation at both regional and international level of the World Heritage Capacity-building Strategy was approved in 2011 in Decision 35 COM 9B and developed by ICCROM and IUCN in collaboration with ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre and other capacity-building partners, such as the UNESCO category 2 centres in various regions of the world. This work was made possible by contributions from the World Heritage Fund and the Swiss Government. The document also presented a progress report on the WH-related category 2 centres and their activities, coordination and application of the new integrated comprehensive strategy for the centres, as well as information on the establishment and review of category 2 centres. She then invited ICCROM to present more information on this item.

The **Representative of ICCROM, Mr Joseph King, Unit Director**, reported on behalf of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre on the progress made on the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy. It was recalled that the Strategy was designed around the five strategic directions and was meant to cover a wide number of capacity-building activities and actors at all levels. The report in document 6 covered a wide range of activities at both the international and regional levels. At the international level, Mr King recognized the support of the Swiss Federal Office of Culture in supporting capacity-building activities for more than 10 years. More recently, support was shown by the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment that was devoted to capacity-building through its support of the new World Heritage Leadership Programme. He added that there was a great need for more capacity-building at all levels of work and requested all States Parties and other interested actors to join in training the next generation of leaders for World Heritage. ICCROM was very pleased with the interventions by Committee Members during the report of the World Heritage Centre in agenda item 5A as many emphasized the need for strengthening capacity-building, and it was the sincere hope to build on those expressions of support towards the development of new programmes and new activities.

The **Representative of ICCROM**, Mr Joseph King, began his report by speaking about the World Heritage Leadership Programme, a partnership of ICCROM, IUCN and the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. The Programme aimed at creating better links in the management of cultural and natural heritage through people-centred approaches. One of the main outputs of this activity would be the development of a single resource manual on managing both cultural and natural heritage in all World Heritage properties. The programme would also look at the issue of resilience of World Heritage properties and impact assessment. The intention was to develop a network of learning sites to be used to develop and share good practice in conservation, and also to build a strong network of World Heritage leaders around the world. The Programme was established on the occasion of the IUCN World Conservation Congress in Hawaii in 2016, and the first major activity of the programme took place just a few weeks ago at the World Heritage property of Røros in Norway where a group of 20 professionals from both the culture and nature sectors came together to take part in the first course on linking culture and nature. One of the key principles of capacity-building is the need to ensure that resource manuals are available in local languages. Towards this end, a number of partners have been working on the translation of resource manuals. So, for example, the manual for managing natural world heritage was translated into Portuguese with the help of the Portuguese category 2 centre. There was also a new Portuguese language manual for managing cultural World Heritage, and there were now manuals in Polish and in German to help prepare World Heritage nominations, in addition to those that already exist. Finally, for managing disaster risks for World Heritage, there was a new manual created in German. In terms of training courses, there were a number of key themes covered in the past year. Of course, people-centred approaches is an important issue and there was a course on culture and nature (in addition to the course held in Røros) that was carried out in collaboration with Tsukuba University in Japan on managing agricultural landscapes. The issue of people-centred approaches was part of the upstream process project for Lake Ohrid (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), and a course was held in 2016 on that topic. Another key issue that was increasingly coming up in conservation reports was the issue of impact assessment, and two courses were undertaken on this subject: one in partnership with World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region under the auspices of UNESCO (WHITRAP, Shanghai) in Vigan (Philippines) in October 2016, and the second in the Africa region in collaboration with the Africa World Heritage Fund in November 2016. The importance of maintenance and monitoring of World Heritage properties was also taken into account and a course was undertaken at the Summer Palace in China this past year [2017]. One of the key thematic areas for capacity-building at this time is disaster risk management. Given the number of natural disasters and conflict situations around the world, a number of activities on disaster risk management in various regions of the world have taken place. ICCROM also continued to update its own website to provide information and links to capacity-building activities around the world. Professionals wishing to look for courses can consult its classified section, which is kept up-to-date with [training](#) opportunities, it was also updating its international database on archaeological conservation projects, called [Fasti](#).

In addition to the international activities, Mr Joseph King of **ICCROM** also spoke about a number of activities at the regional level. Once the benefits of the periodical reporting exercise was compiled for each region, there was a possibility to develop and tailor specific capacity-building programmes and action plans to the needs of each of the regions or subregions. For example, in Asia, there were a number of capacity-building activities, some of them linked to the regional capacity-building strategy developed by WHITRAP-Shanghai, and in Latin America there were regional activities carried out by both the Lucio Costa Centre in Brazil and the Azteca Centre in Mexico based on a regional action plan. In Europe, the work was based around the Helsinki Action Plan, and a number of individual States had also begun national capacity-building activities. Mr King added that one of the aspects of the capacity-building strategy was to get individual countries to develop strategies specifically

tailored to their individual countries, with some countries in Europe in the process of achieving that goal. In Africa, with the Africa World Heritage Fund, there were a number of activities centred on nomination processes, but also management processes and disaster risk. There were also a wide range of activities taking place in sub-Saharan Africa. Finally, in the Arab States region, a number of activities had carried out by ICCROM's ATHAR Centre, by the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage in Bahrain, and also the World Heritage Centre. Some of the excellent activities undertaken by ICCROM-ATHAR Centre had already been highlighted earlier, but Mr King wished to highlight specifically IUCN's work with the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage on the [TAB'EA](#) programme; an excellent collaboration focusing on capacity-building for natural heritage that deserved support. He then highlighted the work done in the framework of the Strategy for the Reinforcement of UNESCO's Action for the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict with a number of capacity-building activities taking place within that framework. The World Heritage Centre had also been working on a number of other activities on sustainable tourism, an important area of work in relation to the management of World Heritage properties. In addition, the issue of marine sites and building a strong network of marine site managers was also something that could be a model for other types of heritage for the future.

Mr Joseph King of **ICCROM** referred to a request made by the Philippines at the 40th session of the Committee that sought some statistics on the people participating on these courses and activities. As a result, ICCROM started to collect this information, starting with five institutions¹, but it intended to expand this effort of data collection over 2018 to include all the category 2 centres and other capacity-building actors, and it would begin a new programme in 2018 to track trends in conservation, which it had already started to do. Mr King displayed on the screen some partial results on a small group of participants and their geographic scope from these five institutions. There were 111 countries represented in training programmes in these institutions over 2016. With regard to gender balance, the figures were not yet at a balanced level. However, carrying out this exercise had helped recognize that this was an area that required more work in the future. It was noted that there had actually been a significant participation from Asia and Pacific and also Africa, with a fairly good number from Europe, North America and the Arab States as well, though a little less in Latin America. Again, this showed the value of the exercise in highlighting areas that required more work in the future. Another specific request by the Philippines in 2016 was to classify the participants by World Bank income groups. It was noted that, significantly, the vast majority of the participants were coming from lower middle income or lower income countries. Mr King wished to thank the Philippines for asking the question, as this exercise helped develop these indicators and statistics that would ensure that training in the future better reached their targets. With regard to the category 2 centres, Mr King referred to working document 6 that contained the reports of the individual category 2 centres, which were also online at the World Heritage Centre [website](#). Moreover, the evaluations of two of the category 2 centres had been finalized, and there were also some feasibility studies currently being undertaken to look at the possibility of creating several new category 2 centres. Mr King also underlined that over the last couple of years, ICCROM had started having regular meetings with the category 2 centres; one had taken place in India in 2016, and the next would take place in South Africa. An informal meeting of category 2 centres was also taking place at the present Committee session. Mr King concluded by saying that indicators could also be collected across the system of category 2 centres.

¹ African World Heritage Fund; World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region under the auspices of UNESCO, Shanghai Centre (WHITRAP, Shanghai); Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage; International Research Centre on the Economics of Culture and World Heritage Studies (ITRECH); and Centre on World Natural Heritage Management and Training for Asia and the Pacific Region.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.

La **Délégation du Koweït** apprécie le contenu du rapport préparé par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'ICCROM sur les progrès réalisés dans la mise en œuvre de la stratégie du patrimoine mondial afin d'améliorer (i) les capacités et les activités des centres de catégorie 2, et (ii) les stratégies régionales pour renforcer les capacités. Le Koweït félicite le rôle du Centre arabe pour le patrimoine mondial dans le renforcement des capacités des pays arabes, en particulier ceux qui sont touchés par les conflits.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** thanked the Advisory Bodies and other relevant partners for the implementation of the Capacity-Building Strategy. It also commended countries and non-government actors that had made contributions to the implementation of the strategy, and it reaffirmed the critical importance of capacity-building being extended to countries, notably, the developing and least-developed countries. The delegation was also encouraged by the development of the World Heritage Leadership Programme and commended Norway for its funding. Indonesia took positive note of the programme that emphasized leadership, innovation and excellence in the face of pressing challenges and it looked forward to the implementation of the programme in its region. It noted that UNESCO had carried out a capacity-building programme in 2016 on the Cultural Landscape of Bali Province, which successfully developed a sustainable tourism strategy for the Subak system so as to achieve a balance between tourism activities and the need to protect and conserve the World Heritage site. The strategy also entailed public participation as well as community empowerment to strengthen public ownership of the Subak system and to ensure that the local community benefitted from the recognition of the Subak system as World Heritage, and the delegation thanked the Advisory Bodies for their assistance in this regard. Indonesia reaffirmed its commitment to establishing a Centre for Human Evolution, Adaptations and Dispersal in South East Asia as a UNESCO category 2 centre, which was in the process of internal preparation, and it would engage UNESCO in its further preparation.

The **Delegation of Finland** welcomed the follow-up report and the progress of the implementation of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy, which is very important and essential for all countries to manage and conserve their own World Heritage. It was therefore pleased to note Norway's support for the World Heritage Leadership Project, which Finland also considered a significant effort both to build knowledge in key issues and to create the link between culture and natural heritage. Finland was considering providing financial support to the project and encouraged all Committee Members to do the same. Finland had included practically all aspects of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy within its national World Heritage strategy whose objectives include: i) to have a clear and open administration; ii) guarantee sufficient economic resources; iii) support high-level competence of all relevant actors through education; iv) improve active awareness-raising; and v) ensure the full commitment of local and regional authorities, as well as the site owners. One topical issue in the strategy was related to capacity-building, and better linking cultural and natural heritage conservation and management together. In this regard, the full implementation of the UNESCO World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme was relevant, and it was happy to speak more broadly about the site after the plenary session.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that capacity-building lay at the heart of the Convention, without which it was not possible to have a truly balanced and credible World Heritage List. It therefore believed that the Committee should start taking a more strategic and systematic look at how capacity-building is being promoted. The delegation noted the progress made in the implementation of the regional capacity-building action plans with the involvement of category 2 centres, and it was glad that one such course on heritage impact assessment for the Asia-Pacific region took place in the Historic City of Vigan in the Philippines supported by ICCROM and WHITRAP-Shanghai. The delegation particularly thanked Mr Joseph King of ICCROM for the updated disaggregated statistics on the beneficiaries of the capacity-building programmes, recommending that this good practice of impact assessment continue in future sessions, as it helped gauge the tangible benefits of

capacity-building on the ground. From the figures presented by Mr King, there was a need to continue examining the impact and effectiveness of the capacity-building strategy since its adoption in 2011. In terms of site managers, stakeholders and experts from States Parties, those most in need had indeed benefitted in concrete and meaningful ways. There was also an apparent need to further enhance support to under-represented States Parties' sites in danger, also with respect to climate change adaptation and the promotion of gender equity. The delegation further encouraged linking capacity-building with thematic programmes, which was endorsed by the Ad-hoc Working Group, that would hopefully be adopted by the present Committee. In conclusion, the delegation welcomed enhanced coordination among category 2 centres, and looked forward to the outcomes of future meetings.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** reconnaît que le suivi de la stratégie du patrimoine mondial pour le renforcement des capacités continue d'être au cœur des mécanismes de mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial. L'Angola félicite le Comité du patrimoine mondial, les organisations consultatives et les différents centres de catégorie 2 pour la diversité des activités de formation menées dans les différentes régions du monde et salue également le choix du Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain d'abriter la prochaine réunion de coordination des instituts de centre de catégorie 2 en automne 2017 ou en 2018. L'Angola souhaite également que l'impact des activités menées dans les différentes régions en termes de renforcement des capacités soit clairement mentionné dans le rapport et que ces activités ne soient pas présentées globalement sous forme d'une liste d'activités mais plutôt de mettre un accent sur l'impact que ces activités ont sur le terrain. L'Angola encourage les centres de catégorie 2 à développer des activités de renforcement des capacités conjointes entre les différentes régions pour consolider les échanges d'expérience entre les professionnels du patrimoine à travers le monde. L'Angola remercie le Centre Lucio Costa pour la traduction des principaux manuels de référence du patrimoine mondial en portugais. Ces manuels contribuent significativement dans la préparation des actions de renforcement des capacités en direction des professionnels du patrimoine des pays lusophones d'Afrique. Finalement, l'Angola souhaite voir que le processus de renforcement des capacités d'experts africains, initiés dans les années 1990, soit repris afin que ces experts soient de plus en plus impliqués dans les travaux d'évaluation des dossiers d'inscription et des missions de suivi menées par les organisations consultatives, et que cette approche soit également étendue dans les autres régions regroupant les pays en voie de développement.

The **Delegation of Portugal** described the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy as one of the most important activities in the context of the implementation of the Convention, and it welcomed the excellent report presented. Concerning the development of the World Heritage Leadership Programme launched in September 2016, the delegation believed that its development would further enhance the understanding of the links between culture and nature, and would improve conservation practices in all World Heritage properties thus fostering a sustainable development in the implementation of the Convention. Portugal was also happy to note that the ICOMOS guidance on heritage impact assessment for cultural properties had already been translated into Portuguese. As regards disaster-risk management, Portugal organized in Lisbon in November 2016 an International Conference on Cultural Heritage: Disaster Preparedness, Response and Recovery with the participation of the United Nations Office for Disaster Reduction, ICOMOS, ICOM, UNIDROIT, the Smithsonian Institution, representatives of UNESCO National Commissions and experts from several countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Portuguese National Commission for UNESCO was currently organizing a workshop aimed at National Commissions of Portuguese-speaking countries with the help of UNESCO's Participation Programme to take place in November 2017 so as to share experiences and best practices regarding several UNESCO issues including World Heritage. The delegation congratulated the World Heritage Centre for its support of the activities described in the report, adding that it would greatly improve the capacity of managers and stakeholders, and increase knowledge on World Heritage issues.

The **Delegation of Turkey** spoke of the remarkable progress made by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies in implementing the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy. Capacity-building, both in terms of preparatory processes and conservation, should always remain as a priority and go hand-in-hand with upstream mechanisms and international assistance. Greater effort placed on resources and invested in these mechanisms would mean lesser problems encountered in terms of conservation and nominations in the future. The delegation also appreciated the activities of the category 2 centres and the importance of developing regional capacity-building initiatives. It also sought to hear more about twinned projects, particularly the total number of completed and ongoing projects, the names of States Parties and properties twinned, criteria for selecting appropriate partners, themes of collaboration, level of their efficiency and contributions to the capacity-building strategy, the role of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies in project partnership, and so on. In that regard, it kindly requested the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to highlight these points in the next progress report to be submitted to the Convention.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** recognized the excellent initiative in the form of the World Heritage Leadership Programme, adding that clearly capacity-building is seen as a very strong element in terms of World Heritage and its sustainability. The delegation emphasized the importance of a people-centred approach, which was mentioned extensively, in reaching out and empowering communities to participate in decision-making around World Heritage. It noted the strong focus in capacity-building on the topic of linking cultural and natural heritage conservation and management, which had the potential to fill gaps in preparing nomination dossiers for mixed sites notwithstanding the deficit that still remains with regard the number of mixed sites that have been put forward. It therefore welcomed hearing more on capacity-building programmes that focus on linking cultural and natural heritage conservation management and wished to know whether there were any deliberate moves in this direction by the Advisory Bodies.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** extended its appreciation of the various capacity-building actions mentioned in the report, adding that they infused much-needed life into the implementation of the Convention. As one of the beneficiaries of these capacity-building initiatives, Zimbabwe assured the Committee and ICCROM that the strategy would be maintained and even expanded, not least because knowledge was an important factor in building sustainability in heritage conservation and safeguarding, and that effectively it engaged the communities in conserving heritage.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** rejoint les avis formulés précédemment et félicite les actions menées par l'ICCROM. La Tunisie prend note du focus sur l'Afrique, l'Asie-Pacifique et les pays arabes qui, en réalité, ont réellement besoin de ces cours. Quand bien même un rééquilibrage sera souhaité, il n'en demeure pas moins que les régions tout juste citées auront encore besoin du soutien de l'ICCROM à condition que celle-ci puisse se doter adéquatement en moyens personnel et financiers. Tout en soulignant l'importance de ces cours pour le renforcement de capacités, la Tunisie demande s'il est possible d'avoir un suivi de ces formations pour savoir qu'elle impact ils ont sur le terrain, et s'ils participent réellement à créer une dynamique. La Tunisie souhaite que l'ICCROM s'ouvre davantage sur les experts africains et arabes pour cette formation multiple.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for all the comments, inviting ICCROM to respond.

Mr Joseph King of **ICCROM** thanked the Committee for the very positive comments, adding that it was clear that over the last couple of years, there was a stronger appreciation of and desire for capacity-building. Mr King thanked Jamaica in particular for emphasizing the community aspects of capacity-building, as it was important to link the aspects of culture and nature. With regard to the issue of impacts expressed by Tunisia, Angola and the Philippines, ICCROM would continue to collect these statistics and look more into how to measure these impacts, which would need to be measured over time and followed up with surveys to find out about the [progress of] participants in two, three or four years time. These issues were

also being looked at by the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH). That said, Mr King hoped to provide a richer report measuring those impacts in the future. He also thanked Finland for the possibility of supporting capacity-building in a more concrete way and he urged other States Parties to also offer support to capacity-building at ICCROM, IUCN, ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre, the category 2 centres, and nationally in their own countries. Capacity-building thus took place at many different levels and required support from the the entire World Heritage system and its actors for that to happen.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** had a slight amendment to reflect the debate and the valuable statistics mentioned by ICCROM [in a new paragraph 4], which would read, 'Further commends ICCROM for the presentation of the disaggregated statistics on the beneficiaries and impacts of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Programmes and encourages that this practice continues in future reports.'

The **Chairperson** then turned to adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–9 were duly adopted.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** est d'accord avec la proposition des Philippines mais elle remarque un problème sur l'orthographe du paragraphe, mais la faute est corrigée promptement ; l'Angola rejoint la correction faite.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 6 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for their support and active participation, inviting the Secretariat to make some public announcements on the side events.

The Secretariat informed the delegates of a side event on 'Linking culture and nature within sustainable tourism' organized by Finland, which would take place at the end of the present session. There was also another side event on 'World Heritage Forests' organized by ClientEarth Prawniczy dla Ziemi in cooperation with WWF Poland, and a third side event 'Localizing the UN Sustainable Development Goals for the World's Cultural and Natural Heritage' organized by ICOMOS, IUCN, UCLG, OWHC.

[Close of afternoon session]

SECOND DAY – Tuesday 4 July 2017

THIRD SESSION

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 7: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/7](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/7A](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add2](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/7B](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add2](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.7.Rev.3](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7](#)

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that several Members of the Bureau had requested to open a discussion on a number of State of conservation (SOC) reports, in addition to those already included in the working document. These include natural properties, Simien National Park (Ethiopia); and cultural properties, City of Jerusalem and its Walls (a site proposed by Jordan), and under agenda item 7B: Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park (Viet Nam) and the Lower Omo Valley (Ethiopia). The Chairperson spoke of the Convention as one of the most successful international instruments for the conservation of natural and cultural heritage sites. Its unique Reactive Monitoring process greatly contributed to the efficient monitoring of threats. However, sadly, the past years had witnessed the terrible consequences of conflict on cultural sites with African natural sites specifically targeted recently. In 2016, 11 guards were killed and many others wounded by poachers in Garamba, Virunga and Kahuzi Biega National Parks and Okapis Wildlife Reserve in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Lobéké National Park as well as Dja Faunal Reserve's research Centre in Cameroon also suffered human losses in the past year. The Chairperson invited the Committee to observe a minute of silence in memory of all the people who dedicate their lives to the protection and conservation of World Heritage.

[A minute of silence was observed]

The **Chairperson** recalled the Preamble of the Convention, which states that the 'deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world'. He therefore called upon States Parties to make the best use of the procedures and recommendations by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to ensure the preservation of the OUV of these heritage sites. The Chairperson reminded the Committee that agenda item 7B would remain open to possibly take into account debates under items 7A and 7B. The draft decision 41 COM 7 would therefore be adopted on completion of items 7A and 7B. He then invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present the agenda item 7.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed that item 7 was the most critical under the Convention, adding that document 7 was a key document on global World heritage conservation issues. Part I provides a detailed snapshot of the factors impacting on the OUV of properties, such as a lack of management plans or their inadequacy, ill-advised housing, or ground transport development projects, inappropriate management activities, encroachment, illegal activities, extractive industries, and of course, conflict situations in

many parts of the world. Document 7 also proposes some explanatory notes on the treatment of mass campaigns by the World Heritage Centre, as it often receives numerous letters or emails from civil society on a specific conservation issue, for which it was impossible to respond to individually, but could not remain unanswered. The Director showed an example for a site in Mexico (Whale Sanctuary of El Vizcaino) that received 30,000 letters and 50,000 signatures from NGOs and civil society. In [Part II](#), more comprehensive information is provided on emergency situations in conflict areas. Indeed, in 2017, conflict situations affected 21 per cent of all the properties reported to the Committee, which had never been so high. This part of the document provided detailed information on UNESCO's action to advocate the international community to mobilize for the protection endangered natural and cultural sites. Other conservation issues were presented in [Part III](#) and include the destructive events that have taken place over the past few years that have brought the question of reconstruction sharply into focus. The urgent need to formulate specific guidance has become obvious. A number of expert meetings were organized to address reconstruction and recovery, and outline the needs to systematically introduce best mitigation measures within management plans and to reinforce capacity-building efforts, among others. Document 7 also addressed climate change, as mentioned by some Members under item 5A. It presented a follow-up to the decision adopted last year, including contacts with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in view of the integration of heritage into the next assessment report. It also presented some elements on the recent mass coral bleaching events that affect a high number of marine World Heritage sites. The exponential urbanization experienced by the world for a century, and the fact that more than half of humanity today lives in an urban environment, is an unprecedented phenomenon and has serious impacts on the OUV of a large number of properties. In line with SDG 11, Target 4, putting culture in the centre of an urban development strategy crucially places humankind at the heart of this process. Vandalism was also one of the conservation issues presented in document 7. It includes graffiti, rubbish dumping, destruction of pieces of heritage, or defacement of other kinds, and constitutes a significant threat to the integrity of the property. Often acts of vandalism are caused by tourists and require better policing and security.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** then spoke of disaster risk reduction as an area for which many resources need to be mobilized. The 2007 Strategy for Reducing Risk from Disasters at World Heritage Properties [\[here\]](#) is still valid but would now benefit from taking into account the 2015 Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction [\[here\]](#) and the 2015 Strategy for Reinforcing UNESCO's Action for the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict [\[here\]](#). In addition, the Heritage Emergency Fund, established in 2015 for the protection of heritage in emergency situations, had already responded to a number of disaster situations, for example, in the ancient city of Bhagan in Myanmar, or more recently in Haiti, Ecuador and Peru. Another significant threat to World Heritage properties was posed by invasive species, and States Parties were strongly encouraged to develop resource strategies to eradicate invasive species in properties to prevent their introduction or reintroduction. In 2017, invasive species were reported in 15 natural and mixed properties. The Convention on Biological Diversity launched (a few days prior) a survey sent to all their parties on invasive alien species. As part of the Biodiversity Liaison Group, the Director felt it was important that the Committee be made aware of this Initiative, and the results of the survey would be examined to see if any World Heritage properties have been impacted. Illegal trade of wildlife species and their products from within World Heritage properties was also seen as a serious threat for which the Committee has expressed concern on numerous occasions and launched an appeal to all Member States of UNESCO, especially origin, transit and destination countries to cooperate to combat this threat, including through improved cooperation between the World Heritage Convention and CITES. The last section of Part III presented integrated approaches for the conservation of natural and cultural heritage, which can indeed strengthen holistic governance, improved conservation outcomes, and contribute to sustainable development at the property level. They are beneficial to realizing the conservation objectives of the Convention, while also

assisting in the implementation of Agenda 2030. A number of examples were provided in the document. As indicated, draft decision 41 COM 7 would only be discussed at the end of the session so that any other issues that may emerge from items 7A or 7B could be included.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to the Advisory Bodies for additional statements on this item.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** explained that the state of conservation (SOC) process in 2017 highlighted two key cultural issues: reconstruction and urban pressure, which together suggest the need for more holistic, coordinated and strategic approaches. Indeed, in terms of individual SOC reports, these same factors – or the lack of them – have been a focus for a number of properties. The challenges of putting in place such holistic, coordinated and strategic approaches are many. It was thus timely that this issue was being raised when site managers were attending a forum [at the present session] and would be able to hear the presentations and discussions of the SOC reports. Property management is quite rightly based locally, and many properties fully engage local stakeholders and have effective coordination at local level. Yet many of the challenges of urban development pressure and reconstruction, particularly post-trauma, bring with them the need for coordination vertically, between the local and national levels. As is often the case, only at a higher level of authority can the necessary strategic approaches be approved to give cultural heritage the necessary profile. Establishing a coordinated approach between the national and local levels is often difficult when urban pressures are responding to national, social and economic priorities. The same can be said for progressing the planning of reconstruction after traumas. However, as this is an area where many actors are involved, perhaps there is a chance to define systematic approaches that could be appropriate as well for non-post trauma situations. ICOMOS has facilitated the development of preliminary guidance on post-trauma reconstruction with the urgency appropriate to the post-trauma situations. The guidance sets out a strategic approach with vertical, as well as horizontal engagement, in order to identify key parameters at the earliest opportunity. The management of urban properties, and the recovery of those impacted by traumas, are thus setting out huge challenges for which ICOMOS suggest much sharper tools are needed if cultural heritage in general and World Heritage in particular are to be seen as a central participant and valuable asset rather than an obstacle to be overcome. Finally, the ICOMOS Guidance has been translated into French, Spanish and Arabic (available [online](#)), and a Russian translation would soon be available. In order to reinforce this guidance document, a global case study has been launched and the website would be updated with all relevant information on this project shortly.

The **Representative of IUCN** recalled that the Committee had considered the impacts of climate change on World Heritage properties during its 40th session, noting that the concerns on these impacts had greatly increased in the past year, notably because of mass coral bleaching in both 2016 and 2017 where the impacts on the Great Barrier Reef had been widely reported. However, this was a set of episodes that impacted properties across coral reef systems throughout the Convention, and the Director of the World Heritage Centre had introduced the work done to help better understand the large scale of those impacts. There was growing evidence of climate change impacts across many World Heritage sites beyond impacts from coral reefs. These include issues of glacier loss, incidents of fire regimes changing, habitat shift trends, among others, and the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre would seek to undertake further work to quantify these impacts, and advise the Committee on future risks and management measures that could be taken. World Heritage sites show how urgent and rapid action is needed to reduce the impacts of climate change to secure the full implementation of the Paris Agreement of the UN Framework Agreement on Climate Change, recalling that this request was to hold the increasing average temperature to well below 2°C and to pursue the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. It was clear that even with the most ambitious implementation, damage to World Heritage sites could not be entirely avoided. For these reasons IUCN considered that the policy on climate change needed to be updated and why it intends, subject to resources,

to put forward proposals at the 42nd session of the Committee. Beyond that, as was noted in item 5, item 6 and also on item 5B, IUCN would be doing work through the World Heritage Outlook to better quantify the impacts of climate change across all natural World Heritage sites to be published in a report in November 2017, while ICCROM, IUCN were focusing on climate change adaptation as one key component in the World Heritage Leadership Programme.

As noted earlier, the **Representative of IUCN** spoke of the ongoing threat from invasive alien species as very serious for World Heritage areas. When the IUCN and World Heritage Outlook were launched in 2014, it identified this as one of the most serious current threats to World Heritage properties. The Honolulu Challenge on Invasive Alien Species [\[here\]](#), established at the 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress, noted that it was essential that management plans for protected areas, which include World Heritage properties, address invasive alien species as a key issue. They should be ecosystem based, emphasize prevention and early detection with rapid response measures, and include stakeholder consultation. These urgent measures are required to protect biodiversity, but also human well-being that World Heritage sites support. It was noted that during the last three sessions, the Committee had expressed its concern about the illegal trade of wildlife and its products affecting natural World Heritage properties. Again, the Director of the World Heritage Centre referred to the vital connection between the 1972 Convention and the CITES Convention in terms of tackling this issue. A [report](#) on illegal wildlife trade of CITES protected species, which was prepared for WWF by Dalberg in 2017, suggests that 45 per cent of natural World Heritage properties are impacted by the illegal wildlife trade. In 2016, the Conference of the Parties of CITES passed a resolution that urged Parties to develop strategies to reduce the demand for illegal products of wild animals and plants, and to strengthen legal enforcement and deterrents, while creating greater awareness of the consequences of illegal wildlife trade on conservation, and on livelihoods in terms of sustainable development and on ecosystems.

The **Representative of ICCROM** remarked that document 7 covered a number of important issues regarding the State of conservation (SOC) of properties on the World Heritage List, including conflict situations, climate change and vandalism. All these issues, at least at the level of heritage management, were sometimes difficult to control. ICCROM noted that – according to document 7 – over 76 per cent of the SOC reports to be examined at this session have management systems or management plans as one of the reported factors affecting the property. While States Parties need to deal with extraordinary problems from time to time, these statistics point to the fact that many of the important issues faced in terms of the state of conservation are related to management control or management systems in those sites. ICCROM pledged to work with States Parties to strengthen their capacities to plan and manage their properties, whether in emergency situations or simply when better management systems are needed. In regard to conflict situations, ICCROM expressed its solidarity with the affected people and communities, and emphasized the need to work closely with States Parties to mitigate the factors that affect heritage as much as possible. In the short term, ICCROM would call attention to the capacity-building activities carried out through the ICCROM-ATHAR Centre in Sharjah (United Arab Emirates), which in partnership with the UNESCO Offices in the region had managed to organize a number of first aid courses for Libyan, Yemeni and Syrian professionals, in addition to regional courses on risk management. ICCROM reiterated, however, that as these conflicts come to an end the international community must continue to play a long-term role in aiding affected communities and building capacities for long-term recovery. ICCROM emphasized that the main goal in these situations is the long-term recovery of communities and their heritage. Reconstruction is in reality only one element of the recovery plan following a conflict or disaster event. More focus on the overall recovery of society is a first step. Furthermore, before making decisions on specific actions of consolidation, restoration, reconstruction or other actions, it is important that other factors are taken into account, including the OUV of the property, its physical, social and economic conditions, the existence or not of documentation, and existing traditional approaches and practices in a given context. All this

information must be processed in a participatory manner with the affected communities in order to lead to sustainable solutions. ICCROM welcomed the meeting plan for September [2017] in Japan to discuss the future of the Bamiyan Buddhist Statues, as well as the efforts of UNESCO and the World Bank to develop a White Paper on the issue of reconstruction of cities in post-conflict and post-disaster situations. Moreover, ICCROM suggested using the term 'recovery' as much as possible instead of 'reconstruction', as the term 'reconstruction' promoted a bias towards creating replicas of heritage rather than promoting the various available options, given the specificities of the situation. It also focused solely on materials rather than the overall values and message.

The **Representative of ICCROM** then spoke about the disaster risk reduction strategy approved by the Committee in 2007, which called for all sites to have disaster risk management plans, adding that most properties still do not have these important management documents or do not implement them if they do have them. ICCROM agreed with the texts in document 7 that there was a need to update the World Heritage Disaster Risk Management Strategy to take into account the advances made with the Sendai Framework, but it also felt that States Parties must develop disaster risk management plans of the site at the regional and national levels, and also to put in place the necessary infrastructure to deal with disasters when they do happen. ICCROM would continue to work with partners around the world to provide capacity-building opportunities to ensure that professionals have the necessary skills and knowledge to respond to emergency situations. Finally, it was noted that the State of conservation was the main theme of the Site Managers Forum that ICCROM had the privilege to help organize with the Polish authorities on the occasion of the present Committee session. The Forum was still ongoing, and ICCROM wished to thank the Polish authorities for sponsoring this forum. There were in-depth discussions by site managers from all parts of the world on many of the key state of conservation themes, and ICCROM asked the Committee to take note of the final statement that will eventually emerge from the forum, as it may contain many important considerations that might touch upon agenda item 7.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Advisory Bodies, and opened the floor comments and questions.

Thanking Spain for financing the Spanish interpretation, the **Delegation of Cuba** highlighted one important theme related to coherence in this type of reporting, explaining that the report should cite other strategies specifically related to UNESCO's work in cases of armed conflict. Despite the fact that there was a reference to this in the report, the delegation felt that there was some disconnect in practice. For example, although it was in the Committee's mandate, there was no item on the agenda regarding this strategy. Indeed, the delegation sought to extend and strengthen actions in terms of situations of armed conflict, and not only in the case of natural disasters. It believed that the Committee should consider how to integrate this strategy, because the monitoring mechanism that needed to be applied had still not been identified, which should in fact be enshrined in the Convention and not solely in the operational side of UNESCO's organs. The delegation also expressed the need to continue strengthening cooperation between the Advisory Bodies and Member States so as to avoid any form of political pressure, as there were examples elsewhere in UNESCO where certain weaknesses could be seen in this regard. Cuba is always fighting against climate change, and on behalf of culture and sustainable development, and there was thus a need to use resources in a sustainable manner. The Committee also needed to make sure that there was a balance in terms of strengthening UNESCO's work and to ensure that this strategy be used as a mechanism that can help harmonize the work of the Advisory Bodies and Member States.

The **Delegation of Portugal** remarked that this issue was of great interest to all Portuguese-speaking countries, and thanked the speakers for all the very positive and interesting contributions. It also thanked the National Institute of Artistic and Historical Heritage of Brazil for translating all the documents mentioned into Portuguese.

The **Delegation of Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for the report and also the Advisory Bodies for their presentation. As the report highlighted, the Convention is increasingly becoming the main tool for protecting properties of outstanding interest, and at the same time the environmental conditions within those properties are challenging the properties even more. In addition to the intentional or unintentional destruction of properties, new urban developments, infrastructural needs, tourism facilities, conflict situations, and low management capacities of local authorities were cumulatively adding further damage, threatening properties. While some of these developments could not be managed or controlled, some could be prevented through awareness-raising and training programmes provided that their reflection is assessed and monitored efficiently on site. The delegation thus attached importance to capacity-building programmes and the role of category 2 centres, together with other tools such as periodic reporting, impact assessment activities, and reactive monitoring. It also believed that the good management of sites, through the capacity-building of site managers, was of the utmost importance. In this regard, it commended the Polish authorities for introducing the first ever Site Managers Forum, which would be a great asset and would hopefully continue in future Committee sessions.

The **Delegation of Peru** thanked the Secretariat for document 7 on the State of conservation, which showed the real situation with regard to protecting and safeguarding sites. Indeed, it also showed the work carried out with Member States in partnership with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. The delegation noted in particular the situation in certain sites where it was difficult to identify the responsibilities of the different stakeholders. It was thus up to States to be responsible for issues that arise, such as mismanagement. Indeed, the report indicated that such difficulties were apparent in 70.1 per cent of cases. It was also noted that war and conflicts affected 14 per cent of sites, with specific references made to the security of sites in Iraq, Libya and Yemen. Nevertheless, the delegation remained committed to protecting and safeguarding World Heritage.

The **Delegation of Finland** thanked the Secretariat for the comprehensive report that highlighted the myriad of threats faced by World Heritage sites, which were not isolated from other world threats such as conflicts or climate change, and thus could only be addressed by international collaboration. Peace is of course an absolute prerequisite for success. The report and the draft recommendation also rightly called for the implementation of the Paris Agreement, as well as other relevant agreements. The delegation suggested that more joint public communication could be made by the different Secretariats to highlight World Heritage sites as examples of what the world stood to lose if action was not taken, for example, in the case of the coral reef sites. At the same time, States Parties should not be overwhelmed by the threats but take action wherever possible. Moreover, the mitigation of threats could take place in many ways, as described in the report. Finland looked forward to the Reactive Monitoring Effectiveness Evaluation in 2018.

The **Delegation of Poland** thanked the Committee for the kind words about the Site Managers Forum, adding it hoped it would be fruitful. The Polish Government was also ready to host an International Conference on Reconstruction to provide guidelines to the Committee so as to share its experience, and would organize an experts meeting around March 2018.

La Délégation de l'Angola commente sur les situations de conflits où le patrimoine mondial est menacé. D'après le rapport, 21 per cent des biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril se trouve en zones de conflit. Cela empêche les organisations consultatives de faire leur travail de terrain. La délégation encourage le travail de l'UNESCO à promouvoir la paix et la coopération internationale, tout en pointant du doigt la tension qui existe entre conservation et développement. L'Angola supporte une réflexion sur la question qui permettrait de trouver un terrain d'entente entre préserver les patrimoines tout en permettant aux États de se développer.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their comprehensive reports, adding that it understood the concerns and agreed with the need to develop effective policies to address those concerns. With regard to the issue of climate change, it spoke of Jamaica's experience with coral reef restoration, as well as the wider Caribbean whose countries participate in coral reef restoration research and the implementation of projects to identify coral species and to enhance their reproduction for their survival and growth. It encouraged other States Parties to support such initiatives within their own countries, as well as programmes by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies so as to support nations in the global reduction of temperatures.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Representative of the Wildlife Conservation Society**, a global conservation organization with field conservation programmes in more than 60 countries, including work in more than 30 natural and mixed World Heritage sites, greatly appreciated the informative document with its global and analytical overview of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. The Organization was committed to working collaboratively with States Parties on the conservation and management of natural sites across the globe, and with governments in efforts to mitigate threats to natural sites. In particular, it was noted that poaching and illegal trade were some of the greatest threats to wildlife across the globe, and wildlife trafficking significantly threatens the OUV of far too many World Heritage sites. More than a thousand park wardens had been killed over the past decades and the Organization's staff around the world appreciated the moment of silence held earlier. Wildlife trafficking has a devastating effect on species around the world, but also undermines local livelihoods, weakens the rule of law, and provides revenue for organized crime networks. Trafficking had become ever more organized and global efforts must also be organized, sophisticated and global. The Organization therefore strongly urged the Committee to adopt the draft decision, and reaffirm and commit to the implementation of the UN General Assembly Resolutions 69314 (2015) and 73R1 (2016) on wildlife trafficking that were adopted unanimously. The mention of SDG target 15.7 on wildlife trafficking was also noted. The Organization greatly supported the call for enhanced cooperation with CITES and called on Member States of the Convention to fully implement all decisions of the CITES Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade.

The **Chairperson** then invited the Secretariat to respond to some of the questions.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked Poland for the announcement of the Conference on Reconstruction in March 2018, adding that the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre would be very pleased to work with Poland. Regarding the issues on conflict raised by Peru and Angola, the Director was pleased to inform the Committee that the World Heritage Centre had increased cooperation with UN Mine Action in New York in these areas of insecurity, as it was important to have good security on the ground. Angola mentioned the issue of balance between development and preservation, and there was an extremely good discussion at the Arusha Conference [on Safeguarding African World Heritage as a Driver of Sustainable Development] in June 2016 in this regard. Jamaica mentioned climate change issues and effective policies, and in that regard the Marine Programme was also organizing a side event during the present session and thus a good platform to discuss those issues. Turkey mentioned the site managers, and the Director was pleased to have the site managers present so they could listen to the specific debates on agenda items 7A and 7B. Moreover, the World Heritage Centre was at their disposal to improve periodic reporting impact assessments and reactive monitoring processes to make sure there was more awareness-raising and training, alongside the category 2 centres. Concerning conflicts, the Director assured Cuba that the Secretariat employed an integrated approach, especially at the Heritage Division of UNESCO where four Conventions were dealing with this Strategy and its implementation.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture**, Mr Francesco Bandarin, remarked on the extensive reporting in document 7 that described the work carried out in the past year on the

issue of conflicts, which has become a major area of concern and activity of UNESCO in recent years. Two years ago the General Conference adopted a Strategy for the Protection of Cultural Heritage and Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict, which was designed to strengthen the capacities of all the UNESCO Conventions in responding to the crises generated in conflict areas. In a way, it is the Strategy that seeks to reinforce the Convention, not only through the information provided to all the Conventions, but also through direct support. The support has a political nature but also a financial component. The Assistant Director-General recalled that an Emergency Response Fund was established, which had so far collected US\$2.5 million, and there were fund-raising activities to increase the amount. An Emergency Response Unit was also created in the Heritage Division with a mechanism that very effectively complements the activities of the World Heritage Fund. For example, in the past 18 months, Nepal, Peru, Ecuador, Haiti and Myanmar had received assistance, as well as countries in conflict such as Iraq, Syria and Yemen. It was noted that there was a difference between the scope of the Strategy, which is focused on conflict, and the scope of the emergency activities of the Emergency Fund, which also covers natural disasters. For this reason, and at the request of many Member States, an annex to the Strategy that includes natural disasters in the activities of UNESCO would be proposed at the next Executive Board and General Conference. It was noted that the Sendai Framework and other UN Frameworks inspired this new document. Thus, at the end of the year, there would be a complete set of normative frameworks, and hopefully a much better outlook in terms of financing. Nevertheless, the Secretariats of all the Conventions involved in responding to crises and conflicts would remain informed, as this was seen as an overarching activity and a way to reinforce capacity in response to crises.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Bodies to respond.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** welcomed Cuba's comments on the issue of cooperation between the Advisory Bodies and States, and the need for both balance and harmonization of work. Indeed, over the last few years, ICOMOS has been trying hard to spread its resources to engage actively with Member States way beyond Committee meetings, and even way beyond nominations and SOC reports. ICOMOS looked forward to the opportunity to talk more strategically about how this activity could be optimized. It also noted the comments by Turkey on the important issue of awareness-raising and capacity-building, particularly in terms of raising awareness of the challenges affecting World Heritage properties, which was absolutely crucial if site management is to get the support it needs at all levels, local and national. Finally, ICOMOS acknowledged the importance of the remarks made by Angola on the need to balance development and conservation. This is a current threat that runs through most or many of the SOC reports in this cycle, and it goes beyond site-by-site challenges to the need to look at how best to put in place much more generic and strategic approaches, and define best practices on this crucial issue.

The **Representative of IUCN** echoed the importance of tackling the strategic issues that face World Heritage sites and endorsed the initiative to bring site managers together at this Committee meeting, which provided the means to really understand how these broader decisions could support site management, as well as giving the Committee and Advisory Bodies an opportunity to engage with civil society in a strategic way. IUCN was thus grateful to hear interventions from NGO Observers so as to more strategically work on conservation, as well as connecting this work with other Conventions to mobilize support for World Heritage. IUCN also wished to respond to the point made by Cuba on the importance of collaboration and cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, specifically on the subject of climate change, and the reason why a reflection was needed on the current policy and how it should be developed by this Committee and States Parties working in the framework of IPCC. Ten years after the policy was first created, the challenge of climate change has unfortunately not gone away but accelerated in terms of the level of shared concern, but also in terms of the direct damage observed in World Heritage sites. Thus, it would be helpful to interact with

States Parties on the content of that policy so that the type of collaboration and cooperative partnership could be established, as requested by Cuba.

The **Representative of ICCROM** acknowledged the intervention by Turkey, specifically on the need to strengthen capacity-building, adding that the work of category 2 centres were excellent in that respect. The ICCROM strongly supported the remarks by IUCN on climate change, adding that most of the time climate change tends to apply only to natural heritage sites when in fact climate change was also an incredibly important threat to cultural heritage sites in terms of potential flooding, migration, and other issues.

ITEM 7A: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/17/41/COM/7A)

The **Chairperson** turned to the sub-item 7A, which according to Paragraph 190 of the Operational Guidelines, the Committee 'shall review annually the state of conservation of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger', inviting the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present this item.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** referred to document 7A, document 7A.Add. and document 7A.Add.2, which presented detailed reports on the State of conservation of 55 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In addition, two general decisions were included: one on the World Heritage properties in the Syrian Arab Republic, and one on the World Heritage properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. She drew attention to the fact that the World Heritage Centre received less than half (26) of the 55 requested SOC reports from States Parties on the statutory deadline of 1 February, making the timely preparation of the documents very challenging. The Director called upon all States Parties to do their utmost to comply with the statutory deadline and to submit the reports according to the format included, as Annex 13 of the Operational Guidelines. In line with the rotation policy, the presentation this year would begin with the reports of natural properties in the following order of regions: North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, Arab States, and Asia and the Pacific. The Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies would jointly make the presentations. This would be followed with the cultural properties in the same regional order. There were no mixed properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A few additional requests from Committee Members to discuss some reports had been made. The final list of the SOC reports open for discussion was distributed as document INF.7.Rev.2. Before opening the item, it was customary practice that the Member requesting the opening of a specific SOC report present its reason for doing so. The Director then recalled Rule 22.5 of the Rules of Procedure that the Chairperson shall put Members questions to the State Party once at the end of the Committee's debate on the property. Rule 22.6 stated that States shall not speak on World Heritage properties in their own territories except at the explicit invitation of the Chairperson within the allotted time and in response to a specific question. She reminded the Committee of Decision 35 COM 12E adopted at its 35th session in 2011 that requested States Parties to refrain from providing additional information on state of conservation issues after the deadline indicated in the Operational Guidelines, as this information could not be reviewed properly.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Director, and opened the floor for questions.

The **Delegation of Poland** as requested in 2016, taking into account of the unchanged situation, wished to adjourn the item on Medieval Monuments in Kosovo until the next Committee session.

The **Chairperson** took note of the request.

The **Delegations of the Philippines** and **Turkey** seconded the proposal by Poland

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** demande si possible que le point 41.COM.7A.16 sur le Parc national du Niokolo-Koba du Sénégal soit reporté à la fin de l'examen du point 41.COM.7B en attendant l'arrivée des experts du Sénégal qui ont eu des contraintes de visas.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** understood that the request was to examine the report at the end of 7B and not at the end of 7A.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** requested the postponement of the item 41 Com 7A.17 discussion of the Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania), as the State Party was meeting with the Advisory Board on the basis of new information received.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the last two items would be discussed after the discussions under item 7B.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE/NORTH AMERICA

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the report on the State of conservation of the natural properties that were *open for discussion*.

Everglades National Park (United States of America)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A](#)

Decision: [41.COM.7A.1](#)

Le Secretariat remarque que le Parc National des Everglades aux États-Unis d'Amérique a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril une première fois en 1993 et jusqu'en 2007, puis à nouveau depuis 2010 à la demande de l'État partie en raison de la détérioration de son écosystème aquatique. En 2011, une mission de suivi réactive du Centre et de l'UICN a contribué à établir l'état de conservation souhaité en vue de retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Le Comité a adopté la même année de nouvelles mesures correctives qui complètent les indicateurs de suivi établis par l'État partie en consultation avec l'UICN et adoptés par le Comité en 2006. Conformément à la décision de la 40^{ème} session du Comité, l'État partie a soumis un rapport sur l'état de conservation actuel du bien. Ce rapport fait état des progrès accomplis dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives mais souligne toutefois un retard dans cet exercice en raison, entre autres, des conséquences du phénomène climatique El Niño de 2015. Ainsi, l'État partie souligne qu'une décennie supplémentaire sera nécessaire pour atteindre l'état de conservation souhaité en vue de retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Depuis la publication du rapport sur l'état de conservation, le Secrétariat n'a pas reçu d'information additionnelle. Par conséquent, l'UICN souhaiterait formuler des commentaires sur l'état de conservation du bien.

The **Representative of IUCN** welcomed the continued progress on the implementation of the corrective measures by the State Party, noting their complexity as part of a long-term recovery programme for the property. However, the increasing abundance of invasive alien species was a significant concern. IUCN therefore recommended that the State Party ensure for their successful containment and eradication, and prevent the introduction of additional invasive species already present in areas in close proximity to the property. IUCN further noted with utmost concern the potential for hydraulic fracturing in the vicinity of the site, as reported by the State Party, and recommended that the Committee requests the State to ensure that any such activities, particularly in upstream areas, were not permitted as they could have a negative impact on its OUV.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Portugal** understood that the national phenomenon El Nino had a negative effect on the property and had increased the abundance of invasive alien species. It commended the State Party for its efforts to proceed with the implementation of the corrective measures, and appreciated the fact that the State Party had finally approved the long awaited general management plan, an important tool to address the challenges facing the property, urging the State Party to implement it swiftly. The delegation called upon the State Party to abide by the principles of the Convention and prevent any oil and gas exploration of the property and in its vicinity, which would have direct and indirect impact on surface waters and groundwater aquifers.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.1 adopted to retain Everglades National Park (United States of America) on the List of World Heritage in Danger

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

The **Chairperson** invited Mr Mauro Rosi, Chief of the Latin America and the Caribbean Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to present the reports on the State of conservation of the natural properties, which were *open for discussion*.

Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/whc/17/41.COM/7A)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.2](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/whc/17/41.COM/7A.2)

Mr Mauro Rossi explained that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1996 under criterion (vii), (ix) and (x) and was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2009. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN deemed it important to inform the Committee about the recent progress made by the State Party in the implementation of the corrective measures and the State of conservation for the removal of the property from the World Heritage List in Danger adopted by the Committee at its 39th session (Decision 39 COM 7.18). At the time of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Committee noted that the moratorium on the destruction of mangroves had expired and that the State Party had encouraged the same concession and development of land within the property, which clearly represented a danger to its OUV. The Committee also noted the weakness of the institutional coordination mechanism with regard to the management and protection of the property. The situation has since positively evolved. The State Party submitted a report on the State of conservation of the property on 31 March 2017 notifying the implementation of a number of important measures. Firstly, the revision of the petroleum regulatory framework was launched in September 2016 and was expected to be finalized and submitted for approval by the Cabinet of Ministers in the coming days. In November 2016, a Task Force was formed to develop regulations, and the official maps of exploration banned areas around the seven components of the property: the Barrier Reef itself, the three atolls and a one kilometre buffer zone. However, no legislation was passed regarding the oil and gas exploration and exploitation as requested, and no detailed maps have been proposed so far. Secondly, the implementation of the integrated coastal zone management plan was started thanks to the funds provided through the World Bank project on marine conservation and climate change adaptation. Regulation for the protection of mangroves throughout the property has been prepared by the State Party and it is currently open for final consultation, ongoing drafting, and, soon, approval.

The **Representative of IUCN** noted the commendable progress that had been made by the State Party towards achieving the desired State of conservation for the removal of the

property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Nevertheless, noting the high proportion of private land and areas of unknown land tenure in the property, further efforts were required to establish clear restrictions and regulations on development in order to avoid negative impacts on the OUV. While ongoing revisions of the mangrove regulation and environmental impact assessment regulations could provide the necessary regulatory framework, it was essential that a permanent and legally-binding ban on the sale of remaining nationally held lands on the property was introduced as a matter of utmost priority. Furthermore, it was recommended that the Committee requests the State Party to provide, prior to finalizing the legislation of the Cabinet decision banning offshore oil exploration within the property, detailed maps of the areas where oil exploration would be prohibited, and to provide further details regarding the revised petroleum regulatory framework.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that the Belize Barrier Reef, like many other outstanding marine sites on the World Heritage List, suffered from an increasing rate of hurricanes and coral bleaching events; threats closely connected to climate change. This biodiversity hotspot is also vital to some 200,000 inhabitants in Belize coastal communities who depend on the reef for their food and livelihood. The coral reefs and the mangrove forests serve as natural protective barriers, reducing the impact of natural hazards such as storms with the disturbed ecosystems more or less losing their ability to reduce the impacts of natural hazards. Hence, it was crucial to take action to prevent more stress on these ecosystems and to build up resilience. The State Party initiated important actions, such as enhancing the protection of mangrove forests, proposing an oil exploration ban within the property, and implementing an integrated coastal zone management regime. Finland welcomed the participatory management approach giving local communities and NGOs even better opportunities to be part of the process. However, it noted with concern that oil exploration outside the property was still a major threat, urging the State Party to take appropriate actions to prevent potentially devastating damages to the OUV. It supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** remarked that the Belize Barrier Reef held the distinction of being the second largest reef of its kind in the world. Arguably, it was the common responsibility of all to play a part in protecting the integrity of the site. Jamaica wished to recognize and congratulate the efforts of the State Party in taking steps towards curbing the series of threats against the site, especially those related to offshore petroleum exploration within the property, through the implementation of the integrated coastal zone management plan. The voluntary moratorium on the sea- and state-owned land throughout the property has continued, and the State Party recently prepared a draft forest regulation. Having participated by invitation to the 20th anniversary of the inscription of the site, Jamaica had the benefit of visiting sections of the site and was heartened that the Belize Government was working towards its desired conservation. However, Jamaica recognized the need for additional actions, as indicated by IUCN, and it encouraged the State Party to continue its vigilance in addressing these matters.

The **Delegation of Portugal** praised the State Party for its efforts in coordinating a comprehensive approach to the challenges facing the property, namely, improving regulations and legislation. Nevertheless, doubts remained regarding the exact areas where oil exploration would be prohibited by a proposed ban on the property and its surrounding areas. It was also of the highest importance that the State Party ensured an effective and efficient legislative and regulatory framework as regards the sale and lease of land within the property.

The **Delegation of Cuba** urged the State Party to continue the necessary work on the protection of the site, in particular through an appropriate management plan, as it was extremely important not only for Belize but for the region as a whole, and other countries located south of Mexico. The delegation thus had grave concerns regarding oil exploration

and other potential extractive industries near the reef. The ecosystem is fragile and needs to be protected, however, the delegation believed that appropriate action could result in the site's removal from the Danger List.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.2 adopted to retain Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** invited Mr Mauro Rosi, Chief of the Latin America and the Caribbean Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to present the reports on the State of conservation of the natural properties, which were *closed for discussion*.

Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.3](#)

Mr Mauro Rossi remarked that Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve in Honduras was the only State of conservation report concerning natural properties in the Latin America and Caribbean region proposed for adoption without discussion.

The **Delegation of Cuba** questioned the procedure as usually these reports were neither discussed nor debated, however the Secretariat may ask whether the State agreed. Usually the State Party decided whether or not the item would be open for discussion.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the decisions are taken by the Committee who have the documents before them. However, due to time constraints and the growing number of properties every year, the Committee decided a couple of years ago that only a certain number of State of conservation reports would be open for discussion. Moreover, the procedure only allowed another Committee Member to open the item, i.e not the State Party concerned. However, a number of sites have ongoing consultations prior to the session, as was the case for Burkina Faso for example that requested to include the item later in the week.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.3 adopted to retain Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers for comment.

The **Delegation of Honduras** thanked the Government of Poland for organizing this event, Spain for the Spanish interpretation, and the World Heritage Centre for the technical support provided to conserve the site. Honduras had made many efforts and strived to come up with a plan in recent months in line with the observations and recommendations made. The delegation thanked the Advisory Bodies for their reports and also for the evaluation process, which had been transmitted to the Government. The delegation reiterated its commitment to working with the indigenous and rural communities in the area so that it could fully implement the recommendations made.

AFRICA

The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Centre, to present the reports on the State of conservation of the natural properties, which were open for discussion.

Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.4](#)

Le Secretariat présente le rapport sur l'état de conservation du Parc national de Manovo Gounda St Floris, soumis le 16 mars 2017 Ce rapport a été soumis pour discussion par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN afin d'attirer l'attention du Comité sur les efforts de l'État partie, avec l'appui des projets Écofaunes, PCBAC-SEAC, pour la protection de la faune et de la flore dans la partie nord-est du pays, notamment en matière de la lutte anti-braconnage et de la transhumance transfrontalière, avec la coopération des États voisins du Cameroun, Soudan et Tchad. La persistance de l'insécurité, les pressions auxquelles le bien fait face, et l'absence de données permettant une analyse de la situation actuelle rendent la restauration de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle (VUE) du bien difficile. Le Secretariat recommande que le Comité demande à l'État partie une évaluation de la faisabilité de la restauration de la VUE du bien avant la tenue de l'atelier d'élaboration du plan d'urgence.

Le Représentant de l'UICN recommande que le Comité accueille favorablement les efforts consentis par l'État partie pour renforcer progressivement la protection de la faune et de la flore dans la région concernée, notamment en matière de lutte anti-braconnage et de la transhumance transfrontalière qui demeurent des menaces graves pesant sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. L'État partie prévoit d'organiser l'atelier d'élaboration d'un plan d'urgence pour la sauvegarde du bien, et bien que cette initiative doit être accueillie favorablement, il convient que le Comité demande qu'un état des lieux quant à la possibilité de restauration de la VUE du bien soit réalisé avant la tenue de l'atelier d'élaboration du plan d'urgence.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Portugal** reconnaît la période difficile à travers laquelle la République centrafricaine vit en termes de sécurité et les différents défis qui affectent la propriété et en particulier les braconnages incontrôlés ont considérablement endommagé sa VUE. La Délégation supporte donc le projet de décision proposé, qui, si l'État partie l'invite, permettra l'élaboration d'une mission de surveillance menée conjointement par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN dès lors que les conditions de sécurité le permette. La délégation rappelle l'importance de la coopération régionale et de la coordination des mesures à prendre avec les États voisins.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended the efforts made by the State Party to strengthen its protection of the natural resources in Manovo-Gounda Forest in the Central African Republic. It appreciated the difficult security situation in which the country found itself, and which restricted the efforts of the State Party to restore the OUV of the property. It encouraged the State Party to continue its efforts with the help of the Advisory Bodies to carry out studies when possible and feasible to look at the restoration of the OUV of the property.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted that other national park had similar problems, as discussed in past Committee sessions. It congratulated the efforts made by the State Party to improve the conservation of the property but there was insufficient information coming from the State Party, and some of the problems were unfortunately beyond the control of the State. They

required strong cooperation with the neighbouring countries, especially with regard to poaching for which the countries should follow the CITES Convention on endangered species and wildlife. The delegation commended the State's efforts to maintain the park's OUV, but questioned the re-evaluation of OUV owing to a lack of data, which could be effected once the security issues were resolved and a Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property could take place.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** appreciated the efforts of the State Party in light of the difficult and challenging security situation to safeguard the sites' fauna and flora against poaching in collaboration with neighbouring countries. However, in light of the uncertainty regarding the security of the site, Jamaica agreed with the Advisory Bodies and looked forward to the IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission and the continuation of the reinforced monitoring mechanism in an effort to determine the current state of conservation and impacts to the OUV.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.4 adopted to retain Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park (Central African Republic) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.5](#)

Le Secretariat rappelle que le rapport sur l'état de conservation du Parc national de la Comoé a été soumis le 11 novembre 2016 par la Côte d'Ivoire. Ce rapport a été soumis pour discussion par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN afin de noter les efforts déployés par l'État partie dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives et de l'état de conservation souhaité. D'après les résultats des indicateurs, le Secretariat affirme que l'état de conservation du bien fait l'objet d'une évolution très positive, et que l'implication des communautés locales y a joué un rôle important. En effet, des espèces emblématiques du bien, comme l'éléphant et le chimpanzé, que l'on croyait avoir disparu se sont régénérées. Les résultats atteints sont très appréciables et dépassent pour certains cas les objectifs initiaux. Sorti d'une décennie de crises politiques sécuritaires et même sociales sans précédent de son histoire, l'État partie a su démontrer avec hardiesse sa volonté et son engagement dans la mise en œuvre effective des objectifs de la Convention de 1972 en mobilisant toutes les ressources nécessaires afin de satisfaire les mesures correctives demandées par le Comité. Malgré de récentes difficultés politiques, l'État partie a montré son engagement aux objectifs de la Convention de 1972 et à fortement réhabilitée et renforcée la VUE du bien. Si bien qu'il est recommandé que le Comité retire le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Le Représentant de l'UICN reconnaît les importants efforts de l'État partie dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives et dans l'atteinte des indicateurs de l'état de conservation en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Ces efforts ont notamment permis à des espèces emblématiques comme l'éléphant et le chimpanzé que l'on croyait disparues de se régénérer. L'UICN remarque néanmoins que des efforts additionnels sont nécessaires afin d'éradiquer systématiquement l'orpaillage à l'intérieur du bien mais aussi d'éviter toute activité minière autour du bien qui affecterait sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. En outre, dans le cas des efforts salutaires de l'État partie d'exclure totalement le bétail du bien, il est recommandé que le Comité demande à l'État partie de réaliser au préalable une étude des impacts potentiels des aménagements pastoraux prévus autour du bien sur sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle afin de minimiser les risques d'intensification de la transhumance dans la zone du bien que pourraient engendrer ces

projets. En conclusion, l'UICN et le Centre du patrimoine mondial recommandent que le Parc national de la Comoé soit retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** congratulated the State Party for the delisting of the Comoé National Park from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and commended its resolute efforts and spirit in complying with the decisions of the Committee to implement the recommendations. In particular, it praised the Government's leadership in creating awareness and empowering local communities to take action and share responsibility to address challenges to the property and to protect its OUV. This reflected the view that Danger Listing could be a catalyst for positive change to strengthen conservation, and should thus not be seen as a sanction but a means to improve international and local engagement and support. The participation of local communities was also essential for the protection and conservation of World Heritage sites, while contributing to sustainable development. The delegation knew the effectiveness of numerous reactive missions in 2016 that drew attention of both the Government and local communities to discourage gold panning at the site, as well as the continued surveillance in accordance with the 2015–2024 planning and management plan. It hoped the State Party would continue its efforts in that direction.

La **Délégation du Portugal** félicite chaleureusement la Côte d'Ivoire pour ses efforts pour la mise en œuvre des indicateurs sur l'état de conservation indispensables pour retirer ce bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that Comoé National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1983. In 2003, it was put on the Danger List, but since then the State Party had taken all the Committee's suggestions, and corrective measures were carried out successfully. It was noted that the conservation indicators had been met as regards biological, management and habitat indicators. Thus, danger listing in this case actually helped the State Party improve the property, placing it in a better position in terms of conservation. The delegation thus congratulated the State Party, and also suggested that it consider some future issues, as indicated by the Secretariat, such as mining, increasing livestock ratio, and pastoral development. Nevertheless, the delegation appreciated the State's efforts to meet all the corrective measures.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** souligne les efforts de la Côte d'Ivoire et ce que cela signifie pour la mise en œuvre de mesures collectives et le renforcement de la coopération ouverte entre les États parties, le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les organisations consultatives. L'Angola félicite la Côte d'Ivoire et tous les parties intéressées pour cette prouesse, et encourage l'État partie à continuer à mettre en œuvre toutes les recommandations proposées par les organisations consultatives.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** rappelle que l'inscription du Parc de la Comoé sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial se justifie par le fait qu'il constitue un exemple exceptionnel d'habitats de transition entre la forêt et la savane. La variété des habitats se traduit par une grande diversité d'espèces animales. Les analyses de l'état de conservation lors des cinq dernières sessions du Comité, ont progressivement révélé des progrès dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives. À la faveur de la normalisation de la situation politico-militaire et du retour de la stabilité dans le pays, le Parc a bénéficié de soutiens multiformes de partenaires techniques et financiers qui ont permis aujourd'hui de renforcer la dynamique de gestion, de protection et de conservation durable du Parc. Si les différents partenariats établis constituent des éléments évidents de développement positif, un travail de coordination soutenu a favorisé l'efficacité des actions. Les résultats atteints dépassent souvent les objectifs initiaux. Ils concourent ainsi à la restauration de l'intégrité du bien. L'implication forte et soutenue des communautés locales est notée avec satisfaction car elle constitue une condition indispensable à la conservation durable du bien. Le Burkina Faso félicite les autorités de l'État partie dans la mise en œuvre des différentes recommandations et remercie les différents partenaires techniques et financiers pour leurs contributions qui permettent aujourd'hui le retrait du Parc de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Delegation of Tanzania** joined the Members to commend the State Party for implementing the corrective measures for its successful work that brought joy, not only to the people of the country itself, but also to the Committee and the world in general. Tanzania understood that Côte d'Ivoire was committed to completing the remaining activities to enhance the conservation of the property and it congratulated Côte d'Ivoire for a job well done.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended Côte d'Ivoire for its efforts in successfully implementing all the recommendations of the Committee and, in the process, improving the relationship with the community in the property; a lesson that all strive to achieve within the concept of sustainable development and heritage. It also commended the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centres for their technical support and for accompanying the State Party. It was hoped that lessons learned from Côte d'Ivoire could be applied to other properties on the danger list. It congratulated Côte d'Ivoire for the delisting of this property.

The **Delegation of Finland** noted that since the site was placed on the Danger List in 2003, the State Party had worked resolutely towards safeguarding and improving the state of the OUV. Finland congratulated the State Party and the international partners involved for all their actions that now resulted in the removal of the site from the in Danger List. It was indeed a wonderful achievement. It especially took note of the recovery of the properties, especially with species like elephants and chimpanzees. It was hoped that this conservation success story could serve as a positive example for other natural heritage sites in Africa and all over the world that were currently on in danger. While it praised Côte d'Ivoire for its actions, it was important that the State Party maintain and strengthen its efforts in order to continue its positive development, including addressing the gold panning within the property. Finland warmly supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated Côte d'Ivoire for effectively working towards the desired state of conservation for the Comoé National Park. Obvious efforts were seen in the securing of the borders of the property through surveillance missions and the establishment of surveillance posts, but also in the increasing numbers of mammals and habitats along with the implemented management activities; all were indicative of the State Party's hard work and commitment to preserve this outstanding example of biological diversity. Nevertheless, there were still areas of concern, but with the commitment already shown in reinforcing and strengthening the site's OUV Jamaica was confident that the site would continue to make strides in its conservation efforts. The State Party had proven that the Danger List was by no means a 'death sentence' but an opportunity to work alongside the Advisory Bodies to remedy situations, and be removed from the List once accomplished. Jamaica wholeheartedly congratulated the State Party for the sterling effort and it supported the draft decision for the removal of the site from the Danger List.

The **Delegation of Cuba** shared the view that the state of conservation of a site was the most important point of the Committee session. This was a significant example of how adequate monitoring and follow-up of a State Party can lead to a positive outcome, and an example of the implementation of the Convention. The delegation urged the Committee to continue its efforts in focusing on the state of conservation and the work of the Advisory Bodies, which is all about preserving the OUV of these different sites.

La **Délégation du Liban** note le nombre important d'interventions soutenant le projet de décision ce qui montre l'importance de ce site inscrit en 1983, un des premiers parcs inscrits sur la Liste. Elle salue vivement les efforts des autorités ivoiriennes qui donnent une leçon magistrale de détermination et de persévérance ce qui renforce notre Convention.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** congratulated Côte d'Ivoire on the removal of the property from the Danger List, adding that this was a wonderful example of how danger listing could operate as a positive input in the conservation of properties. Notwithstanding the excellent achievements attained with regard to natural heritage values, the delegation was delighted to highlight the strong and sustained involvement of the local communities; one of

the most important factors for assuring success in conservation. This showed how important people-centred approaches are in maintaining sustainable conservation and securing improvements in heritage sites. The delegation hoped that the recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies are respected and followed.

The **Delegation of Croatia** remarked that the Committee's decision to remove the Comoé National Park from the List of World Heritage in Danger was understandable and justified. It welcomed the inventories of large fauna and the sizeable stable populations of elephants and chimpanzees, expressing strong hope that the State Party would find a way to also deal with additional threats such as gold panning. The delegation was confident that the State Party would manage to enforce the ban on this activity and monitor its development around the property. It fully supported the Committee's decision.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** joined the previous speakers in commending the efforts of the State Party for its implementation of the corrective measures, and welcomed its commitment to assessing the potential impact of the mining project. Azerbaijan congratulated the State Party with the removal of the property from the Danger List.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.5 adopted to remove Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Côte d'Ivoire, inviting the Minister to address the Committee.

La **Délégation de la Côte d'Ivoire** adresse sa profonde gratitude aux autorités de la Pologne pour l'accueil et exprime sa gratitude à l'UNESCO et à l'ensemble des partenaires pour leur soutien dans la mise en œuvre de la Convention. Depuis 2003, lors de sa 21^e session, le Comité a lancé un appel à la Côte d'Ivoire de retrouver la paix pour amorcer son développement et assurer sereinement la protection des biens de l'humanité sur son territoire. Quinze ans après cette décision, la Côte d'Ivoire plus que jamais est au travail depuis l'avènement en 2011 à la magistrature suprême de S.E. M. Alassane Ouattara, Président de la République. Dans ce cadre, l'État de Côte d'Ivoire s'est résolument impliqué dans les services des parcs nationaux en moyennant facteurs humains, financiers et techniques. La restauration de l'autorité de l'État et la reprise en main du Parc national de la Comoé ont ainsi constitué une priorité nationale. Dans la mise en œuvre de ces actions, le soutien technique et financier des partenaires au développement et des acteurs du monde de la recherche a été primordial. De même, l'appui des autorités administratives et des communautés locales vivant à la périphérie n'a jamais fait défaut. C'est pourquoi La Côte d'Ivoire reconnaît que la décision du Comité sait évaluer les progrès des États parties. Il est vrai que plusieurs défis demeurent à relever. Mais le Gouvernement prend toute la mesure de la décision du Comité et des défis à relever, et aussi les recommandations formulées par le Comité seront-elles traduites en plans d'action pour assurer leur mise en œuvre et leur suivi régulier. La Côte d'Ivoire remercie les partenaires bilatéraux et multilatéraux, notamment les coopérations allemandes, françaises et japonaises, les ONG, les universités et centres de recherche, l'UNESCO, l'UICN et le Fonds africain du patrimoine mondial. Le Parc national de la Comoé a encore besoin de soutien et de mobilisation pour renforcer tous les niveaux de gestion afin qu'il soit un modèle réussi de mise en œuvre de la Convention et un lieu de partage d'expériences pour la région Afrique et pour le monde.

The **Chairperson** remarked that Côte d'Ivoire just proved that the removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger was not just a theory.

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)
Decision: [41.COM.7A.8](#)

Le Secrétariat remarque sur l'état de conservation du Parc national de Kahuzi Biega a été soumis par l'État partie le 13 février 2017. En effet, une mission conjointe entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN de suivi réactif du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'UICN s'est rendue dans le bien du 24 avril au 3 mai 2017. La mission a noté une nette amélioration dans les efforts de surveillance qui ont permis de couvrir environ 52 per cent du bien grâce à l'augmentation des effectifs de l'UICN et au déploiement de gardes dans toutes les stations du bien. Les résultats préliminaires du recensement de la faune qui doit se terminer en août 2017 sont modérés. Les éléphants sont quasi absents en basse altitude tandis que les gorilles situés en haute altitude sont stables voire en augmentation et que la population de chimpanzés est stable dans les zones visitées. Bien que la plupart des mines artisanales à l'intérieur du bien aient été fermées, la mission a eu accès à des informations indiquant que les mines sont opérationnelles en périphérie du bien et qu'elles sont également une menace pour la faune.

Le Représentant de l'UICN note des progrès importants dans la reprise du contrôle d'une partie du secteur de basse altitude du bien, l'amélioration des efforts de surveillance, la fermeture de la plupart des mines artisanales à l'intérieur du bien ainsi que la réalisation du recensement de la faune. Cependant, une partie importante du secteur de la basse altitude reste sous le contrôle des groupes armés. Les activités minières et le braconnage demeurent des menaces particulières pour les gorilles et leur habitat. L'éléphant a beaucoup souffert du braconnage et son observation dans le bien est désormais très rare voire inexistant. En outre, l'empiètement de la détérioration du corridor écologique entre la basse et la haute altitude, suite à son occupation illégale, constitue une des plus importantes menaces pour le bien et un frein majeur quant au possible retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Au vu de ce qui précède, la mission de suivi réactif qui a visité le bien en mai 2017 a actualisé les mesures correctives pour la période 2017-2020. Il est recommandé que le Comité demande à l'État partie de mettre en œuvre ces mesures correctives actualisées et que le parc soit maintenu sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Portugal** regrette la situation dans laquelle le bien se trouve, lourdement affectée par la guerre et les dégradations. Le Portugal remarque aussi bien sur ce site que sur le site qui suit, le Okapi Wildlife reserve, qu'ils sont affectés par des situations de conflits armés. Le Portugal exprime ses condoléances aux familles et personnes affectés par ces conflits et qui travaille à la préservation de ce patrimoine mondial. De plus, le Portugal soutient la RDC à demander l'assistance internationale du Fonds du patrimoine mondial afin de quantifier les indicateurs biologiques en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en danger.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** appreciated the efforts of the State Party towards achieving a desired state of conservation, but it was also well aware of the situation where the security of the place was totally unstable and had resulted in the death of eleven officers who guarded the park. It urged the State Party to continue working in collaboration with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre in trying to find a management system to minimize the current loss of wildlife in the area. The delegation also urged the State Party to include the protection and management of the site in its discussions on peace with other UN bodies that were working to achieve peace within the region.

La Délégation de l'Angola remarque que la situation dans ce pays continue à être une préoccupation pour le continent avec des situations encore très instables dans la région de Kasaï, donc cela montre combien la situation est difficile. Elle encourage l'État partie à travailler avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et des organes consultatifs pour continuer la

mise en œuvre des mesures correctives qui sont proposées. La situation préoccupe l'Angola et demande au Centre et aux organisations consultatives d'accompagner ce pays qui traverse des moments difficiles.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.8 adopted to retain Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.9](#)

Le Secrétariat remarque que le rapport sur l'état de conservation de la Réserve de faune à Okapi a été soumis par l'État partie le 13 février 2017 et attire l'attention du Comité sur l'insécurité permanente dans la région et la présence continue de groupes rebelles armés qui empêchent les équipes de patrouille d'accéder pleinement au bien, réduisant significativement la zone de couverture de surveillance par rapport à 2015. Bien que la fermeture nocturne de la Route nationale 4 ait une avancée bienvenue pour réduire la circulation au sein du bien, des informations tierces ont été reçus qui signalent une hausse significative du nombre d'habitants dans les villages le long de la route, et que la majorité des mines d'or et de diamant à l'intérieur a été réoccupée et rouverte, et que de nouvelles mines ont été ouvertes aussi. Le Centre a demandé à l'État partie de faire des commentaires à ce sujet mais aucune réponse n'a été reçue à ce jour.

Le Représentant de l'UICN accueille favorablement le lancement d'opérations conjointes entre l'Institut congolais pour la conservation de la nature et les forces armées de la République démocratique du Congo, ainsi que les efforts consentis par l'État partie de fermer les mines à l'intérieur et de sensibiliser la population sur l'impact de l'extraction minière artisanale. Cependant, l'UICN note sa vive préoccupation quant aux informations qu'elle a reçues signalant que la majorité des anciennes mines d'or et de diamant à l'intérieur du bien ont été rouvertes et que de nouvelles mines ont été également ouvertes. En parallèle, le nombre d'habitants qui s'installent autour des villages à la recherche de mines artisanales continue de croître. L'UICN recommande que le Comité réitère ses demandes à l'État partie d'évaluer les impacts de la pression foncière autour des villages le long de la Route nationale 4 et de fournir des informations sur les licences d'exploitation minière qui empiètent sur le bien et de garantir leur annulation.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.9 adopted to retain Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Simien National Park (Ethiopia)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add2](#)
Decision: [41 COM 7A.13](#)

The **Chairperson** invited Angola to explain the reasons behind its request to open the report on this natural property.

The **Delegation of Angola** explained that it had assessed the reports by the Advisory Bodies as well as the additional information from the State Party, and it sought some clarity because even the reports from the mission held in 2017 commended the work done by the State Party in addressing the major issues. The delegation understood that there were still some aspects that needed to be addressed, particularly related to implementation. However, it recognized that there was a good management plan in place, but weak implementation. There was also the issue of boundaries that need to be redefined. Some demarcation had been done and some new laws had been approved, but it sought to understand whether implementation was the basis of the recommendation to retain the site on the Danger List. Thus, it sought clarification from IUCN, particularly if they could provide some information in light of the new information provided by the State Party.

The Secretariat explained that World Heritage Centre considered important to acknowledge that the State Party had made considerable progress in responding to the Committee requests and in meeting the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It was noted that the IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission visited the property in April 2017. While noting that the Committee welcomed the completion of the grazing pressure reduction strategy in 2016, the World Heritage Centre paid particular attention to the mission recommendation to carry out additional situation analysis in livestock-raising on the property, and to revise the strategy accordingly. This work would qualify the management response in addressing overgrazing and better understand the livelihood needs of the local community. It was noted that the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and the State Party had carefully discussed the outcomes of the Reactive Monitoring Mission, including during a meeting on 3 July 2017. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN were committed to assisting the State Party in implementing the recommendation of the mission in order to meet the last and outstanding indicator that will demonstrate the property's readiness to be removed from the List in Danger, which was within reach.

The **Representative of IUCN** explained that the recent mission took place in April 2017, and thus IUCN was in a position to comment in detail. In terms of the framework, as was seen in the case of Comoé, IUCN always looked to the desired state of conservation as set by the Committee, and whether all the requirements have been met. As noted by the Secretariat, progress on the corrective measures had been made, which was commendable, but in terms of the requirements to attain the desired state of conservation, although most of the requirements were met, not all of them were. However, it was felt that with some work, it should be possible to complete the remaining requirements. The key issue noted was the need for significant efforts to address the question of grazing in the property, which would build on the first steps currently undertaken. It was acknowledged that livestock-raising represented one of the most important means for local communities to meet their daily needs, and thus the reality of grazing is something that is present in the property and its immediate surroundings. However, beyond the current efforts to reduce grazing pressure it was essential to have a clear, realistic and funded plan to achieve levels of grazing that did not impact on the OUV of the site. In that regard, the proposal – through the decision and the mission report – was to adopt a more realistic and adapted desired state of conservation, as the current wording was unrealistic in terms of the potential for implementation, and one that also reflected the relationship with communities.

The **Representative of IUCN** further explained that the other key aspect was the Committee's past request for the State Party to submit a proposed boundary modification of the property to align it with the revised boundaries. This would need a submission in the procedure that the Committee would consider later on in the form of a new nomination. It was

noted that the Simien National Park had been enlarged to three times its original size, and thus this would be a significant boundary modification in line with paragraph 164 of the Operational Guidelines. Moreover, this was a request made a number of times by the Committee so as to provide the best opportunity for the State Party to compile the information now needed to revise the general management plan to integrate the issue of grazing management, as mentioned, and thus enable the State Party to fully achieve the final aspect of the desired state of conservation. Significant progress had been made, but not all the requirements were fully in place to consider the issue of the Danger List, but the recent Reactive Monitoring Mission presented a sound basis on which to discuss these issues.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted from the mission report by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre that Ethiopia had improved the conservation status of the property and, having worked for the last 21 years, had met most of the corrective measures. As indicated, the area had increased, the corridors between the lands had been established, the boundaries had been officially published in their gazette, and livestock grazing had been reduced. Even though IUCN was unsatisfied with the level of the grazing plan, the delegation felt that grazing was restricted to a very small part of the park, and that a restrictive grazing strategy could be easily implemented. Additionally, with regards to the biodiversity indicators, the Ibex population had increased to 950, the Ethiopian wolf to 140, and the baboon population to 25,000. Thus, the implementation of the corrective measures could be seen, especially as the State had invested considerable funds to improve the livelihoods of the people by relocating villages and the road within the park. The delegation thus proposed, with the Committee's support, to remove the property from the Danger List to reward the State's efforts for the past 21 years. This would also speed up the desired state of conservation.

The **Delegation of Finland** was pleased to note the significant progress made in successfully dealing with the threats to the site, and it congratulated Ethiopia for its efforts. It particularly welcomed the strong indications of increasing populations of flagship species, and found positive the IUCN's mission report indicating that the State Party had implemented all the corrective measures needed for the site to be removed from the Danger List, except one. This corrective measure concerned overgrazing, which had been identified as the main threat to the site's OUV. The finalized grazing pressure reduction strategy was considered a step in the right direction, but the clear and funded plan to implement this strategy in the management system was still lacking.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** was also of the opinion that it was now time to remove this site from the Danger List, which had been on the list for 21 years due to three major threats: the decline of mammals, agricultural encroachment, and the impacts of road construction. Corrective measures had since been adopted. In 2009, the major issues highlighted by the Committee were boundary gazetting and livestock reduction. Thus, other issues had been brought up that were not in the original desired state of conservation. It was noted that there had been 64 decisions taken on this property since it was listed. Moreover, the mission report emphasized road construction, identifying social cohesion, crop cultivation, overgrazing, agricultural encroachment, and impacts and risks associated with tourism. Out of those, the report summarized the three major issues of overgrazing, tourism management infrastructures, and the promotion of alternative livelihoods. With regard to the proposals, it was noted that the [recommendation] proposed a new general management plan (GMP) with an updated desired set of conservation, whereas the current GMP was still a valid working document. In addition, the formalization of a significant boundary modification would involve the preparation of a new nomination, which in Africa would take no less than 5 years to complete. The delegation concluded that the site could not realistically be removed from the danger list on the basis of the recommendations proposed. For this reason, the delegation proposed a revised decision that acknowledged these issues, while maintaining that these issues could be tackled when the site is off the Danger List.

The **Delegation of Portugal** carefully noted the remarks by IUCN and the Committee Members, adding that it was time to hear the State Party's understanding of future actions and commitments concerning the preservation of the site.

The **Delegation of Ethiopia** thanked the authorities and the people of Poland for their warm welcome and congratulated the Chairperson. Ethiopia had been collaborating with the Committee and the Advisory Bodies to address the corrective measures set by the Committee for the removal of Simien Mountain National Park from the List of Danger. Regarding the first recommendation, to extend the interlinking corridors, the delegation explained that Ethiopia had extended the park's territory from 136 km² to 412 km² with the inclusion of four new areas linked by habitat corridors. The second recommendation, to gazette the new park extension into National Law, had been enacted on the Simien Mountain National Park designation by the Council of Ministers. The Reactive Monitoring Mission confirmed this in its latest mission report. With regard to the recommendation to reduce human and livestock encroachment, Ethiopia had developed a grazing pressure reduction strategy, which resulted in less land being prone to livestock grazing, from 153 km² to 27 km² (over 80 per cent achieved). In addition, a number of kilometres of the park had been designated for restricted grazing. This progress was also been confirmed in the recent joint reactive mission that also noted the increase in the population of wild Ibex from less than 300 to a visible increase of 950, the Ethiopian wolf to 140, and the baboon population that is now over 25,000. Regarding the recommendation to devise alternative livelihood options for the population, Ethiopia had invested millions of dollars, with over 600 households in the park voluntarily relocated at the cost of close to US\$15 million. Moreover, the livelihood improvement strategy for the relocated community was developed in a joint effort. Other complementary measures on road realignment, to take routes out of the National Park, have been implemented at an additional cost of US\$12 million. Ethiopia requested the Committee to take note that all the recommendations have been met, and therefore to consider removing Simien National Park from the Danger List. Ethiopia had mobilized its scarce resources and worked closely in collaboration with UNESCO and other international partners to implement the decisions of the Committee. In addition, the local people had made relentless effort in the past 22 years to address the Committee's concerns. Removing the property from the Danger List would convey appreciation and commend the local community to further boost their efforts towards the sustainable conservation of the site.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** noted that the Secretariat and the IUCN had recognized the State Party's response to the recommendations made by the Committee, and noted the reduced threat to the endangered species that had resulted, as well as the policy and legal steps put in place to protect the property. The main outstanding issue remained the issue of the boundary, which according to Tanzania would require a new formalized nomination. It therefore joined in the recommendation by Tanzania and Ethiopia for the removal of this property from the Danger List.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** congratulated Ethiopia on the tremendous effort invested in the site in implementing the corrective measures. Having listened to Ethiopia's statement, and considering the positive impact that removing the site from the Danger List would have on the local community who showed serious commitment towards the status of the site and who are caretakers of the site for generations to come, the delegation supported the removal of this site from the Danger List.

The **Delegation of Cuba** thanked the Chairperson for giving the floor to Ethiopia, adding that the information provided by the State Party concerning the follow-up to the recommended corrective measures was a useful complement. It thus recommended that the site be removed from the Danger List because of the continued efforts by Ethiopia in implementing the corrective measures.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked Ethiopia for the information on its active efforts undertaken over the last few years. It strongly supported these efforts, adding that it was

great to see the progress made in the implementation of the management programmes, for example, in terms of the biodiversity indicators, such as the Ethiopian wolf. It thus supported the removal of this site from the Danger List.

La **Délégation of Burkina Faso** exprime également son appréciation à l'État partie pour les efforts qu'ils ont fournis dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives. Elle associe également aux positions qui ont été exprimées en faveur du retrait du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial car ce serait une manière d'encourager l'État partie dans ses efforts qu'il a fournis, mais aussi de maintenir cette volonté de poursuivre la mise en œuvre de cette décision du Comité.

The **Delegation of Peru** extended thanks to the IUCN for its technical report. It noted the progress made by Ethiopia in implementing the corrective measures, which was recognized by IUCN, and it thus supported a compromise solution. The delegation requested that the State Party confirm its commitment to continuing with these efforts and supported its removal from the Danger List.

La **Délégation du Portugal** remarque que les paroles de l'Éthiopie étaient extrêmement utiles et clarificatrices. La délégation reconnaît les progrès significatifs et l'engagement de l'État partie à préserver le bien, et donc supporte le retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en danger.

The **Delegation of Croatia** found the explanation by Ethiopia helpful in clarifying the situation and it congratulated the Ethiopian Government for all the corrective measures taken and implemented in protecting the property. Consequently, the delegation joined the other Members in supporting the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** remarked that it was clear that the vast majority of Committee Members supported its removal from the Danger List. With no further comments, the Chairperson turned to the adoption of the draft decision, inviting the Rapporteur to present the amendments received.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from the United Republic of Tanzania. It was noted that the original draft decision had 13 paragraphs. Tanzania proposed to change the order of paragraphs: paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 would become paragraphs 9, 10 and 11, and paragraph 7 would become paragraph 4. Paragraph 4 also had a change in tense. Paragraph 8 would now become a new paragraph 5, which had two parts: the first part was retained with a new addition, and the second was deleted. Paragraph 9 became a new paragraph 6. Paragraph 10 became paragraph 7 and remained unchanged. The original paragraph 11 became paragraph 8, with a proposal to delete the first part and to start the paragraph with, 'Takes note of the location of the proposed eco-lodge development inside the Park and requests the States Party [...]'. The word 'undertakes' was deleted. The original paragraph 4 became paragraph 9 with no modification, and paragraph 5 became a new paragraph 10 with a slight modification in the first part, to delete 'reiterates'. Paragraph 5 became a new paragraph 11 with a slight modification, to read 'Also requests [...]', the rest of the paragraph remained unchanged. Paragraph 12 stayed in its order and was unchanged. Paragraph 4 stayed in its order with a modification that would read, 'Decides to remove the Simien National Park from the List of World Heritage in Danger considering the achievement of the initial agreement of desired state of conservation'.

The **Delegation of Finland** was in favour of consensus and was ready to consider the amended draft decision, but found the wording problematic and inconsistent, especially the new paragraphs 9 and 10. Moreover, the amendment came very late, and paragraphs 9 and 10 mentioned 'DSCOR', which should be replaced with appropriate language. In this regard, the delegation asked the Secretariat and the IUCN to help insert the correct language in the amended draft decision, and suggested a drafting group to achieve this.

The **Delegations of Zimbabwe** and **Jamaica** supported the proposal by Finland.

The Delegation of Cuba supported the draft decision but sought a minor change in paragraph 3, which would read, 'Congratulates the State Party for efforts made [...]', adding that it was important to acknowledge the withdrawal of the site from the Danger List.

The **Delegation of Turkey** supported the amendments submitted by Tanzania, adding that it was appropriate and important to include the congratulations phrase as suggested by Cuba.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** was very much in favour of the overall amendments presented by Tanzania and it supported this draft decision in essence. However, as pointed out by Finland, there were some inconsistencies in the language, especially with regard to the mention of DSCOR that needed to be corrected. It therefore strongly recommended a drafting group to clean up the language before adopting the decision.

The **Chairperson** asked whether the Republic of Korea would join the drafting group.

The **Delegation of Portugal** fully agreed that the complex decision required some redrafting. It also agreed with Cuba's suggestion to congratulate the State Party, but that preferably it should appear at the end of the decision so as not to confuse the order with the paragraph that welcomes certain measures, which be corrected by the drafting group. The delegation also referred to the issue of alternative livelihoods, noting that the process had not yet been completed, and suggested that the drafting group encourage the State Party to pursue and conclude its efforts concerning guarantees of alternative livelihoods for these populations that had been voluntarily displaced.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the delegations of the Republic of Korea and Tanzania form a drafting group to bring a final draft decision to the afternoon session.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Tanzania** accepted the proposal to join the drafting group.

The **Chairperson** thanked Tanzania, adding that IUCN was available to help for consistency.

The **Delegation of Cuba** did not wish to stymie the consensus, but did not think that it was necessary to convene a drafting group to find the language needed, and that a final version of the decision could be adopted now, adding that the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies could work hand-in-hand to clean up the text. It agreed with Portugal to move the congratulatory statement.

The **Chairperson** noted that consensus had been reached, adding that the proposal was to convene a drafting group, not a working group, to attain the quality needed in the decision.

The **Delegation of Angola** supported the idea of the drafting working group so as to clarify a couple of issues. It also supported the recommendation by Portugal with regard to the livelihood issues as the State Party had indicated that the livelihood improvement strategy was underway, which should therefore be reflected in the draft decision. It also proposed a timeframe of 1 February 2018 for the strategy to be approved.

The **Chairperson** noted that the drafting group, namely, Korea, Tanzania and IUCN would prepare a final and consistent version during the lunch break.

The Secretariat announced the side events for the day, including one on Coral Bleaching in World Heritage Marine Sites organized by the World Heritage Centre, a presentation of the World Heritage Leadership Programme by ICCROM and IUCN, and a Connecting Practice: Defining New Methods of Linking Culture and Nature under the World Heritage Convention side event, as well as another event organized by the Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS-IUCN. The Secretariat also recalled that the Budget Working Group would start its work at 2 p.m. *[Close of morning session]*

SECOND DAY – Tuesday 4 July 2017

FOURTH SESSION

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 7A: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER [Continuation]

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) [Continuation.]

The **Director World Heritage Centre Director** informed the Committee that paper copies of the amendments to the draft decision were available in the room.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee had stopped its consideration of the Simien National Park in Ethiopia before lunch, adding that the drafting group, presented by the Republic of Korea, would present the amendments.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** reminded the Committee that the drafting group was composed of the United Republic of Tanzania, Finland, the Republic of Korea, and representatives of IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, to incorporate the comments raised during the debate on the Simien National Park into the draft decision. The group tried to adopt the standard language for removing a property from the Danger List, which actually entailed rearranging the paragraphs more so than the substance of the paragraphs themselves. Thus, it was decided to present a clean draft of the draft decision to the Rapporteur who would then present it to the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** read out the revised amendments. Noting the original draft decision, paragraphs 3 and 13 relative to the decision to retain the property on the danger list, would thus need to be changed. This was in addition to a new paragraph 4 that decided to remove Simien National Park from the Danger List. Paragraphs 4–8 would remain unchanged, but paragraphs 9 and 10 were modified. The drafting group therefore introduced a new paragraph 4, proposed by Tanzania, which would read, 'Decides to remove Simien National Park from the List of World Heritage in Danger'. Consequently, the original paragraph 4 would become paragraph 5, paragraph 5 would become paragraph 6, and so on. Paragraph 6, with a new addition, would read, 'Also notes that the voluntary relocation of the Gich community has been completed, and establishment of alternative livelihood options is underway, and also requests the State Party to ensure the application of the highest standards in concluding all the remaining commitments'. Paragraph 6 would become paragraph 7, paragraph 7 would become 8, original paragraph 8 would become paragraph 9 with a slight modification, which would read, 'Further notes the location of the proposed eco-lodge developments inside the park and requests furthermore the State Party to submit the EIAs including a thorough assessment of the potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment, to the World Heritage Centre for review in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines'. Paragraph 9 would become paragraph 10, with a modification by Finland, which would read, 'Requests moreover the State Party to implement the other recommendations of the 2017 mission, which build upon earlier mission recommendations, in particular to: a) Adopt a clear, realistic and funded plan to manage and substantially reduce overgrazing in the property to the levels that do not impact on its Outstanding Universal Value; b) Initiate the evaluation of the current 2009-2019 General Management Plan (GMP) to inform the next GMP; c) Strengthen the participation of local communities in the management and eventually the governance of the property. Paragraph 11 would now read, 'Reiterates its repeated request to the State Party to submit a proposal

for a Significant Boundary Modification through the preparation of a new nomination as per Decisions 35 COM 7A.9 and 40 COM 7A.42, in order to harmonize the boundary of the property with the new boundaries of the national park. Paragraph 12 would now read, 'Requests the State Party to initiate the development of a new GMP to encompass the expanded Simien Mountains National Park boundaries and to further refine the policy and management framework with the objectives to reduce overgrazing, better manage tourism and infrastructure, and promote alternative livelihoods'. Lastly, paragraph 13 would read, 'Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2018 an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018'.

The **Chairperson** noted that the amendment reflected the consensus, turning to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–3 were duly adopted.

The **Delegation of Cuba** noted that paragraph 4 was a 'decision' paragraph [i.e. 'It decides to remove...'] and should thus be positioned at the beginning of the draft decision for the sake of consistency, as the following paragraphs referred to withdrawing the property from the Danger List.

The **Chairperson** noted that it was a matter of sequence.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated the drafting group for the excellent and clear text, adding that the normal procedure was to place the decision 'to decide' at the head of the decision, followed by the other elements *after* the decision.

The **Chairperson** returned to the the draft decision, and paragraphs 4–13 were duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.13 adopted as amended to remove Simien National Park (Ethiopia) from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Delegation of Ethiopia** began by thanking Poland and the Polish people for their warm welcome and hospitality, and the Committee for their support and encouragement. The delegation remarked that the decision not only conveyed a commending message to Ethiopia and its communities, but was also an exemplary expression of support to our common heritage. Indeed, the implementation of the recommendation of the Committee had cost over US\$30 million and 21 years of relentless efforts, and the delegation was therefore very happy that the Committee recognized these efforts today. It also assured the Committee that it would continue to strongly engage with UNESCO and IUCN in implementing the recommendations to best conserve the site.

Congratulating Ethiopia, the **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the agreed postponement of the reports on the Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) and the Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) until after the completion of Item 7B. He then invited the Secretariat to read the list of natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, located in the Africa region, for which the reports were proposed for adoption *without discussion*.

The Secretariat then presented the following natural properties: Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N 155bis); Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 136); Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 280); Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63); General Decision on the properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC); Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257); and Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573).

The **Chairperson** noted no comments or objections to the State of conservation reports presented.

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7A.6, 41 COM 7A.7, 41 COM 7A.10, 41 COM 7A.11, 41 COM 7A.12, 41 COM 7A.14, and 41 COM 7A.15 adopted.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comment.

The **Delegation of Uganda** welcomed the work of the Committee in its implementation of the Convention, adding that Uganda was committed to biodiversity conservation and the protection of the environment against the impacts of oil and gas activities in its oil and gas policy. Uganda noted with serious concern Decision 41 COM 7A.11 [Virunga National Park, Democratic Republic of the Congo], specifically paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, adopted during the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee and re-adopted today at this 41st session. The delegation was concerned that the decision may have far-reaching consequences, not least because the decision was adopted without first establishing whether there were in fact risks on the ground. The delegation remarked that it was surprising that the report by the Advisory Body, on which the decision was based, did not even consider the strategic environmental assessment report for oil and gas operations in the Albertine Graben, which is the guiding decision-making study in the petroleum sector that was completed in 2013, even though the report was readily available online and the UNESCO Secretariat had been informed of its response in 2016. Uganda therefore strongly objected to this decision, which clearly disregarded the presentations by the UNESCO Director-General in 2016 in response to the queries presented to Uganda on the following points. Before opening up new areas for oil and gas activities, or any petroleum-related activities anywhere in the country, including the Lake Edward or George Basin, there are numerous checks and balances that must be satisfied aimed at ensuring environmental protection. For example, the environmental park assessment is undertaken prior to undertaking any petroleum activity that may have an impact on the environment, including plans for biodiversity conservation to ensure no net loss of biodiversity. Uganda therefore believed that the site's World Heritage status was compatible with the adequate implementation and mitigation measures for oil or gas exploration. Uganda stated that the Ngaji block, which is part of the Lake Edward and George Basin, is one of the basins in the Albertine Graben where oil and gas exploration has been undertaken since the late 1990s. Uganda had put in place the required policies and institutional framework to ensure that oil and gas activities in the Albertine region as a whole did not impact negatively on the environment. To date, oil and gas developments exist harmoniously with other sectors in the region. Therefore, Uganda's decision to include the Ngaji block in the call for tender for future petroleum exploration projects did not contravene Article 6.3 of the Convention and was thus considered highly unlikely to damage the OUV and integrity of the region, as alluded to under paragraph 7. It was in this regard that Uganda first supported Decision 40 COM 5C, which aimed to integrate sustainable development perspectives into the process of the Convention, welcoming the report presented during this 41st session and looking forward to its quick operationalization. Finally, Uganda called for the revision of the decision taken on paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, and remained ready and committed to engage with the Committee to exchange information in this regard.

The **Chairperson** reminded Observers of the time limit.

The **Delegation of Uganda** wished to see its remarks reflected in the final report.

ASIA-PACIFIC

The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Centre to present the reports on the state of conservation of the natural properties that were *open for discussion*.

Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.18](#)

The **Secretariat** noted that the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in June 2011, and the Committee had not reviewed a State of conservation report in

the most recent years. The State Party's report presented progress on several points in achieving the indicators for the desired state of conservation and the removal of the property from the Danger List, including the implementation of the Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tour (SMART) in all of its components. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN noted that the State Party had made significant investment in addressing the request made by the Committee since 2011. The State Party reported a range of activities in terms of identifying and dealing with the boundary issues. It also reported on the submission of the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) for road development plans within the property. On the 17 May 2017, the Director of the World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party to seek further information regarding the proposed development of a geothermal project within Gunung Leuser National Park and the related preliminary study of the project. No further information has been provided on this property since the distribution of the working document. In view of the concerns related to the plans to develop geothermal energy inside the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommended that the Committee requests the State Party to invite a IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property to provide advice on any proposed geothermal development and its impact on the property's OUV. The mission shall also assess the progress made with regard to the implementation of corrective measures for achieving the desired state of conservation. Finally, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommended that the Committee retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Representative of IUCN** welcomed the States Party's statement that a preliminary study to explore the possibility of developing geothermal energy extraction within the property would not be conducted. However, IUCN noted that, according to third party information, such a study had indeed been commissioned by the proponent of a geothermal project located within the property on a plateau in Gunung Leuser National Park. This area contains critically important habitat for all four key species of the property, namely, the Sumatran tiger, rhino, elephant and orangutang, and its classification as a core zone of Gunung Leuser National Park legally protected it against geothermal developments. In September 2016, the Indonesian Government rejected the proponent's request to consider reclassifying this area from a core zone to a utilization zone, which would have legally enabled the proposed geothermal development to go ahead. However, third party information indicated that there continues to be uncertainty about the status of this project, and that in March 2017 a meeting was convened by the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources to discuss geothermal development in the property. Since the Committee's previous session in 2016, IUCN has had several opportunities to exchange directly with the State Party regarding the question of geothermal development in and around the property. During these discussions, the State Party indicated that it would welcome a mission to provide further advice, which is thus the recommendation put before the Committee to request that the State Party invites such a mission.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** noted that the property was listed on the List of the World Heritage in Danger in 2004, and also noted that since then, considerable State actions, as well as international technical assistance and dialogue with Advisory Bodies, had transpired resulting in greater protection and substantial improvements in addressing the threats with a view to achieving the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the Danger List. For this, the delegation congratulated Indonesia and encouraged further progress. This reinforced the delegation's opinion that the inclusion of the property on the Danger List should be viewed and utilized constructively, as Indonesia has done, and hoped that other States Parties would also view it in this commendable manner. The delegation welcomed the fact that the Indonesian Government had not permitted the construction of new roads within the property, and all efforts had been taken to ensure that no negative impact to the OUV would be caused by upgrades to access roads and footpaths, while encouraging increased patrols of the property to discourage illegal logging activities. It

looked forward in due course to the removal of the property from the Danger List, requesting that Indonesia be given an opportunity to talk about its development to the property.

The **Delegation of Finland** acknowledged the efforts by Indonesia to address the threats to this outstanding property. It particularly welcomed the completion of the SEA for road development plans that noted the negative impact on the OUV of the property should road development go ahead within the site. The delegation encouraged the State Party to implement the recommendation in the draft decision in this regard, as well as to invite IUCN to a Reactive Monitoring Mission. It recognized the strong responsibility that biodiverse countries such as Indonesia have for conserving biodiversity, and it called on the international community and all partners to strengthen its support to Indonesia in its efforts to protect this important site, including strengthening the property-wide monitoring of these species. Finland supported the draft decision.

Echoing the remarks made by the Philippines, the **Delegation of Portugal** commended Indonesia for its very positive attitude towards the inclusion of this property in the Danger List, and also for its continuous efforts to address the challenges affecting the property, namely the management of infrastructure on the ground. In this context, it welcomed the initiation of the strategic environmental assessment for road development plans that could affect the property. The delegation was concerned about the continuous adverse effects of illegal looting, poaching and small-scale mining. As for the commitment taken by the State Party not to pursue a preliminary study to explore the possibility of developing geothermal energy extraction within the property, the delegation wished to hear from the State Party, as there was some conflicting information in this regard. Furthermore, it encouraged the State Party to improve the management and governance of the property and to engage fully with provincial and local authorities, as well as other stakeholders. It looked forward to the result of the Reactive Monitoring Mission.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended Indonesia for the work undertaken thus far to address the threats facing the property, noting the efforts to contain road infrastructure development at the site, particularly with respect to the SEA. Despite the advances made with SMART patrols, the delegation noted the call for the State Party to urgently control property-wide monitoring of these species. It also took note of the law enforcement that needed to be improved to curtail the illegal activities at the site. The delegation also invited the State Party to clarify the matter regarding the geothermal development within the property, as this seemed to influence the position of the Advisory Bodies. It therefore encouraged the State Party to follow through on its own expressed interest to invite a Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property to address the progress made with the implementation of corrective measures. In light of the information, the delegation supported the recommendation that the property be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** noted that the progress report by the State Party showed very strong and promising efforts by the State Party to fulfil its requirements outlined in the DSOCR [desired state of conservation report]. The submission of the SEA report was a good way forward and the close monitoring of the property to collect and accumulate significant data was important in providing scientific evidence so as to make appropriate decisions. In addition, data collection on the key species marked a good start, and the delegation asked the State Party to enlarge these efforts to collect species data within the overall property, as advised by the Advisory Bodies. It also supported the draft decision to request the State Party to invite a Reactive Monitoring Mission of IUCN, which would greatly help in setting constructive methods regarding road development to ensure the conservation of the property.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** echoed the remarks made by Committee Members in commending Indonesia for the work carried out during the previous years. It also called on the international community and other stakeholders to continue its support to Indonesia in this endeavour. It asked the Chairperson to allow the State Party to speak about the

developments made during the past years, adding that it looked forward to the property's removal from the Danger List.

The **Chairperson** invited Indonesia to respond.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** was committed to implementing the decisions of the Committee on the property. In this regard, the Government has been carrying out various measures from law enforcement to community development that has shown positive impact. In 2016, it successfully lowered the incidence of poaching within the property, and nineteen poachers were arrested, compared to nine in 2015. The Government also took tough measures against encroachment and other illegal activities within the property. It took note of the result of the SEA, as it was well aware of the policy option presented in the SEA for road development. Indonesia was now in the process of drafting a regulation on the technical requirements of strategic road development in the conservation forests, as road construction in the protected areas would impact negatively on the area's integrity, as well as its key species and biodiversity. The competent authorities have conducted several capacity-building activities to increase positive impacts and strengthen the national park's management. Regarding the monitoring of key species, Indonesia was set to increase the number of priority endangered species by 10 per cent from the baseline number recorded in 2013–2014. Currently, the population of key species, namely the Sumatran tiger, elephant, rhino and orangutan is relatively stable. Other activities in the corrective measures were also taken, such as habitat management, awareness campaigns, patrol and wildlife rescue, rehabilitation and release [of species]. With respect to the Aceh Spatial Plan, the Central Government coordinated with the government of Aceh Province with a view to submitting to the Committee a state of conservation [report] of 2018. The delegation assured the Committee that there was no concession or exploration permit issued with regard to geothermal energy within the property. The Government welcomed the initiative to have a Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property in due course, and it would also submit the requested updated SOC report by the due date. Indonesia would maintain lines of consultation with the Advisory Body and it hoped that the national commitment for the equal development of all Indonesian citizens could go hand-in-hand with its international commitment to UNESCO. It also hoped that the Committee and the Advisory Body would positively note Indonesia's efforts, and it stood ready to continue with a view to remove the property from the World Heritage in Danger List at the earliest possible time.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers for comment.

NGO Representative, Mr Panut Hadisiswoyo, from the Orangutan Information Center of Sumatra spoke of his life dedicated to the protection of Sumatra's forests and the communities and wildlife they call home, and the ecosystem on Earth where orangutans, rhinos, tigers and elephants live together in the wild. The List of the World Heritage in Danger is a critical tool for States Parties to address threats to World Heritage properties. Like the State Party, Mr Hadisiswoyo wished to see this magnificent property removed from the Danger List. However, this could only happen when the clear and present threats to the OUV of the property were removed, and the current destruction reversed. Despite repeated assurances, some of these threats were still taking place, such as encroachment and illegal settlement, illegal logging, illegal wildlife poaching, road building, industrial destruction, including ongoing proposals for geothermal plants and hydrodams. The State Party, in its State of conservation report, had also acknowledged these threats. The NGO would continue to work collaboratively with the Government to address these threats, but there was only so much NGOs could do. It is the government that is responsible for law enforcement, including the prosecution of offenders. It is the government that is responsible for stopping new roads, industrial development and encroachment in the property. He thus called upon the global community to join its NGO and support the Indonesian Government to protect and restore the property and the Leuser ecosystem.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.18 adopted to retain Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that even though amendments had not been presented, it wished to see the draft decision presented on the screen so that Committee Members could clearly reflect on the draft decision before adoption. The delegation explained that it had wanted to thank Indonesia for the information provided, which it wished to see reflected in the draft decision.

The **Chairperson** remarked that it had invited comments earlier from the Committee, and he invited the Centre to present the next report.

East Rennell (Solomon Islands)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.19](#)

The Secretariat remarked that the State Party had finally submitted a State of conservation report, including the desired state of conservation, for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. As indicated in the working document, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN supported the State Party and the customary owners to prepare the DSOCR with funding from the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust and the Flanders Funds-in-Trust under the World Heritage Marine Programme. A number of important measures had been undertaken by the State Party and should be welcomed. A recently established ministerial core team for heritage was currently preparing a national Round Table to further consolidate these efforts and to include relevant stakeholders. It would also discuss the implementation of the proposed desired state of conservation, and the World Heritage Fund. Furthermore, it made available US\$34,500 to support this project, in particular to support the participation of representatives from the customary owners. Additionally, technical assistance via the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust was made available at the World Heritage Centre and implemented by the International Centre on Space Technologies for Natural and Cultural Heritage (HIST), a category 2 centre. The project provided satellite images and baseline data to address conservation issues at the property, and a training workshop was organized for that purpose. In view of the ongoing situation at the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommended retaining East Rennell on the List of World Heritage in Danger and called upon the international community to support the State Party with the implementation of the DSOCR, and to develop sustainable livelihoods for the customary owners of the property.

The Representative of the IUCN noted that the State Party had made commendable efforts to consolidate the conservation and management of the property, including the development of a strategic framework for the various measures required to ensure its conservation, including the establishment of an inter-ministerial core team for heritage to oversee this process. Further efforts were however needed to put in place a permanent legal mechanism to ensure that no commercial logging was permitted within the property. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre therefore recommended that the Committee urge the State Party to expedite the designation of the property under the Protected Areas Act, as well as the finalization of the management plan in consultation with the customary owners. IUCN recalled the Committee's requests to the State Party to undertake urgent action to halt the further spread of invasive rats on Rennell Islands to prevent them from spreading into the property. In that regard, it noted with concern that a proposal for a rat eradication project had been put on hold due to uncertainties in governance mechanisms. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre therefore recommended that the Committee call upon the State Party to take urgent measures to clarify these uncertainties and to address the threat of invasive species on the OUV of the property.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.19 adopted to retain East Rennell (Solomon Islands) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE/NORTH AMERICA

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the report on the state of conservation of the cultural properties that were *open for discussion*.

Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/8B.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.20](#)

Le Secrétariat remarque que le bien Cathédrale de Bagrati et Monastère Gelati en Géorgie est inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril depuis 2010. Conformément à la décision de la 40^e session du Comité, l'État partie a soumis un rapport sur l'état de conservation et sur les progrès accomplis en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. À cet égard, l'État partie a également soumis pour examen par cette session du Comité une modification importante de limite du bien conformément à la décision 39.COM.8B.35. Le Secrétariat, en accord avec l'organisme consultatif ICOMOS, suggère de reporter la discussion sur le rapport sur l'état de conservation de ce site après l'examen du point 8B.

The **Chairperson** suggested following the recommendation to return to the State of conservation of Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) at a later stage once the boundary modification request had been examined. With no objections, the Secretariat moved to the next report.

Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.22](#)

The Secretariat recalled that Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2004, and on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2012 on the basis of the potential danger that the Liverpool Waters Development Project constituted to the property. The Committee also considered at that time the possibility of deletion of the property from the List of World Heritage should the project be approved and implemented. Since 2012 the Committee has reviewed every year the state of conservation of the property and has adopted decisions requesting the State Party to reconsider the proposed Liverpool Waters Development. It proposed to stop its consent to the development project before the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger is adopted and a set of corrective measures with a timeframe for the implementation is developed. The Committee also reiterated in its decisions, its serious concern that the Liverpool Waters Project would irreversibly damage the architectural and town planning attributes of the property, as well as its conditions of integrity. The State Party has engaged in the preparation of a number of key documents and tools to address the Committee's decisions. Two statements of desired state of conservation for removal have been submitted by the State Party in 2014 and 2016, and reviewed by the World Heritage Centre and

ICOMOS. Furthermore, until the publication of the state of conservation report for the 41st session of the Committee, the State Party has transmitted the 2017–2024 management plan of the property for review by the World Heritage Centre and the ICOMOS. The State Party also transmitted the response to the ICOMOS Technical Review of the 2016 desired state of conservation, which addressed the issue of applying a moratorium on planning permissions to the whole property until the DSOCR is agreed, stating that the earliest the DSOCR could be agreed would be July 2018. In the meantime, and in the framework of paragraph 172 and 174 of the Operational Guidelines, the State Party has replied to a request by the World Heritage Centre concerning five development projects, of which one is situated within the buffer zone, the Ovatus 1 tower, and one, the Infinity tower, is located immediately adjacent to the buffer zone. The State Party informed the Secretariat that the Liverpool City Council has approved both projects. In the same response, the State Party provided new information on the proposal for a 32-storey tower within the Princess Dock Area of the Liverpool Waters Development and within the buffer zone of the property. The Secretariat was informed that Historic England has been consulted and has not lodged any objection. However, the Secretariat did not receive its report or an impact assessment. The current draft decision in its paragraph 11 and 12 takes stock of the different Committees' decisions, as well as the responses exchanged with the State Party.

The Representative of ICOMOS remarked that the property continues to face strong challenges associated with an approved large-scale planning consent. ICOMOS has participated in joint World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS missions to the property in 2006, 2011 and 2015. Over this period, there has been progress in improving the state of conservation of the property through repair and reuse of historic buildings and structures, which were previously at risk. However, these conservation works cannot compensate for the major adverse impact on the OUV of the property resulting from progressive overdevelopment within the property itself and within the buffer zone arising from the Liverpool Waters Outline Planning Consent. ICOMOS and the Committee have consistently advised that the subject approval, which is valid until 2042, and specifically the scale of the proposed development, would fundamentally and adversely affect the OUV of the property. The statement of OUV for the property expresses concerns that the height of any new construction in the property should not exceed the height of structures in the immediate surroundings. The Committee originally considered the Liverpool Waters Scheme at its 35th session in 2011, expressing its extreme concern and recommending that it should not proceed, noting that English Heritage at the time regarded the scheme as significantly damaging for the OUV of the property. The potential impact on OUV of the Liverpool Waters Scheme was noted in the 2012 Liverpool City Council Office's Report to the Council's Planning Committee, which also advised on the potential impact on the property and the noted concerns of English Heritage, mission experts and the Committee. The property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2012 because of the danger to OUV value presented by Liverpool Waters. At every session since, the Committee has expressed its concern and requested that the scheme be subject to very substantial modification. This has not occurred and large-scale projects continue to be approved. There have been a range of projects in the buffer zone approved and announced very recently, such as a 34-storey tower, the 27-storey Ovatus 1, three 27- to 23-storey Infinity triple towers, a high-rise scheme is adjacent to the buffer zone and a new football stadium is proposed on the waterfront at Bramley-Moore Dock within the property. While there may be individual heritage assessments and merit-based decisions for specific projects, it is the ongoing incremental cumulative consequences that it posing the threat to OUV. The evolving impact is greater than the cluster of towers or changes to the setting of important elements such as the Three Graces. It is also a fundamental change to the visual quality and integrity of the docks, bearing in mind that the property was inscribed as a Maritime Mercantile City and Port.

The Representative of ICOMOS further remarked that the State Party has prepared and submitted a number of documents which it calls 'desired state of conservation for removal' reports, the most recent of which was in November 2016. However, this document does not

specify a desired state of conservation nor provides appropriate corrective measures. Rather, it is a statement of process to be followed within the existing outline approval. An effective statement for removal should actually identify and require protection of important views, link the strategic city development vision to regulatory street planning, specify actual heights, and build form envelopes for new developments, among other things. In other words, the DSCOR needs to express the desired state. As already noted by the Committee, the final DSCOR should precede finalization of the planning tools and regulatory framework, including revision to the supplementary planning document and the Liverpool plan approval. The preparation of a revised outcomes-focused desired state of conservation for removal, which identifies precisely how the approved scheme should be refined to protect the OUV of the property, is now of the utmost urgency to inform necessary major changes to the Liverpool Water Scheme prior to consideration of any further planning proposals or approvals. ICOMOS regrets the misalignment between the obligations of the State Party and the obligations of the local planning authority to consider and determine applications resulting in continual approval of developments, which incrementally impact OUV. Further approval and construction of major developments within the property and its buffer zone should not proceed before the DSCOR is finalized and approved, and relevant corrective measures have been taken. ICOMOS recognized the huge difficulty in circumstances that have now been created, and that the necessary changes, including very substantial reductions to the allowable development, are not within the power of the State Party. It can only be achieved through engagement, negotiation and agreement between the principle stakeholders, in particular, Liverpool City Council and the developer, Peel Holdings.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Portugal** remarked that this dossier has been ongoing for many years, and it profoundly regretted the almost total absence of progress and unwillingness of the State Party to properly address the serious concerns raised by the Committee over the years and implement its consecutive decisions. It was particularly surprised to hear the argument put forward by the State Party in that under UK law it was unable to accede to the Committee's request to limit the granting of planning permission. Furthermore, the State Party failed to submit the proper revised desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger with appropriate corrective measures. Considering the remarks by ICOMOS, the delegation wondered whether there was still some hope that the State Party wished to work to salvage the remaining OUV of the property, or was the Committee already in countdown mode for the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List at the next Committee session in 2018. Either way, the UK should thus clarify the matter by demonstrating its commitment to work fully with the Committee and abide by its decisions or not.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** noted that the Committee had discussed this dossier with regret for four years. It also wondered whether the Committee still believed that there would be some change to the plans, and that the State Party would take measures to halt the plans already in place. The delegation doubted that this was the case, as this would already have been done. The delegation believed that the situation was irreversible, and that the Committee faced the dilemma of being forced to delete the property from the List.

The **Delegation of Finland** welcomed the news that all stakeholders are fully informed, and it recognized the Committee's serious concerns about the potential threat of the Liverpool Waters Development Chain to the OUV of the property. It was however worrying that the State Party has failed to specify a desired state of conservation. It could accept the fact that within the United Kingdom legislative framework, the State Party was unable to accede to the Committee's request to limit the granting of planning permissions. However, it could not accept that the desired state of conservation has been pending since 2013. Part of the problem lay in the fact that the State Party was not able to produce the document requested by ICOMOS. In order to submit a revised desired state of conservation by the 1 February 2018, the State Party should continue its dialogue with ICOMOS and look for possible ways

to resolve the issue. The delegation also wished to hear from ICOMOS as to whether it had any hope for this site in the future.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** noted that the Committee had examined the current development within the property and the adverse effects to its OUV since 2013. The delegation understood the needs of a city thriving with citizens to keep up with economic sustainability. However, as repeatedly underlined, such developments need to happen while respecting the heritage values that were recognized at the time of inscription. The Committee should strongly urge the State Party to finalize a desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the Danger List, and to provide ample time to host ongoing developments until corrective measures can be outlined as appropriate, as already requested in the draft decision. The delegation counted on the State Party's strong efforts and good faith.

The **Delegation of Turkey** deeply regretted that there had been no further improvement in the finalization of the DSOCR since 2016 despite the deep concerns in that regard. It was also unfortunate that there was still no approved DSOCR since the property's inscription on the danger list. Even worse, it was disappointing and worrying to learn that the UK's legislation framework prevented the State Party from complying with the Committee's request to limit the granting of planning permission for Liverpool Waters Project. Proposals to delist the property from the World Heritage List was of course not welcome, and should only be applied if actual damage and loss of OUV had occurred. However, if the State Party has no sufficient management capacity to sustain the OUV of the property, delisting must be an option to sustain the credibility of the List. In that regard, the delegation was greatly concerned by the statements of the State Party with regard to the impossibility of revoking planning concerns and limiting the granting of planning permission. Nevertheless, the DSOCR submitted by the State Party stated that the State Party was still committed to further collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. The delegation reminded the Committee of the discussions on the Dresden Elbe Valley during the 33rd session in Seville [which was delisted]. While many of the Members underlined the loss of OUV of the property to sustain its presence on the List, other Members highlighted the power and role of the Convention in protecting properties against such ambitious developments. The delegation sought to hear the position of the State Party as to whether it would continue to implement the Committee's decisions. To conclude, it supported the draft decision to retain the property on the World Heritage List in Danger until the required studies are completed and the Committee is satisfied by the state of conservation of the property, as well as the efforts of the State Party. Nevertheless, the recommendation for delisting should be reviewed by the Advisory Bodies and the Committee.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** joined in the remarks made by Portugal and Lebanon, adding that it was imperative that States Parties respect in good faith the decisions of the Committee. Given the lack of progress and engagement by the State Party, the delegation felt that it was appropriate to consider removing the property from the World Heritage List. This would send a resolute message to the State Party, especially if there was no impetus to agree on a desired state of conservation for the property, and remove it from the danger list.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** noted that the State Party submitted a DSOCR in late 2016, which still did not provide the appropriate corrective measures. The Committee had repeatedly expressed concern over the potential threat of the proposed Liverpool Waters Development, and noted that it would irreversibly damage the attributes of the OUV and conditions of integrity. Jamaica was deeply concerned about the dynamic issues surrounding the sites, and was particularly concerned that if the State Party did not stop the granting of planning permits, which negatively impact on the OUV, State faced possible removal from the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Poland** noted that urban pressure and the changes it brings to the character of the World Heritage properties, their integrity and authenticity, were reported as a

major threat. It was a common problem, with Liverpool one such example. Poland shared the concerns, and echoed the remarks by Portugal, Lebanon and others. The city needed a wise regeneration policy with inhabitants of Liverpool at the heart of it, and it doubted that the Liverpool Waters scheme would bring such benefits to Liverpoolians. It did not see a solution at the moment, but it was convinced that the Committee should find a way to stop further transformation and degradation of the city's historical structure and character.

The **Chairperson invited** the delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to respond to the concerns raised.

The **Delegation of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** was grateful to the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the attention devoted to Liverpool's World Heritage status since it was first placed on the Danger List. It deeply regretted that Liverpool remained on the danger list and that deletion was even contemplated in 2018. However, the delegation did see some cause for optimism. Following the recent General Election in the UK, there was a new Heritage Minister who made clear that the Government should redouble its efforts to strengthen stewardship of all the UK's World Heritage sites, with the protection and enhancement of the OUV as its guiding star. It was noted that the Lord Mayor of Liverpool, Councillor Malcolm Kennedy, was present to demonstrate Liverpool City Council's desire to work with the World Heritage Centre in addressing a range of issues facing the property. In the last decade, Liverpool had reduced the number of buildings at risk by 75 per cent, and it had a new management plan for Liverpool, which stated, 'ICOMOS guidance on heritage impact assessments for cultural World Heritage properties has now been formally adopted by the Council for all development within the World Heritage Site and buffer zone'. Earlier in 2017, Liverpool was designated by the European Union as a heritage role model, a designation that will support community engagement with the World Heritage site. The UK Government recognizes and greatly values the role civil society plays in protecting all of the World Heritage sites, and was encouraged by the involvement of civil society in the present meeting. This included people who live and work in Liverpool, who value its World Heritage status, and are working hard to retain it. The delegation accepted that there remained real challenges and tough decisions to be made. It fully recognized and accepted the views expressed by the Committee and the reviews of the Advisory Bodies, to which it sought to respond clearly and energetically. The delegation thus wished to reassure the Committee that it was committed and determined to take the measures addressed by the decisions of the Committee and the Advisory Bodies. The State Party has had useful discussions with representatives of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and it fully intended to continue that dialogue as it refined the desired state of conservation for removal prior to the next Committing session. It was hoped that the DSOCR would be approved to share the view that deletion was not be the right way forward. In the meantime, the Minister wished to echo the Mayor of Liverpool's invitation to every member of the Committee to visit Liverpool in the next 12 months to see in person how its OUV is being protected and enhanced.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** wished to respond to the interventions from Members of the Committee, the State Party, and Finland to say that ICOMOS was hopeful but not optimistic at this point. This was because virtually all the major developments that are so problematic have not yet been built and hence why there was still hope. In addition, there was very strong civil society interest within Liverpool to ensure that the property is not removed from the World Heritage List, and there were a number of Liverpoolians who journeyed to Krakow specifically to articulate and express that view. The issue lay in the nexus between the relative constitutional house and roles of the UK State Party, Liverpool Council and the developer. Thus, everything hinged on whether or not those parties could reach agreement to change the nature and scale of the development. There is an opportunity for the State Party to lead that process, and define the desired state of conservation for removal. It was thus a question as to whether the Liverpool City Council and the developer would agree to do what the desired state requires. However, the most urgent thing that would

determine whether this property comes back from the brink or not is whether or not a satisfactory DSOCR can be prepared and adopted.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers for comments.

Reading out a statement on behalf of Mr Gerry Proctor, who was unable to attend, a **Representative of the NGO Engage Liverpool** stated that seventy-five per cent of the people of Liverpool in a recent poll felt that World Heritage Site designation was a status worth fighting for. Civil society actors and members of the academic community were already engaged in the struggle. They have decided that there is no alternative but to launch a belated campaign to do everything possible to hold on to this prestigious designation. They have calmly waited for the outcomes of negotiations between UNESCO and the State Party to reach a successful conclusion. While the relationship between development and conservation, progress and heritage was still being worked out, the NGO requested that the Committee promote wide discussion and debate around constructive conservation. The NGO urged the Committee to support the efforts of the 75 per cent of people in Liverpool who want to retain their respected World Heritage Site status, adding that the struggle was formidable, but with its help the people could win.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

Rapporteur noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.22 adopted to retain Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBEAN

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no cultural properties located in the Latin America and the Caribbean region proposed for discussion this year. He therefore invited the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of properties for which the reports were *proposed for adoption without discussion*.

The Secretariat cited the following: City of Potosi (Bolivia, Plurinational State of) (C 420), Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile) (C 1178bis), Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama, Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135), Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366), and Coro and its Port (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (C 658).

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no comments or objections to the state of conservation reports of the sites presented.

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7A.23, 41 COM 7A.24, 41 COM 7A.25, 41 COM 7A.26, and 41 COM 7A.27 adopted.

AFRICA

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the report on the state of conservation of the cultural properties that were *open for discussion*.

Old Towns of Djenné (Mali)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 7A.28](#)

Le Secretariat remarque que le rapport sur la ville ancienne de Djenne, soumis par l'État partie le 25 janvier 2017 et complété par un rapport d'évaluation soumis le 3 mai 2017. Ce rapport fait état de la fragilité de la situation sécuritaire dans cette région du pays qui ralentit la capacité d'intervention de l'État partie, d'où un faible niveau de mise en œuvre des mesures correctives; cinq mesures engagées sur 20. Cette situation s'explique également par un faible niveau de financements mobilisés pour Djenne car les partenaires financiers ont manifesté plus d'intérêt pour Tombouctou que pour ce site. De ce fait, il a recommandé que le Comité prenne note des progrès réalisés par l'État partie et l'encourage à les poursuivre et à sensibiliser davantage ses partenaires à soutenir Djenne dans le cas du plan d'action pour la deuxième phase de la réhabilitation du patrimoine culturel du Mali. En réponse aux enjeux que font face au bien, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a développé un projet sur l'implication effective des communautés locales dans la sauvegarde du patrimoine en mettant en place des métiers du patrimoine culturel générateur de revenus pour la population locale, en particulier pour les jeunes, facteurs déterminants pour la lutte contre l'immigration massive et la radicalisation. En vue de la situation, le Comité pourra une nouvelle fois faire appel à la communauté internationale à offrir son soutien urgent et sans réserve à l'État partie pour le renforcement des mesures de conservation et de la gestion de Djenne.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted that some progress had been made in addressing the corrective measures, but under extremely difficult conditions with flooding in addition to an unstable security situation with increased attacks. The most recent flooding in Djenné in August 2016 caused damage to some of the oldest monumental mud houses, including the sixteenth century Moroccan palace. This brought about structural instability and even collapse to some of the buildings, and also damaged, to a lesser degree, the Great Mosque and archaeological sites. These disastrous impacts have compounded the problems already faced by the Djenné cultural mission. The security situation has led to a gradual decline in the population, which means that houses are no longer regularly maintained and craftspeople have no sponsors, all of which has led to the ongoing deterioration of the built fabric that could rapidly accelerate over time, as traditional mud construction needs regular maintenance. The cultural mission acknowledged that they do not have adequate resources to implement their activities effectively. It is a credit to them that progress is being made with the conservation and management plan. The challenges facing Djenné, particularly the need to mitigate degradation of the densely packed urban houses and the Great Mosque, need to be addressed before it becomes irreversible, as well as the need to revitalize and support a viable community in the city that should be given greater visibility. Djenné, along with Timbuktu notably, is one of the few remaining intact urban areas that still reflect the distinctive urban planning and traditional buildings that once prevailed over larger areas of Northern West Africa. ICOMOS joins the World Heritage Centre in supporting a call to the international community to spread the focus beyond Timbuktu in order to encourage support for the sustainable conservation of the fragile and extraordinary scarce urban resource that is Djenné before it is too late.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Finland** thanked Mali for its serious commitment to the implementation of some of the corrective measures adopted in the 40th session, despite the challenging situation and the lack of resources. Unfortunately, Mother Nature was not working in its favour, as flooding caused the deterioration in the old urban fabric and the collapse of certain buildings in 2016. Finland encouraged the State Party to seek international assistance from the World Heritage Fund in order to implement priority action for the rehabilitation of the damaged monumental houses, and invite a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring

Mission to the site when the security situation is stabilized. Finland supported the draft decision.

La **Délégation du Portugal** reconnaît que le Mali est un pays en guerre. Une guerre qu'il n'a pas voulu et dont il est victime. La Délégation comprend pleinement la situation difficile à laquelle le Mali doit faire face pour préserver son patrimoine dans un contexte constant d'insécurité et de menaces pour ses institutions et ses citoyens. Des pluies, des inondations et l'abandon des populations ont rendu la tâche de préservation encore plus complexe. Malgré toutes ces difficultés, étant donné l'état de dégradation de certaines composantes du bien, la délégation encourage Mali à davantage travailler avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et ICOMOS afin de préparer, dès que possible, l'état de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en danger. Pour cela, il est indispensable qu'une mission de suivie soit dépêchée sur place afin de vérifier les conditions dès que la situation sécuritaire le permet.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended the State Party for its work to try and restore the property under very difficult circumstances of security and war, as well as the floods that have also worked against the restoration of the property. It sympathized with Mali for the lack and inadequacy of resources for rehabilitation, and it appealed to the international community to support Mali in the restoration of this property. The delegation agreed with the advice from the World Heritage Centre that emphasis should not be only on Timbuktu, but also on other properties within the same country. The delegation supported the draft decision, and also reinforced the need for a Reactive Monitoring Mission that might also trigger international assistance to Mali.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** noted that the State Party has moved to address the corrective measures laid out by the Advisory Bodies despite the sustained security factors that the country faces. Up to May 2017, when the State Party presented its DSOCR, five of the 20 measures outlined were being implemented, for which the State Party must be commended. Even with these positive moves, the delegation noted the additional problems that have emerged since the property's inscription to the danger list that includes the collapse of historic houses dating to the sixteenth century and the appearance of cracks following flooding caused by torrential rains in 2016. Given the extreme developments over the last year, including the impact of a natural disaster and security concerns, the delegation supported the decision that the State Party review and update its implementation schedule concerning the remaining corrective measures. The international community also needed to rally around the State Party, given the security factors that are outside their control, and Jamaica supported the draft decision as presented.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** note la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives que le Comité avait adoptées lors de sa dernière session dans des conditions difficiles et dans un contexte sécuritaire précaire ce qui démontre toutefois une bonne volonté de l'État partie à y coopérer. La délégation encourage l'État partie à poursuivre cette mise en œuvre des mesures correctives ainsi que la prise d'actions prioritaires pour la réhabilitation des lieux, et l'encouragement de ce fait à solliciter l'assistance internationale au titre du Fonds du patrimoine mondial et aussi à recourir à toute aide de la communauté internationale. La délégation soutient le projet de décision qui est proposé.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** echoed the remarks of the previous speakers with regard to the unstable security situation affecting the conservation status of this important property, adding that the State Party would have accomplished most of the issues if it were not for this situation. Moreover, the State Party had to concentrate most of its resources to stabilize security. Other conservation challenges would continue to arise with time if international organizations could not work together to address security. The [Reactive Monitoring] mission in 2016 was not possible because of insecurity, which risked hampering conservation. The delegation supported the draft decision and advocated assistance to the State Party in these difficult times.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.28 adopted to retain Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** then invited the Secretariat to read the list of cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Africa region for which the reports were proposed for adoption *without discussion*.

The Secretariat presented the following cultural properties: Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119rev), Tomb of the Askia (Mali) (C 1139), and Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7A.29, 41 COM 7A.30, and 41 COM 7A.31 adopted.

ARAB STATES

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the report on the state of conservation of the cultural properties that were *open for discussion*.

Le Secretariat souhaite faire une brève introduction sur la situation en Iraq en général. En abordant l'état de conservation des biens irakiens placés sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, le Secrétariat souhaite souligner que malgré les bonnes nouvelles de libération de plusieurs régions, villes et sites archéologiques en Iraq, le peuple irakien continue de subir de grandes souffrances en relation avec le conflit. Le patrimoine irakien a beaucoup souffert et demeure très menacé par le conflit armé, le pillage et le trafic illicite. Bien que les épisodes de destruction intentionnelle du patrimoine se sont beaucoup atténués depuis la 40^e session du Comité, le 22 juin dernier avait été témoins de la destruction intentionnelle de la mosquée médiévale al-Nouri à Mossoul avec son fameux minaret incliné al-Hadba. Cette mosquée figurait parmi les sites les plus emblématiques de la ville de Mossoul inscrits sur la Liste indicative de l'Iraq et donc aussi les plus emblématiques du pays entier. La destruction de cette mosquée qui allonge la liste de sites religieux de toutes les confessions détruites intentionnellement en Iraq, montre que la destruction intentionnelle fait partie d'une politique de la terre brûlée censée anéantir le moral de la population et la mémoire collective. Afin d'évaluer les dommages suivis par le patrimoine irakien, planifier les futures actions de réhabilitation et coordonner les efforts de la communauté internationale dans les zones libérées en Iraq, le Gouvernement irakien et l'UNESCO ont organisé une Conférence internationale de coordination sur la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel dans les zones libérées d'Iraq, au Siège de l'UNESCO en février dernier, en présence des organisations consultatives. Cette Conférence a rassemblé plus de 100 experts de la communauté scientifique internationale et a permis de faire le bilan de la situation dans ces zones, de définir les actions à court et moyen termes pour le patrimoine archéologique et urbain en général et les sites du patrimoine mondial en particulier, les sites religieux, et les musées et le patrimoine immobilier bien sûr. La réunion a aussi débouché sur la création d'un comité de pilotage conjoint entre l'UNESCO et le Gouvernement de l'Iraq chargé de coordonner les actions dans les zones libérées. Cependant, l'accès limité aux sites concernés rend la mise en œuvre des mesures d'urgence lente et très compliquée.

Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.33](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan rapporte sur l'état de conservation du site Assour Qal'at Sherqat en Iraq. L'État partie indique que Assour a été entièrement libérée à la mi-décembre après deux années d'occupation par les groupes armés extrémistes. Le Conseil national des antiquités et du patrimoine a effectué une estimation préliminaire des dommages subis, et a entamés le nettoyage du bien et la préparation des travaux d'urgence. L'État partie a indiqué qu'une intervention immédiate s'imposait pour éviter l'effondrement de nombreux éléments, en particulier la porte de Tabira. Il reporte également que le cimetière royal a subi de gros dégâts dus aux eaux pluviales. En février 2017, l'UNESCO a fait une mission rapide d'évaluation du bien et a confirmé les dommages signalés. À cette occasion, l'UNESCO a insisté sur le besoin urgent d'installer un abri couvrant les tombes royales et d'assurer la protection du site par les forces de sécurité. L'État partie demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'envoyer une équipe d'experts pour évaluer les dégâts en détail afin de préparer un plan de conservation pour guider son action future au sein du bien et recommande de mener une action internationale pour la conservation d'urgence des sites qui ont été libérés.

On behalf of ICOMOS and ICCROM, the **Representative of ICOMOS** stated that they acknowledged with regret that armed conflict had significantly damaged Iraq's cultural heritage in this property, but welcomed the liberation of Ashur Qa'lat Sherqat in late 2006 and the subsequent rapid assessment activities by the State for Antiquities and Heritage. It was recognized that some conservation interventions, such as securing sites and the protection of the royal tombs were urgent to prevent further damage, but that these should be limited to situations where collapse or further damage is imminent. The proposed joint mission would assist in assessing the damage so as to put together a comprehensive conservation plan, which should occur as soon as security conditions permit. Substantial additional support for the safeguarding of the property and its OUV was required through increased mobilization of the international community to provide greater financial and technical assistance. ICOMOS and ICCROM strongly supported efforts to ensure the protection of the property despite the difficult prevailing situation, and consider that the recently prepared provisional guidance on post-trauma recovery and reconstruction of World Heritage properties may contribute to the implementation of the priority action outlined at the February 2017 International Coordination Conference on the Safeguarding of Cultural Heritage in Liberated areas of Iraq.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** thanked the Secretariat and ICOMOS for their comprehensive brief. It noted everyone's concern that Iraqi cultural heritage was increasingly a target of deliberate destruction. Most recently, all witnessed the destruction of al-Hadba Minaret, in which the Director-General of UNESCO stated on 22 June 2017, 'on this irreparable loss of our collective heritage and memory. The al-Hadba Minaret and al-Nuri mosque in Mosul were among the most iconic sites in the city and stood as a symbol of identity, resilience and belonging'. This explains the importance of preserving Iraq's cultural heritage. The international community should thus continue to be vigilant and help Iraq protect its unique cultural heritage, and in this regard, the delegation hoped that the International Conference on Safeguarding Cultural Heritage in Liberated Areas of Iraq held in February 2017 would further accelerate the action needed to protect Iraq's cultural heritage. Turkey would support the Steering Committee by its contribution of an expert, and it would continue to support Iraq in safeguarding its cultural heritage.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.33 adopted to retain Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Hatra (Iraq)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.34](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan rapporte sur l'état de conservation du site de Hatra, en Iraq. L'État partie a pris le contrôle du site d'Hatra le 26 avril 2017 et la zone entourant le site reste une zone de combat rendant l'évaluation des dommages impossibles. Hatra a très probablement été utilisée comme un lieu de stockage et un centre d'entraînement militaire pour les groupes extrémistes armés et le site avait subi à la mi-2014 la destruction intentionnelle de ses éléments sculpturaux figuratifs. Le rapport d'analyse récent des images satellitaires UNITAR UNOSAT indique que Hatra a subi des destructions supplémentaires depuis 2015. L'État partie rappelle l'obligation faite à tous les belligérants dans le cadre des accords internationaux de protéger les biens culturels en cas de conflits armés. Il demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'envoyer une équipe d'experts pour évaluer les dégâts en détail afin de préparer un plan de conservation pour guider son action future et il recommande de mener une action internationale pour la conservation d'urgence des sites qui ont été libérés.

On behalf of ICOMOS and ICCROM, the **Representative of ICOMOS** acknowledged that armed conflict had significantly damaged Iraq's cultural heritage in this property, in particular due to occupation by extremist groups, resulting in continuing destruction and preventing important conservation work. It was essential that any military actions are mindful of obligations to protect cultural heritage under international law and that immediate works be focused on essential stabilization and protection activity, such as securing fencing at the threatened sites or protecting cultural fragments. Local conservation efforts would also require substantial support to increase mobilization of the international community to provide greater financial and technical assistance. Comprehensive detailed assessment of the damage is essential prior to any non-urgent conservation actions, and as before the recently prepared provisional guidance on post-trauma recovery and reconstruction of World Heritage properties may contribute to the implementation of the priority actions outlined at the February 2007 International Coordination Conference on the Safeguarding of the Cultural Heritage in Liberated Areas of Iraq.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

Addressing the two Iraqi World Heritage sites, the **Delegation of Portugal** noted the lack of information regarding heritage conservation. The absence of security on the ground made it very difficult to address the factors that were negatively affecting the properties, and the delegation deeply regretted the damage to heritage due to armed conflict and looting of Iraqi archaeological sites. With regard to Ashur Qa'lat Sherqat, the delegation commended UNESCO's rapid onsite assessment in February 2017 following the liberation of the property in December 2016. It also praised the State Board of Antiquities and Heritage of Iraq for the rapid assessment made of the property right after its liberation, and it looked forward to receiving a full report of the assessments. The delegation also praised the Iraqi people for their resilience and their constant defiance against Da'esh. Their courage and determination to rebuild their country and to ensure a peaceful and prosperous future for all citizens of Iraq should also be commended.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** noted that Iraq wished to take the floor.

The **Delegation of Iraq** thanked UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICCROM and all the countries that support Iraq, adding that the terrorists aim to destroy the heritage in order to erase Iraq's history and future and destroy its civilization. In the name of the Iraqi government, the

delegation assured the Committee that the destructive forces would soon be vanquished. The most important thing was to raise awareness among the people, and the local and international community to better appreciate this common heritage. The international community should be aware that protecting cultural heritage was for humanity as a whole, and it was a moral duty to participate in protecting the cultural heritage of and threats to the entire world. The extremists wreaked severe damage on archaeological sites; they systematically dug tunnels and searched for antiques to sell on the Internet and on the black market. Security Council Resolutions No. [2199](#) (2015) and No. [2347](#) (2017) call on Member States to fight illicit trafficking and to consider smugglers as criminals, while punishing all individuals, organizations, auctions, and countries that allow trade in cultural items with unknown certificates of origin. The delegation concluded by stating that the terrorists tried but would never erase Iraq's culture, identity, diversity, history and the pillars of civilization.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.34 adopted to retain Hatra (Iraq) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Archaeological Site of Cyrene

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.37](#)

Le Secretariat rappelle qu'à l'instar de l'Iraq, du Yémen et de la Syrie, la Libye fait face à une situation de conflit qui entraîne de grandes souffrances humaines et menace son patrimoine culturel et naturel, d'où l'inscription de l'ensemble des sites libyens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril l'an dernier à Istanbul. Depuis mai 2016, date de la réunion internationale d'experts sur la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel libyen organisé à Tunis, peu de progrès ont été accomplis par la communauté internationale dans la gestion des risques encourus par les sites du patrimoine libyen en raison de la difficulté d'accéder au pays, défis également liés à la gouvernance de la Libye. Aujourd'hui, les professionnels libyens du patrimoine ont besoin d'un grand soutien. Leurs besoins concernent le renforcement des capacités, l'assistance technique mais surtout les équipements et les matériaux pour protéger leurs sites car ils n'ont plus accès à la marchandise internationale, clôture, caméras de vidéosurveillance, véhicules, matériaux de construction et de restauration, matériaux pour protéger et transporter et sécuriser les éléments structuraux sur les sites archéologiques et dans les musées. Bien que les sites du patrimoine mondial de Libye n'aient pas subi de dommages importants à ce jour, la situation extrêmement difficile de pays divisé, en proie à la violence, et la présence de groupes extrémistes armés constituent une véritable menace et requièrent l'intervention et le soutien de la communauté internationale. Elle note aussi que le Centre du patrimoine mondial a été informé à plusieurs reprises du mécontentement des autorités locales et de la société civile suite à la décision du Comité à sa dernière session à Istanbul d'inscrire les biens libyens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Les autorités Libyennes n'ont pas perçu cette inscription comme une marque de solidarité et de mobilisation internationale mais comme un manque de reconnaissance de leurs efforts déployés malgré le conflit. Ce qui s'ajoute au manque de soutiens technique et financier de la communauté internationale.

On behalf of ICCROM and ICOMOS, the **Representative of ICOMOS** made a general comment in that the issues related to the Libyan properties under consideration were common to all. ICOMOS and ICCROM noted with regret that the security situation in Libya continued to militate against effective conservation. All the Libyan properties up for discussion at this Committee session were impacted by substantial and inappropriate urban encroachment, as evidenced by analysis of satellite imagery. Precise delineation of the

boundaries of the property and their buffer zones remained an important objective. The actions of local authorities and local community members to protect the cultural heritage sites were important steps towards longer term conservation and management, but it was also important that longer term conservation is founded on a thorough understanding and informed by expert advice. Therefore, it was crucial that local efforts were supported through increased mobilization of the international community to provide greater financial and technical support for the implementation of short and medium term measures identified during the International Meeting on the Safeguarding of the Libyan Cultural Heritage organized by ICCROM in collaboration with UNESCO and held in Tunis in May 2016. The joint mission, previously requested by the Committee, should be sent to the Libyan World Heritage properties as soon as the security situation allowed.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** a suivi avec intérêt et satisfaction quant à la prise de conscience du danger de la situation du patrimoine archéologique libyen et souligne avec accord ce qui vient d'être dit par la Secrétariat « Peu de progrès ont été réalisés ». La délégation regrette la situation en Libye et appelle à ce que la communauté internationale agisse de manière plus efficace et à redoubler d'effort pour venir en appui à la Libye. Pour sa part, la Tunisie n'a ménagé aucun effort dans deux directions. La première direction, c'est la vigilance frontalière pour juguler tous les trafics qui passent par les frontières et qui concernent le trafic de pièces archéologiques. Et l'appui tunisien va dans une deuxième direction. C'est l'appui qui va aux libyens en matière de formation et d'accompagnement technique en matière de préservation et de protection du patrimoine. La Tunisie rappelle que toute aide à la Tunisie dans son soutien à la Libye est la bienvenue.

Addressing the three archaeological sites in Libya, the **Delegation of Portugal** remarked that the situation in the country remained very unstable despite the commendable efforts of the Department of Antiquities of Cyrene. Several challenges faced the three properties in Libya, including urban encroachment, although the impact on the properties and their vicinities was still difficult to evaluate. The delegation fully understood that the dramatic situation in the country might move the safeguarding of cultural heritage down in the list of priorities. Nevertheless, it was important that a mission to Libya be carried out as soon as security conditions on the ground permitted. Indeed, it hoped that civil strife would soon end and allow the Libyan people to rebuild their country.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** noted that the ongoing conflict situation in Libya would continue to degrade the status of conservation of the World Heritage sites in Libya. It called upon the international community, along with Portugal and Tunisia, to support Libya in safeguarding the affected heritage properties by supporting technical missions as soon as possible.

La **Délégation du Liban** prend note que le rapport présenté par le Secrétariat et les organes consultatifs indique effectivement que la situation sur les sites libyens est inquiétante. La délégation rappelle que en 2016 à Istanbul le Comité a pris la décision d'inscrire les sites libyens. Mais cette décision a été prise par le Comité sans que ni le Secrétariat ni les organes consultatifs ne la propose. Cela veut dire que le Comité a joué un rôle important en tant que prise de décision, et heureusement car la situation des sites est vraiment inquiétante.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** requested the World Heritage Centre to advise the Committee on the extent to which the UN Security Council Resolution 2347 on the protection of heritage in conflict could be used to support the situations in both Iraq and now Libya.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to respond to the question.

Mr Lazare Eloundou Assomo, the Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre recalled that UN Security Council Resolution 2347 was adopted in March 2017, which was historic in that it allowed Member States to follow the protection of cultural heritage affected by conflict. Mr Assomo further recalled that the Director-General in 9 June [2017] sent a letter

to all Member States requesting information on how some of the points in the Resolution were being implemented by Member States. It was hoped that the replies would be submitted by the end of August [2017] as the World Heritage Centre intended to prepare and submit a report to the Executive Office of the United Nations Secretary-General by the end of September. The Secretary-General would then present the report on the implementation of the UN Resolution Council to the Security Council by November [2017]. This would serve as an important monitoring tool, and it was hoped that it would also continue to alert and build awareness on the importance of protecting all World Heritage sites.

Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libya)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11641)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.37](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11641)

Ms Nada Al-Hassan rapporte sur l'état de conservation du site archéologique de Cyrène en Libye. L'État partie a fourni un rapport sur l'état de conservation selon lequel des travaux de clôture des zones archéologiques ont été lancés pour protéger des empiètements importants survenus depuis le début du conflit. Un contrôle accru de l'empiètement urbain a été mis en place sur le plan juridique et administratif et un accord local prévoit la destruction des constructions illégales. Cependant, un rapport intérimaire de l'UNOSAT établi à partir de comparaison d'images en 2012 et 2016 fait état de 1 839 constructions nouvelles au sein du bien et dans ses alentours. Cyrène souffre également d'un problème d'évacuation des eaux usées, un grand problème qui cause la dégradation de ses vestiges archéologiques et en l'absence de carte indiquant clairement les limites du bien et les limites de sa zone tampon, il est très difficile de contrôler l'empiètement urbain avec les outils juridiques. Malgré le fait qu'il y ait un conflit en Libye et une grande absence de moyens, le travail effectué par les autorités locales et par la société et leur mobilisation sont remarquables. Il s'agit de travaux et d'initiatives liés à la restructuration administrative, à l'engagement de la direction des antiquités, de la société civile, de la police, des universités, des scouts, des écoles pour des activités de sensibilisation, de nettoyage, de restauration et de formation. L'empiètement urbain, les logements illégaux, la destruction intentionnelle et les risques d'incendie constituent les principales menaces pour Cyrène. Le Département des antiquités libyennes, qui n'a pas pu venir à ce Comité, considère que leurs efforts sont insuffisants et lance un appel au Comité et à la communauté internationale pour leurs soutiens technique et financier substantiels.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The **Delegation of Libya** thanked UNESCO and ICOMOS for the support given to Libya to protect and conserve its cultural heritage during the ongoing political crisis, wishing that it redouble its efforts in the future to help Libya, notwithstanding the resource constraints. Libya's archaeological heritage is truly spectacular, yet protecting built heritage is a complicated task, rendered even more difficult by the ongoing civil war that has engulfed the country since 2011. Libya's cultural resources were under immense strain, both before and during the current crisis. The Libyan Department of Antiquities had been weakened by the current crisis owing to the lack of security and the widespread use of arms. The ongoing conflict among rival groups seeking to occupy territory also had a negative effect on heritage. The heritage institutions were struggling to cope to protect its vast heritage and needed to improve capacity-building and technical resources. The delegation asked how UNESCO could respond to the need of World Heritage sites on the Danger List, as these sites deserved a protection plan so they could be sustained over time. Libya requested a risk assessment advisory mission to be undertaken so as to guide a decision-making framework. In the meantime, the Department of Antiquities requested help in defining and mapping the

buffer zones, which should be given priority and could not wait. Libya was in desperate need of technical assistance to deal with the corrective measures identified by the World Heritage Centre. In the longer term, the goal would be to develop an institutional approach to define a collaborative strategy together with the local authorities. The delegation was aware of the security concerns, but there were international Libyan experts who were willing to work under these conditions in Libya, and action was needed soon as any delay would only complicate the situation.

The **Chairperson** took note of the request.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.37 adopted to retain Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libya) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.36](#)

The **Chairperson** indicated that under the state of conservation report of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) a Draft decision 41 COM 7A.36 had been proposed by Kuwait, Lebanon and Tunisia.

La **Délégation du Liban** demande un vote par appel nominal sur ce texte.

Les **Délégations du Koweït, Tunisie, Cuba et la Croatie** soutiennent la proposition du Liban.

The Secretariat explained that the voting procedure concerned Rule 40 called ‘Show of hands’ voting. A vote by roll call would also be taken if requested by not less than two Members before voting takes place. In addition, Rule 39 on ‘Counting of votes’ stated ‘For the purpose of the present Rules, the expression “States Members present and voting” shall mean States members casting an affirmative or negative vote. States Members abstaining from voting shall be regarded as not voting’. It was also noted that decisions covered by the provisions of the Convention shall be taken by a majority of two-thirds of its Members present and voting.

La **Délégation du Liban** demande si, pour ce type de vote, il ne faut pas juste une majorité simple plutôt qu’une majorité de deux-tiers, et demande une clarification sur ce point.

The Secretariat explained that this was a matter covered by the provisions of the Convention as it was related to the state of conservation and the retention [of a site] on the List of World Heritage in Danger, which had been confirmed by Legal Affairs. She recalled a vote on the same World Heritage property at the Committee’s 40th session, which was taken with a qualified two-thirds majority in accordance with Rule 37.

The **Delegation of Cuba** asked that the terms and object of the vote be made very clear to the Committee Members.

[Voting procedure takes place]

The Secretariat noted that the question [of the vote] was projected onto the screen and reads as follows *Are you in favour of draft Decision 41 COM 7A.36 on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan)*, and the roll call began.

The **Chairperson** announced the results²:

- Required majority: 9
- 21 Committee Members present
- 10 Yes – 3 No – 8 Abstentions

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.36 adopted.

The **Delegation of Israel** thanked the countries that stood by against an anti-Israel and anti-Jewish decision whose moral clarity brought honour to their countries. It wished to make known that during the last 24 hours, Holocaust survivors had sent a letter to the Polish Foreign Minister and appealed to the Israeli press, expressing their feelings and dismay at the UNESCO resolution. The delegation spoke of the nearby largest mass grave of the Jewish people as the deepest, darkest wave of humanity, adding that sights, sounds and smells of the German Nazi Auschwitz-Birkenau were not confined to the camp's electrified fences. A month ago, the delegation had approached the Arab delegations through one of their ambassadors requesting sensitivity with regard to the present location, and to desist from tabling the anti-Jewish resolution concerning Jerusalem. It was explained that this would help build positive relations, but sadly two such anti-Israeli resolutions had been brought [to the Committee]. As representative of the Jewish State and to commemorate the Holocaust, the delegation requested that the Committee stand for one minute of silence in solemn memory of the six million Jews killed by the Nazis.

[One minute of silence]

The **Delegation of Israel** suggested that the Arab countries and their partners visit the Nazi German camp at Auschwitz-Birkenau, adding that the Nazis did not succeed in separating the Jewish people from its eternal capital, Jerusalem, which is mentioned in prayers and the famous phrase, 'Next year in Jerusalem'. Since 1967, Jerusalem is open to anyone whether Muslim, Christian or Jewish. The Delegation mentioned that Israel is building Jerusalem. The delegation concluded that the Committee would not succeed in denying the Holocaust or destroying Israel or Jewish history, and no politicized UNESCO decision would succeed in separating Jerusalem and the Jewish nation nor rewrite its history in Jerusalem.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that only the Chairperson could ask for a minute of silence, and it was thus an incorrect interpretation of that decision, adding that the Committee did not take any decision concerning measures against Israel nor against the Jewish people and that this was turning the meeting into a politicized circus. The delegation requested a minute of silence for the Palestinians who have died in the region.

[One minute of silence]

The **Delegation of Jordan** expressed its thanks and appreciation to the Members of the Committee for adopting the decision on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls, adding that Jordan represents the voice of balance, moderation, peace and wisdom in the Middle East and had sought to adopt this decision by consensus and not a vote. However, it was successfully adopted by a majority vote which confirms its legitimacy, the justice of its cause, and the importance of the Holy City of Jerusalem, not only to the followers of the three monotheistic religions, but also to humanity as a whole. This decision based on credible, legal and scientific language and supported by facts on the ground aimed to preserve the historical and legal status of Jerusalem that prevailed before the Israeli occupation of the Holy City in 1969. It was recalled that the site had been inscribed on the World Heritage List at the request of Jordan in 1981, and was on the List of World Heritage in Danger since

² In favour of the draft decision: Azerbaijan, Cuba, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Tunisia, Turkey, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

Abstentions: Angola, Croatia, Finland, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea and United Republic of Tanzania.

Not in favour of the draft decision: Jamaica, Philippines, Burkina Faso.

1982. In this regard, the delegation reaffirmed that al-Qudsi al-Sharif and its Islamic and Christian holy places were among the first priorities of His Majesty King Abdullah II in his capacity as custodian of the holy sites in Jerusalem.

La **Délégation de la Palestine** remercie les États membres qui ont voté en faveur de la résolution de Jérusalem. Le délégué commence par préciser qu'il s'est levé pour la minute de silence en respect aux victimes du nazisme et insiste sur le fait que les victimes sont toutes humaines et doivent être reconnues avec le respect qui leur aient dû sans considération de nationalité, de religion ou de couleur de peau. Le délégué note que, du fait que le délégué Israélien est resté assis, ce dernier n'a pas respecté l'hommage aux victimes à travers le respect de la justice, parce qu'une justice est appliquée aux uns mais pas aux autres. L'héritage de la barbarie nazie devrait être un devoir de clairvoyance et de surveillance de toutes les injustices et un respect profond de la liberté. La délégation insiste sur la politisation des différents Comités qui est effectué plus explicitement par certains membres du Comité. Finalement, la Palestine met en garde contre le mélange dans le discours entre une occupation d'une part et les victimes de la barbarie nazi d'autre part.

Explaining its vote, the **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that despite voting against the decision it wished to reiterate its support for peace and constructive dialogue between all parties in the Middle East based on a two-State solution with Israel and Palestine living side-by-side in peace based on the relevant UN Security Council resolutions. The delegation reaffirmed its commitment to engage in good faith for the protection of cultural heritage in the region.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** explained that as a country with many important historical sites, it was fully aware of the importance of the conservation of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls for the world, and especially for the three monotheistic religions. In this regard, Indonesia extended its appreciation to all stakeholders for their tireless efforts to protect the integrity of their properties. It also stressed that sustainable conservation of a property could only be achieved through the cooperation of all States Parties in the region. In this light, Indonesia urged the State Party, the Advisory Bodies and other relevant stakeholders to implement the decision by the Committee in accordance with UNESCO's World Heritage Convention. Regarding the decision on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls proposed to the Committee, Indonesia shared the view that the Reactive Monitoring Mission was urgently needed to provide objective information with respect to the threats and conditions of the property. It believed that UNESCO's Reactive Monitoring Mission would be able to determine the actual needs to conserve the property. Indonesia reaffirmed its commitment to actively contribute in its capacity as a Member of the Committee in the protection of all the world's World Heritage sites. It also reiterated its view that political issues are beyond the mandate of the Committee. In this regard, the Committee should concentrate its efforts based on factual conditions and needs, and make decisions based on objective recommendations by the Advisory Bodies, and hence why it supported the decision.

The **Delegation of the United States of America** remarked, as stated in the past, that these politicized and one-sided resolutions were damaging to the credibility of UNESCO and greatly hindered the important work that the Committee undertakes to safeguard and preserve the world's diverse World Heritage. Given the urgent challenges, the Member States of UNESCO need to focus on the core priorities, such as preserving cultural and natural heritage, and in doing so respect the interests and history of all peoples. These politicized resolutions do not further the mandate and standing of UNESCO, and in fact hinder and obstruct progress in the region.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to announce the evening's side events.

Ms Petya Totcherova announced that there were three side events organized by different States Parties, as well as an event on guidance on post-traumatic recovery in reconstruction for World Heritage properties organized by ICOMOS.

[Close of afternoon session]

THIRD DAY – Wednesday 5 July 2017

FIFTH SESSION

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Vice-Chairperson: Mr Byong Hyun Lee (Republic of Korea)

ITEM 7A: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER [Continuation.]

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited Ms Nada Al-Hassan to present the cultural properties from the Arab States that were *open to discussion*.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Archaeological Site of Sabratha (Libya)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.39](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan rapporte sur l'état de conservation du site de Sabratha en Libye. L'État partie n'a pas fourni de rapport sur l'état de conservation du site comme demandé à la 40^e session du Comité. Aucune information récente sur l'état de conservation du bien n'est disponible à part le rapport d'activité de l'UNOSAT, sachant que le site de Sabratha est occupé par les groupes extrémistes armés. Le rapport intérimaire de l'UNOSAT de décembre 2016 fait état de 620 nouvelles constructions aux abords du site de Sabratha entre 2012 et 2016. L'absence d'une carte officielle indiquant clairement les limites du site et celles de sa zone tampon empêche de contrôler ces empiètements. Le projet de décision souligne la nécessité d'un engagement majeur de la communauté internationale dans la protection de ce bien.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that it had given a general overview of the Libyan properties and would not provide a statement on each.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** rapproche la situation en Libye de celle en Syrie. La Tunisie propose, comme il a été fait pour la Syrie à travers le point 50, de prévoir une décision générale pour tous les sites affectés par les conflits armés en Libye.

Ms Nada Al-Hassan assure qu'il est possible, comme c'est déjà le cas pour la Syrie et la RDC, de faire une décision générale qui regroupe les activités et les informations transversales à la situation libyenne en général.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** suggested that a draft be proposed and shared with the Committee, which would also need to be translated.

Ms Nada Al-Hassan demande si la Tunisie comptait proposer cette décision pour ce Comité ou pour le prochain.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** avait prévue de proposer cette décision pour le prochaine Comité.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.39 adopted to retain the Archaeological Site of Sabratha (Libya) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna (Libya)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.38](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan présente le site archéologique de Leptis Magna. L'État partie n'a pas fourni de rapport sur l'état de conservation de Leptis Magna comme demandé par le Comité à sa 40^e session à cause de la situation du pays. Aucune information récente sur l'état de conservation du bien n'est disponible à part, comme pour le site de Sabratha, le rapport de l'UNOSAT sur les images satellites prises en décembre 2016 et qui font une comparaison en 2011 et 2016 en trouvant 580 nouvelles constructions aux abords de Leptis Magna. L'absence d'une carte indiquant clairement les limites du bien et celles de sa zone tampon empêche de protéger le bien de ses empiètements. C'est le cas de tous les sites libyens. D'autres sources, dont un reportage TV, font état d'initiatives par la société civile pour protéger le bien d'attaques intentionnelles grâce à un système de rondes civiles armées et œuvrent à sensibiliser les communautés locales à la valeur de ce site archéologique. Le projet de décision souligne la nécessité d'un engagement majeur de la communauté internationale dans la protection de ce bien.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.38 adopted to retain the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna (Libya) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Ancient City of Aleppo (Syrian Arab Republic)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.44](#)

Ms Nada Al-Hassan rappelle que le conflit armé en Syrie a commencé en 2011 et qu'il a engendré de grandes souffrances humaines et de nombreux dégâts sur le patrimoine culturel. Le rapport relatif à l'ensemble des biens syriens est présenté après la revue des six biens syriens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. L'état de conservation de l'ancienne ville d'Alep a subi, jusqu'en décembre 2016, des dégâts et destructions d'une vaste étendue et aux conséquences d'une extrême gravité qui affectent lourdement les populations et leur patrimoine culturel. Le centre historique d'Alep se trouve aujourd'hui à l'image de ce que furent Berlin ou Varsovie à la fin de la Deuxième guerre mondiale. Cependant, les combats se sont arrêtés en décembre 2016 et la réhabilitation de la ville a commencé. Le document devant vous énumère les nouveaux dégâts survenus depuis la 40^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Une courte mission de l'UNESCO en janvier 2017 a fait un point sur l'ampleur des dégâts sur la partie accessible du centre historique et a convenu avec les autorités locales et la Direction générale des antiquités et des musées de Syrie de certaines mesures d'urgence pour le bien, comme la mise en sécurité et la consolidation des bâtiments historiques, ainsi que le traitement des débris. Suite à cette mission, l'UNESCO a dépêché deux professionnels nationaux pour coordonner les activités culture et éducation. En mars 2017, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a organisé une réunion technique de coordination à Beyrouth portant sur Alep à laquelle ont pris part les représentants de sept institutions syriennes, six entités internationales ayant travaillé à Alep.

La cinquantaine de participants ont reconnu l'urgence de mettre en place un système de coordination et de coopération, ont souligné le rôle crucial de l'UNESCO en matière de coordination internationale et ont convenu de la nécessité d'une planification stratégique intégrée et participative pour la ville d'Alep et d'actions prioritaires en lien avec les besoins de première nécessité de la population et leur sécurité, notamment en termes de stabilité structurelle. Malgré cela, il n'a pas été aisé d'établir des mécanismes de coordination et de planification à la hauteur de la tâche colossale que représentent la réhabilitation et la revitalisation d'Alep. Cette coordination est nécessaire aux niveaux national, international et interagences au niveau de l'ONU. De nouvelles informations relatent de l'étendue des dégâts souterrains. La ville présente des problèmes structurels de taille qui nécessite un plan urgent de gestion des risques. Il semble que la ville soit libre de mines anti-personnelles à l'exception du fossé entourant la Citadelle qu'il sera nécessaire de déminer. Environ 2 000 habitants ont réintégré la Vieille Ville depuis l'arrêt des. Une multiplicité d'acteurs privés et institutionnels initie des interventions ad hoc et la situation actuelle empêche la Direction générale des antiquités et des musées de jouer son rôle de contrôle de qualité. Les demandes de permis de restauration sont délivrées dans la journée mais aucun accompagnement ni contrôle de sécurité ou de qualité n'est mis en place. En l'absence de planification de systèmes de coordination et de contrôle de qualité, les travaux en cours sont très préoccupants. La complexité et la restauration de la revitalisation d'Alep est sans mesure et prendra des décennies. Les ouvriers et les matériaux traditionnels tels que le bois manque. Les architectes et ingénieurs possèdent les compétences requises mais sont sous une grande pression de travail. Il est urgent de mobiliser dès aujourd'hui tous les efforts et toutes les ressources disponibles pour faire face à la question de la sécurité des habitants à travers la gestion des risques et des travaux de stabilisation similaires à des travaux post-séismes et de développer en parallèle une stratégie holistique et intégrée pour la ville d'Alep au niveau de toute l'agglomération suivant la recommandation sur les paysages urbains historiques. Cette approche devrait prendre en compte des facteurs urbains, sociaux, économiques, juridiques, financiers, techniques mais aussi historiques, archéologiques, déontologiques et symboliques. Il conviendra aussi de développer des mécanismes opérationnels à la hauteur de l'urgence humanitaire et de la rapidité avec laquelle la vie reprend à Alep. C'est à la lumière de ces nouvelles données préoccupantes que le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives proposent une révision de la décision.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that that State of conservation report in 2016 noted that it was impossible for the State Party to fully assess the scope of damage to this property. In 2017, after having taken back control of the city in December 2016, the State Party was able to provide detailed information on the alarming extent of damage of Aleppo with whole sectors of the city completely destroyed and up to 70 per cent still inaccessible due to mines. Although it was reported that 50 historic buildings had been damaged, more than 3,000 individual structures had also been damaged or destroyed. In one sense, the task of repairing the damaged monuments was manageable and the rebuilding of the minaret was being given priority as a symbolic action. However, if Aleppo is to emerge as a dynamic and coherent city with links to its past then the recovery of the property needed to be multidimensional encompassing immediate, long-term actions and be coordinated and motivated by the needs and aspirations of its inhabitants drawn together into an overarching strategy. Although these thoughts were well articulated in the Beirut Technical Coordination Meeting held in March [2017], such coordination was not yet happening and a strategic approach was apparently not yet in place. Meanwhile the 2,000 people who have returned were being given construction permits to build. Time was running short for a strategic and coordinated approach to be put in place, and without the possibility to gather evidence or to undertake what was left for proper structural and archaeological assessments, the opportunity to rebuild the city in a way that reflected its past may be lost. If Aleppo is to be reborn as a major cultural city, the framework for its revival needed to be drawn out as soon as possible.

The **Representative of ICCROM** deplored the destruction of the cultural heritage, and indeed, the very fabric of the city of Aleppo. The complexity of problems faced in Aleppo was enormous and there was a need for the development of an overall, methodological framework for the recovery effort. As a World Heritage site, the OUV must be safeguarded, but it must be considered as part of a larger number of issues, such as structural stability, use of materials and construction techniques, and the long-term needs of the population. All these issues must be balanced with much needed humanitarian action and the desire of the city's residents to begin rebuilding their buildings and lives as soon as it is safe and possible to do so. ICCROM therefore suggested a strategic and integrated approach rather than an ad hoc building-by-building approach. This must be based on necessary documentation and be supported by dialogue with national and local government and the local community to ensure that this complex situation could be resolved in a positive way for all stakeholders and for the benefit of Aleppo's important heritage. ICCROM also underlined the need for short-term support for risk management, damage assessment, first aid and stabilization of the heritage, especially given the news reported by UNESCO on the damage caused by some underground explosions. Long-term support for recovery efforts, including capacity-building, must be supported by the international community, including working with affected communities and professionals on restoration techniques, urban conservation issues, and working with traditional or construction techniques. ICCROM offered its continued collaboration with the State Party in ongoing capacity-building activities in the country and at this site.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Portugal** wished to address the Syrian sites as a whole, as it was very difficult to separate the tragic situation from one site to another, and an integrated approach was needed. [In French] **La Délégation** se rappella du début du conflit en Syrie en 2011 lorsque le Conseil de sécurité a essayé de mettre fin à la tuerie et à la souffrance dans ce pays. À ce moment là les morts se comptaient par dizaines, puis par centaines et très vite par milliers ; aujourd'hui, les victimes se comptent par centaines de milliers, des millions de réfugiés et de personnes déplacées, un pays détruit et une société ravagée. Incontournablement, les biens qui témoignent de l'extraordinaire richesse historique et culturelle de ce pays ont aussi connu les ravages, la destruction et le pillage. Dans certains cas la reconstruction et la récupération du patrimoine mondial syrien s'avère pratiquement impossible. Comme l'a souligné l'ICOMOS rétablir le patrimoine sera un travail herculien. Une fois que les conditions le permettent, la communauté internationale doit se mobiliser pour répondre à cette responsabilité historique. Un mot d'appréciation est donné aux efforts des autorités syriennes et à ceux de la Direction générale des antiquités et des musées pour la protection et conservation du patrimoine mondial en Syrie. Le Portugal soutient tous les efforts politiques qui visent à ramener la paix et les dialogues en Syrie afin de mettre fin cette catastrophe et de permettre la reconstruction du pays, le retour des réfugiés et des déplacés et l'édification d'une société basée sur le respect des libertés individuelles, le pluralisme culturel et religieux, la justice et les droits de l'homme. Le Portugal tient également à appuyer sans réserve les efforts du Représentant spécial du Secrétaire général des Nations Unies, Staffan de Mistura, et salue sa détermination. La délégation se réjouit de l'adoption par le Conseil de sécurité de la Résolution 2347 en mars dernier et son rôle pionnier concernant la protection du patrimoine. L'adoption de la Résolution 2199 en février 2015 a marqué un tournant dans l'articulation du Conseil de sécurité et de l'UNESCO, et a inscrit le lien étroit qui existe entre culture et sécurité globale. Cela rappelle que le système multilatéral, et les Nations Unies en particulier, reste les meilleurs garants de la paix et de la stabilité internationale malgré les attaques dont le multilatéralisme fait l'objet. Alep, Bosra, le Krak des Chevaliers, Damas, Palmyre témoignent du pire chez l'homme : le génie créateur, d'un côté, et l'arme destructrice et la haine, de l'autre, de plus la récupération et la sauvegarde de ce patrimoine unique ne sera pas possible sans la paix et le dialogue. Le Portugal rappelle que la tâche prioritaire est de travailler pour parvenir à la paix en Syrie tout

en l'établissement un vrai dialogue au sein de ça société et en veillant à ce que de nouvelles destructions du patrimoine mondial n'aient pas lieu.

The **Delegation of Poland** aligned with the comments made by Portugal and expressed its solidarity and compassion with the people of Aleppo and all the sites and cities damaged due to armed conflict. It was profoundly touched having itself witnessed the ruins of war in towns and cities in Poland. For this reason a general approach on conservation and rehabilitation was needed, and perhaps it would be useful to share the experiences of conservators from all over the world, as discussed in Warsaw and Krakow so successfully during the World Heritage Young Professionals Forum whose declaration spoke of adopting rehabilitation and reconstruction measures and other achievements of modern science.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted that despite all efforts, the conflict in Syria continued to have devastating impacts on World Heritage properties in the country. It deplored all the deliberate attacks to destroy the country's unique and cultural heritage and it welcomed UNESCO's efforts to assist the State Party in its continuous and succinct efforts to safeguard its cultural heritage. It underlined in particular UNESCO's leadership in raising awareness among the international community, particularly through the [#Unite4Heritage](#) campaign. The delegation spoke of the revised roadmap concerning Syria's tangible and intangible heritage, and the methods to coordinate ongoing initiatives on documentation, damage assessment and capacity-building efforts, adding that the international community should mobilize its resources to focus on future emergency long-term recovery and protection plans. It also welcomed the appointments of two National Officers by UNESCO, one for culture and one for education, which it believed would help ensure coordination with local and national authorities for the implementation of activities in the recovery of the properties. As an international community, all effective measures should be taken to fight against the illicit trafficking of cultural objects in line with the UN Security Council Resolutions 2199 and 2347. In this respect, Turkey's remained committed to continue its support of all international efforts to safeguard Syria's cultural heritage.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** also wished to deliver a general statement and joined the international community in deploring the continuing armed conflict in Syria and its devastating effects, both to its people and to its six World Heritage sites. The delegation commended the Heritage conservation professionals and the local communities in their efforts and commitment to protecting these properties, especially given the extremely difficult and dangerous conditions. It also wished to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their continued support of the State Party in the identification of the necessary corrective measures and the development of the sites' state of conservation for the removal of the properties from the Danger List as soon as the situation allowed. For the ancient city of Aleppo, the Philippines echoed the Committee's call for the State Party to carry out an appropriate recovery plan and establish detailed studies on optimal approaches prior to undertaking any restoration work on the property. The delegation appreciated Poland's appeal to the international community to come together in mutual support for the rehabilitation and heritage conservation of the Ancient City of Aleppo. For the site of Palmyra, the Philippines appreciated the State Party's efforts to protect documents and repair the Palmyra Museum's collections, and it encouraged the State Party to continue doing so in close coordination with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies. Lastly, the Philippines called upon all UNESCO Member States to cooperate in fighting the illicit trafficking of cultural heritage coming from Syria as per UN Security Council Resolution 2199, as well as protecting cultural heritage sites during armed conflict as per Security Council Resolution 2347.

La **Délégation du Liban** salue les efforts de l'UNESCO en faveur de la Syrie. Elle rappelle qu'elle héberge plus du quart de sa population en réfugiés syriens et reconnaît l'aide donnée par La Directrice générale, Mme Bokova et le Bureau régional de l'UNESCO à Beyrouth. Même si pour le Liban le défi principal est celui de l'éducation, où plus de 300 000 élèves syriens partagent les salles de classe avec les élèves libanais, elle n'hésite pas à rappeler

que le problème du patrimoine syrien est à l'avant-garde de ses préoccupations. Les autorités libanaises, avec le concours du Centre du patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO, endiguent efficacement tout trafic de biens et s'apprêtent à coopérer avec l'UNESCO et les parties concernées pour participer à la réhabilitation de ce patrimoine précieux.

La **Délégation du Koweït** remercie le Comité, le Centre du patrimoine mondial, et l'ICCROM pour leur travail dans les régions arabes. Elle rappelle que la Syrie se trouve dans des zones où les groupes terroristes, tels que Daech, ont détruit le patrimoine culturel. Cela incite l'inclusion dans la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril de l'ancienne ville d'Alep et les vieilles villes de Bosra, le vieux Damas et le Vieux fort Qal'at Salah El-Din, al-Ayyûbî et le vieux village détruit dans le nord de la Syrie. En raison de l'instabilité de la situation économique en Syrie et de la destruction massive infligée à ces sites, le Koweït recommande de garder le site mentionné sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted a number of amendments from the Secretariat. Paragraphs 1–5 remained unchanged. Paragraph 6 was deleted, and a new paragraph 6 was proposed, which would read, 'Also expresses its deep concern about the instability of buildings within the property and urges the State Party to undertake a detailed risk assessment and emergency consolidation works for the concerned structure in order to guarantee the safety of the inhabitants'. Paragraph 7 was also modified, which read, 'Encourages the State Party to implement the actions agreed upon at the technical coordination meeting organized by UNESCO in March 2017, and also urges the State Party to allow sufficient time for the development of an integrated strategic plan for the rehabilitation and revitalization of the property in its broader urban context, in line with the Recommendation on the Historical Urban Landscape (UNESCO,2011)'. The last part of paragraph 7 would read, 'and in this regard, underlines the need for UNESCO to ensure its coordinating role'. Paragraph 8 was also modified, which would read, 'Also asks the State Party to continue its efforts in documenting and assessing damages since December 2016 despite the extremely difficult situation'. Paragraph 9 was edited in some parts, the first part would read, 'Further expresses its concern that rehabilitation and restoration works are taking place within the property without quality control and recalls to the State Party that before any works are undertaken in the property, detailed studies and extensive field work are required, and also discussions on defining optimal approaches including considerations that go beyond technical issues, and requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for consideration by the Advisory Bodies, any planned projects within and around the property prior to the implementation, in accordance with Article 172 of the Operational Guidelines'. Original paragraph 9 would now become paragraph 10, which remained unchanged. Paragraphs 11–13 also remained unchanged, apart from re-numbering.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

Noting the extensive changes, the **Delegation of Zimbabwe** wished to know what had occurred from the time of the draft decision to this new information, especially the part in paragraph 6, concerning the mobilized recovery of Aleppo by the State Party, which had been deleted.

The **Vice-Chairperson** found the question relevant, inviting the Secretariat to respond.

Ms Nada Al-Hassan explained that the information came from the conservation expert who had worked in Aleppo for 30 years and had undertaken many conservation projects and knew the city very well. His expertise was in addition to UNESCO's visit. The expert thus drew UNESCO's attention to the stability risks of the buildings that were endangering the safety of the inhabitants, and he compared these to post-seismic risks. In addition, the issue of ad hoc restoration had come from several sources, including from the State Party that wrote to UNESCO asking for support in restoring certain buildings. UNESCO then reminded the State Party about risk management and the need to define priorities, and why strategic

planning was important. The decision had thus been discussed and agreed upon with the Advisory Bodies so as to reflect these grave concerns, especially with regard to the safety of the inhabitants, while calling for a strategic approach to Aleppo rather than ad hoc decision-making that would drastically and quickly transform the city without due consideration of its importance. Regarding paragraph 6, Ms Al-Hassan explained that the paragraph had not been deleted but integrated into the new paragraph 8, which instead of ‘Notes’ had become ‘Encourages the State Party to consider [...]’.

The **Delegation of Portugal** could agree with the [revised] decision, but it also had the same number of questions as Zimbabwe. It thanked the Secretariat for the clarification but wondered how the decision could change so radically in 24 hours even if it was for the best. With regard to paragraph 6, the delegation felt that it was important to have some note of encouragement in these decisions vis-à-vis the people who work in extremely difficult conditions. It noted the original paragraph 6, which read ‘Notes the efforts mobilized by the State Party for the recovery of Aleppo since December [...]’, while the new replacement paragraph 8 read, ‘Also encourages the State Party to continue its efforts in documenting and assessing damages’, which it considered quite different. The delegation proposed, ‘Notes the efforts mobilized by the State Party for the recovery of Aleppo since December 2016, and also encourages the State Party to continue [...]’. It agreed with the draft decision but that some of its important elements should not be discarded.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** aligned with the remarks by Zimbabwe and Portugal, adding that paragraph 6 [the new paragraph 8] should take into account and encourage the efforts mobilized by the State Party, and it thus endorsed the proposal by Portugal.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** rejoint les propos et l’analyse présentés par Portugal sur la proposition de supprimer l’ancien point 6 alors que celle-ci avait l’intention faire une proposition sur le point 8. La proposition portugaise joint les deux idées : à la fois d’appuyer les efforts de l’État partie dans un contexte extrêmement difficile et l’encourager à poursuivre ses efforts en matière de documentation. La version du nouveau point 7 convient à la délégation.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** noted that ‘since december 2016’ was repeated in the new paragraph 7, and suggested keeping it paragraph 7 and deleting it in paragraph 8.

The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and with no comments or objections, paragraphs 1–14 were pronounced adopted.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.44 adopted as amended to retain the Ancient City of Aleppo (Syrian Arab Republic) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic)

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/8B.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.45](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan présente le rapport sur l’état de conservation de l’ancienne ville de Bosra en Syrie. Les accords conclus entre les parties prenantes ont été respectés dans cette dernière année. Cela a permis d’éviter de nouveaux dégâts et a rendu possible la poursuite du travail entrepris par le Service des antiquités basé à Bosra. Il importe de saluer tout dialogue avec, et entre les communautés locales et la mobilisation de ces dernières pour la sauvegarde du bien et sa protection, malgré les difficultés inhérentes au contexte sécuritaire et politique.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** had no comments to add.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The **Vice-Chairperson** declared **Decision 41 COM 7A.45 adopted to retain the Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.46](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan rappelle que l'UNESCO a effectué une mission d'évaluation en Syrie en avril 2016, où elle s'était rendue à Palmyre, mais a pu par la même occasion visiter l'ancienne ville de Damas, où elle a pu constater les dégâts des incendies ont sévi au sein du bien, notamment dans le quartier al-Hasounia en avril 2016, et plus récemment dans le souk al-Hamidiyya et le quartier historique protégé de Sarouja. Dans les sessions précédentes du Comité il a été fait le cas de plusieurs explosions de voitures, notamment dans la Vieille Ville et d'obus qui avaient touché la mosquée des Omeyyades, la Citadelle et d'autres bâtiments. mais Damas reste plus ou moins stable. Le Secrétaire présent les problèmes dans incendies dans ce contexte-là. Suite à ces incendies, la municipalité de la Vieille Ville a procédé rapidement à la sécurisation des quartiers endommagés, à la réhabilitation des infrastructures et à la reconstruction des boutiques dans l'urgence avec, comme priorités, la protection des habitants et la reprise des activités économiques. Malheureusement, les exigences techniques des projets de restauration, selon les standards scientifiques et techniques nécessaires, n'ont pas été respectées. Elle regrette cet état où les travaux ont été effectué sans recherche de documentation historique et travail approfondi de restauration. En règle générale, les matériels traditionnels manquent en Syrie et les restaurations se font avec de nouveaux matériaux selon les techniques de construction traditionnelles. À la demande de la Direction générale des antiquités et des musées de Syrie, en novembre 2016, l'UNESCO a organisé une réunion technique de coordination d'urgence, à Beyrouth, qui a rassemblé des représentants de six institutions syriennes : la mairie de Damas, qui gère la Vieille Ville, la mairie de la Vieille Ville, une ONG locale, et des experts syriens, avec l'objectif de discuter les projets de restauration élaborés et entrepris suite à l'incendie et d'aborder les mesures d'atténuation des risques dans ce quartier en particulier. La Secrétaire rappelle que l'UNESCO et les organisations consultatives, déjà en décembre 2013, suite à l'incendie dans les souks d'Alep, avaient fait un plan de réduction des risques dus aux incendies pour la ville de Damas, par peur que les mêmes problèmes se reproduisent à Damas et ces mesures d'atténuation des risques d'incendie n'ont malheureusement pas été mises en œuvre. Cela est la raison pour laquelle il y a des incendies répétitifs aujourd'hui. Lors de cette réunion technique, les participants ont convenu de la nécessité de développer un plan de gestion intégré et un plan de gestion des risques, bien qu'aucun des deux plans n'ai été commencé. En décembre 2016, un atelier d'assistance technique avec des membres de la Direction des antiquités et des experts de l'UNESCO, se sont penchés sur le projet de restauration du bâtiment prénommé « la Banque ottomane » du XIX^e siècle, le seul qui ai survécu à cet incendie. La révision du projet a été recommandée pour le respect de la conception originale du bâtiment en se basant sur une documentation exhaustive et un diagnostic technique des dommages. Des mesures d'urgence doivent être mises en œuvre pour éviter une dégradation supplémentaire des structures de ce bâtiment et d'autres dans la Vieille Ville. Aujourd'hui, avec le conflit autour de Damas, beaucoup des boutiques stockent leurs affaires inflammables à l'intérieur de la vieille ce qui élève les risques pour le bien.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** recalled that the property had been inscribed as an historic city for its dense urban fabric and for the way its layout reflected multiple layers from Greek and Roman to later Ottoman times. Even before the recent fires, the vulnerability of urban buildings, owing to the lack of traditional maintenance and conservation and the erosion of attributes related to the spread of semi-industrial activities, were of concern and expressed in the approved statement of OUV. This vulnerability was significant due to the damage inflicted from fires that still continue. If traditional practices had been the norm, and an adequate supply of traditional materials and crafts people had been available, then a rapid response to the damage could have been entirely satisfactory. As things stand, the rapid response appeared to use modern materials, and rebuilding work was not being defined as part of an overall recovery plan or strategy. It would thus be unfortunate if the work carried out in response to the trauma and fire reinforced the damage and contributed to the erosion of OUV attributes. ICOMOS underscored the need to shore up and support buildings where possible, adding that ensuring the strict use of traditional techniques and materials in order to prevent further damage and erosion would be hugely important to the urban fabric of the property, even though it appreciated that this approach might take longer.

The **Representative of ICCROM** spoke of the disaster risk management issues, adding that one of the main conservation issues was the significant number of fires that had taken place recently and which called for strategic responses to manage fire risks in the future. These strategic responses should include the identification of the most likely causes of these fires, measures for the mitigation of the identified fire risks where possible, and finally, distribution of the necessary fire equipment and other necessary infrastructure that would allow for a quicker emergency response. It was recognized that the present capacities to carry out actions by the State Party might be reduced, but given the seriousness of this problem it was important for the State Party to try to improve its ability to respond to these emergencies in a more rapid manner. To this end, ICCROM had been supporting some of the participants of its previous disaster-risk management courses in developing small projects to help with the issues related to emergency rapid response, and those projects had been carried out with the support of the Prince Claus Fund. ICCROM added that recovery efforts must be carried out in a strategic and methodologically way prior to approving individual restoration work in reconstruction projects, and it would be useful for the State Party to develop a clear approach to restoration and reconstruction that took into account the OUV of the property, the traditional materials and techniques, and the social and economic aspects of the site.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.46 adopted to retain the Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Ancient villages of Northern Syria (Syrian Arab Republic)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.47](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan présente le rapport de l'État partie qui fait état de difficultés d'accès au site et de dommages affectant certaines de ses composantes, notamment des fouilles illégales, des constructions illégales, la collecte et la destruction de pierres anciennes afin de les réutiliser pour des constructions nouvelles, mais aussi l'occupation de certains sites par les personnes déplacées. Cependant, elle souligne qu'un dialogue a été établi avec certaines composantes des populations locales pour la protection de ce bien en Syrie. Il relate la préoccupation du Comité du patrimoine mondial face à la situation du site et le

manque d'informations détaillées sur les dommages subis. Le site de Saint-Siméon a été notamment utilisé pour des entraînements militaires, donc la préoccupation est grande.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.47 adopted to retain the Ancient Villages of Northern Syria (Syrian Arab Republic) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Crac des chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din (Syrian Arab Republic)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.48](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan présente le rapport qui indique que la Direction générale des antiquités et des musées de Syrie, la DGAM, a poursuivi les travaux de documentation et de modélisation du monument avec divers partenaires dont l'[Iconem](#). L'état du bien et des consolidations d'urgence effectuées en 2014 par l'État partie ont été examinés par les experts de l'UNESCO. Ces travaux de consolidation ont été effectués avec les matériaux disponibles et s'avèrent aujourd'hui inadaptés aux charges qu'ils soutiennent. Donc ce qui était une mesure d'urgence nécessaire il y a trois ans, aujourd'hui devient donc problématique parce que les bâtiments ont besoin d'une restauration pérenne. Le rapport recommande la réalisation de travaux de restauration de petite et moyenne échelles afin d'éviter des dégâts supplémentaires. Quant aux destructions de grande échelle, elle requiert une interprétation historique et des travaux de restauration complexes qui devront être faits au préalable.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** also noted that although the emergency consolidation works had been undertaken there was a need to begin to address the longer term overall conservation stability of this large property. However, in order to move to this wider action, when the security situation allowed, there was a need to carry out a thorough multi-disciplinary investigation into the structural stability of the fortress, as well as detailed documentation in order to identify priorities. The proposed Reactive Monitoring Mission should be the opportunity to consider these issues and how a conservation plan might be developed to frame the conservation challenges of the property, and to consider how these might be developed in a strategic manner.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.48 adopted to retain the Crac des Chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din (Syrian Arab Republic) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.49](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan rappelle que le site de Palmyre a été occupé par des groupes extrémistes armés entre le 11 décembre 2016 et le 2 mars 2017. Pendant cette courte période, le Tétrapyle et des parties de l'avant-scène du théâtre du mur du Prochenium à

Palmyre ont été intentionnellement détruits. L'atelier d'assistance technique organisé à Beyrouth a permis d'assister le personnel de la Direction des antiquités sur les considérations techniques pour le diagnostic des structures, les consolidations d'urgence du portique du temple de Bêl, de l'arc de triomphe, de la Citadelle et du Musée de Palmyre. La Direction des antiquités adhère au principe selon lequel les travaux de restauration devraient se limiter aux interventions de première nécessité en attendant des conditions adéquates d'intervention qui permettraient un examen complet de la situation, en conjonction avec les spécialistes sur Palmyre et la communauté scientifique internationale, sur les modalités d'intervention appropriées. L'État partie a pris des mesures de consolidation d'urgence du portique du portail du temple de Bêl resté debout après la destruction intentionnelle de ce temple. Afin de renforcer la protection du site, l'État partie a soumis au Centre du patrimoine mondial, en un temps record, une demande de modification mineure des limites du bien qui a été examinée et évaluée positivement par l'ICOMOS. Cette modification sera soumise à l'approbation du Comité lors de l'examen du document 8D. Cette demande propose la création d'une zone tampon d'environ 200 kilomètres carrés que le site n'avait pas auparavant, qui aide à la protection de Palmyre. Le projet de décision préconise une approche prudente et graduelle focalisée sur l'évaluation des dégâts, les mesures de consolidation et de protection d'urgence et appelle à la contribution financière de la communauté internationale en faveur de Palmyre.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** welcomed the immediate work undertaken by the State Party to fully record the property, to collect and store valuable fragments, and to undertake immediate and short-term actions, in particular, recording Palmyrah through 3D technology. Unlike Aleppo and Damascus, there was not the same pressing need for urgent action and there was time to consider and develop options for appropriate long-term restoration approaches before interventions are made. ICOMOS therefore believed that the development of a conservation plan, which could articulate and justify the rationale for future interventions, would be highly appropriate and desirable and could perhaps evolve as a model for other archaeological properties.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.49 adopted to retain Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

General Decision on the World Heritage properties of the Syrian Arab Republic

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.50](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan présente le rapport sur la décision générale du Comité sur la république Syrienne. À cause du conflit, et depuis 2011, le conflit a eu des effets dévastateurs sur la population et le patrimoine. L'État partie a fait état des dommages subis par les sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et sur la Liste indicative, particulièrement ceux qui lui était accessibles. Dura-Europos a fait partie d'une coopération effective avec les communautés locales, appréciable pour le suivi et la protection de ces biens. Depuis la session du Comité en 2016, l'UNESCO a organisé une série de réunions que relatées à travers chaque intervention précédente. L'UNESCO continue sa collaboration avec la Direction générale des antiquités et des musées. À travers le bureau de Beyrouth pour la mise en œuvre du projet de sauvegarde d'urgence du patrimoine syrien financé par l'Union européenne, l'Autriche et le Gouvernement flamand de Belgique. Ce projet existe depuis trois ans et demi. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial met également en œuvre un projet, aussi financé par le Gouvernement flamand de Belgique, dédié au site de Palmyre et

qui a permis la préparation des limites du bien de Palmyre. Il est important de signaler qu'en vue de la catastrophe du conflit syrien il est crucial de passer à une échelle d'intervention plus importante, capable d'affronter l'entreprise colossale nécessaire. Cela en référence à ce que la distinguée déléguée de Cuba a évoqué le 4 juillet 2017 concernant la stratégie de l'UNESCO sur les situations de conflit. Il est nécessaire de mobiliser tous les efforts et toutes les ressources humaines et techniques disponibles afin de reconstruire la Syrie dans le cadre d'une stratégie intégrée, globale et holistique, et d'une coordination nationale et internationale concertée, sans lesquelles la phase post-conflit pourrait avoir des effets négatifs sur le patrimoine culturel. Le projet de décision souligne l'appel lancé à la communauté internationale de soutenir la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel syrien par l'intermédiaire du Fonds d'urgence de l'UNESCO pour le patrimoine, et affirme l'encouragement, le soutien et la solidarité du centre UNESCO à Beyrouth avec le peuple syrien et avec les professionnels du patrimoine qui travaillent depuis le début du conflit.

With no comments from ICOMOS or ICCROM, the **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to the Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Liban** souhaite attirer l'attention sur la nécessité d'un mécanisme de coordination efficace entre les interventions sur la réhabilitation de la reconstruction et de la conservation du patrimoine syrien, point déjà soulevé par l'ICOMOS, les organes consultatifs, le colloque tenu en coordination avec l'ICCROM et le Louvre de Lens. Un des problèmes majeur reste le risque que chaque intervention soient différentes en fonction de parties et organes différents, d'États différents, ce qui risquent d'aboutir à des problèmes. Sans coordination certaines actions peuvent s'annuler. Le Liban considère important d'introduire un paragraphe à ce sujet dans le projet de déclaration. La délégation n'a pas eu le temps de soumettre cette proposition au Rapporteur mais désire faire la proposition directement sur l'écran, compte tenu qu'il ne s'agit que de deux paragraphes.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** greatly appreciated the intervention by Lebanon, as it was absolutely crucial to ensure coordination on the ground. The Director explained that UNESCO had already placed staff on the ground in Aleppo to ensure coordination in the city. With regard to the general discussion on the approaches to reconstruction and recovery, as was discussed under item 7, it was noted that Poland was organizing a meeting where all the different aspects would be brought together, including the workshops by ICOMOS and ICCROM in Louvre-Lens and at other events. The Director thus believed that it would be good to report back to the Committee on the approaches in general.

La **Délégation du Liban** propose de garder le point 7 et 8, puis de faire que le point 10 devienne le 9, et inversement 9 devienne 10. Ensuite, le paragraphe 11 qui ajoute « Insiste sur l'importance d'assurer une coordination efficace de tous les efforts en vue de la restauration, la reconstruction et la conservation du patrimoine culturel syrien avec la participation effective de l'UNESCO ». La délégation aurait préférée « sous l'égide de l'UNESCO » mais reconnaît que tout le monde n'accepterait pas cette formulation.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted no comments or objections to the proposal by Lebanon. He then proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–14 were duly adopted.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.50 adopted as amended.

Mme Nada Al-Hassan fait une brève introduction sur la situation générale au Yémen. Elle rappelle que le conflit au Yémen a éclaté en 2015 et a généré une crise humanitaire sans précédent et continue d'avoir des effets dévastateurs sur le peuple yéménite. Le patrimoine unique et précieux du Yémen subit des dégâts irréversibles à cause du conflit et reste sous la menace d'être détruit par le conflit armé. En juillet 2015, l'UNESCO a organisé une réunion d'experts qui a élaboré un plan d'action d'urgence pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel yéménite mais ce plan d'action n'a pu être mis en œuvre car n'ayant pas bénéficié du soutien financier escompté, et compte tenu que l'accès au Yémen est impossible jusqu'à aujourd'hui. L'UNESCO déploie de grands efforts de levée de fonds, notamment pour des

projets alliant conservation du patrimoine et création d'emplois pour les jeunes. Malgré ces difficultés, l'État yéménite a consenti à des efforts louables pour la sensibilisation des populations locales, la formation d'équipes techniques et la mise en œuvre de travaux de conservation d'urgence en coopération à distance avec l'UNESCO, l'ICOMOS et l'ICCROM. Néanmoins, le manque de moyens financiers et la situation sécuritaire instable sont un frein pour les opérations de réhabilitation des bâtiments fortement endommagés et de recouvrement. Comme pour toutes les villes endommagées par les conflits, la réhabilitation nécessite une planification stratégique et intégrée. Cette planification devrait prendre en compte les besoins de première nécessité de la population, leur sécurité ainsi que les facteurs urbains, sociaux, économiques, juridiques, financiers, techniques, historiques et archéologiques en autres. Celle-ci nécessitera, outre des moyens financiers accrus, des études multidisciplinaires approfondis et une consultation large d'expertise nationale et internationale.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted that the the security situation in Yemen, including armed conflict and socio-economic disturbances combined with a lack of organizational support and resources, continued to obstruct effective heritage management and physical conservation works. Nevertheless, there were commendable efforts by the General Organization for the Preservation of Historic Cities in Yemen and the local communities in damage assessment documentation, first-aid intervention, capacity-building, and communication with the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO-Doha Office and the Advisory Bodies. However, substantial additional support was required for the safeguarding of the Yemeni World Heritage properties and their OUV through increased mobilization of the international community to provide greater financial and technical assistance.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Finland** thanked Yemen for its strong commitment in working to preserve its cultural heritage, noting that dialogue had continued with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and the State Party had been able to work with damage assessment documentation, first-aid interventions and capacity-building at the affected sites. However, the bigger issues, such as preparing management plans and implementing the national strategy for the preservation of the historic cities, sites and monuments, were still cause for concern. The delegation hoped that the security situation would soon allow for a Reactive Monitoring Mission to the Yemeni properties to assist with the development of corrective measures for the desired state of conservation for removal of the sites from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

With no further comments, and with the Yemeni delegation not present, the **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to continue with its presentations on the Yemeni sites.

Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.51](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan indique que le conflit armé qui a éclaté en 2015 au Yémen continue de menacer le bien et son patrimoine bâti ainsi que ses habitants pour lesquels il devient de plus en plus difficile de répondre aux besoins de première nécessité. Parmi les dommages au patrimoine bâti, elle relève la destruction d'un centre de recherche agricole situé près de la Vieille Ville qui s'est traduit par des dommages sur les bâtiments historiques dans la ville, à cause de la force de l'explosion. Le rapport indique que malgré les difficultés liées au conflit armé et notamment financières, l'État partie est en mesure de mettre en œuvre certaines initiatives de conservation dont la restauration de la mosquée Al-Asha'ir, l'amélioration des façades des magasins et des passages couverts du souk, l'inspection des activités de construction et la sensibilité au patrimoine des populations locales. L'état partie invite également une mission de suivi réactif du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de

l'ICOMOS afin d'évaluer l'état de conservation du bien, et a indiqué que le soutien international continue d'être essentiel pour la protection de Zabid et pour rendre possible la préparation d'un plan d'urgence pour le bien.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** recalled that the Historic Town of Zabid was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger prior to the current conflict in Yemen and owing to the serious deterioration of its built heritage and urban fabric. The conflict, the economic conditions, and the ongoing disturbances exacerbated this situation and continue to affect both the people and their cultural heritage. ICOMOS acknowledged the continuing commitment of the General Organization for the Preservation of Historic Cities in Yemen to conserve cultural heritage within Zabid despite these challenges, including damage assessment documentation, first-aid interventions, capacity-building and ongoing communication with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It was noted that there had been some incremental progress directed at reversing the decline within the city and better engagement with local communities, but further support was essential. A Reactive Monitoring Mission, when security allowed, was considered a priority as it could offer advice on short-term repair works and the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.51 adopted to retain Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Old City of Sana'a (Yemen)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.52](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan rapporte que le bien continue d'être affecté par le conflit armé et le déclin socioéconomique. En septembre 2016, les quartiers d'Al-Madrasa et Al-Bakiriya ont été endommagés suite aux dommages déjà subis par le quartier d'al-Qâsimi. Ces dommages supplémentaires ont été causés par les vibrations des explosions qui ont eu lieu dans les zones environnantes. Malgré le manque de fonds, l'Organisation générale pour la préservation historique des villes du Yémen, GOPHCY, a terminé la documentation et l'étude technique de la zone al-Qâsimi en coopération avec le Bureau de l'UNESCO à Doha et l'ICOMOS. Les interventions d'urgence n'ont toutefois pas pu être mises en œuvre en raison du manque de financement et d'accès. La stabilité de deux immeubles de ce quartier est préoccupante car ils pourraient s'effondrer à tout moment après les précipitations importantes de l'année précédente. Cependant, le rapport note que les habitants procèdent aujourd'hui à la reconstruction, ou construction, de bâtiments dans le centre historique sans considération pour le statut patrimoine mondial du bien. Cette tendance préoccupante est liée à l'absence de système de contrôle en cette période de conflit. Quatre membres des équipes de GOPHCY et de l'Organisation générale des antiquités et des musées ont participé à un atelier de formation sur la gestion des risques en période de conflit armé organisé par l'ICCROM et le Bureau de l'UNESCO de Doha qui s'est passé à l'extérieur du Yémen. L'État partie indique que le soutien international continue d'être essentiel pour la protection de Sana'a et pour rendre possible la préparation d'un plan d'urgence pour le bien. Ce plan comprendrait le renforcement des capacités, la conservation, la restauration et la construction d'habitats et d'abris pour la population locale.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that the Old City of Sana'a continued to endure socio-economic disturbances and armed conflicts that were affecting both its people and cultural heritage. An analysis of satellite imagery from December 2016 had identified 217

affected structures, of which 33 were destroyed; a major increase compared to similar analysis in 2015. Major infrastructure, including an important water supply and sewerage project, was currently unable to proceed and there was evidence of inappropriate new construction activity. Although the security situation and lack of resources continued to militate against conservation activities, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS supported reconstruction plans to sustain shelter for the inhabitants, and ICOMOS had provided specific technical advice. The recently prepared ICOMOS provisional guidance on post-trauma recovery and reconstruction of World Heritage properties offered further guidance, but additional training and access to expert advice was also essential. A joint Reactive Monitoring Mission undertaken in response to the open invitation from the State Party was also highly desirable, as soon as the security situation allowed.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** congratulated Yemen for its great effort to protect and conserve its World Heritage, and it called upon the international community to collaborate and urgently intervene to prevent the great loss and damage to the sites. It was noted that the situation was shared with other heritage sites in the Arab region, and the delegation urged the Committee to consider inaugurating an international reconstruction project for the Arab region and its heritage sites in areas of conflict, as reconstruction was an international opportunity for knowledge dissemination across generations and cooperation across regions. The responsibility of salvaging the damage imposed on heritage was shared between professionals and local communities, and would be the first step towards narrowing the gap that is the cause of terrorism against heritage and memory. The participation and responsibility of the young generation would assure the stand against the destructive ideologies of our time.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.52 adopted to retain Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.53](#)

Mme Nada Al-Hassan présente le rapport qui indique que le bien est toujours exposé aux dommages dus aux pluies et aux inondations et qu'il est de plus en plus menacé par le conflit armé commencé 2015, où les bâtiments historiques ont été endommagés par des explosions dans les parties sud et ouest de la ville. L'État partie rapporte, que la situation en matière de sécurité et les conditions économiques défavorables sont la cause d'un manque de soutien administratif et de ressources pour les projets de conservation. Malgré ces difficultés, l'Organisation générale pour la préservation des villes historiques du Yémen a mené plusieurs initiatives de conservation comme la formation d'une équipe technique pour évaluer les bâtiments endommagés, la restauration de 10 bâtiments historiques et l'organisation d'un atelier pour la sensibilisation de la population. L'État partie sollicite, par ailleurs, la communauté internationale pour apporter leur soutien financier afin d'établir des plans d'urgence pour Shibam appelée « la Manhattan du désert ».

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted that the Old Walled City of Shibam was subject to flooding in 2013, resulting in significant physical damage and degradation. Add to this the economic conditions and ongoing disturbances, which prevented substantial intervention, and the property was now increasingly threatened and subject to actual damage arising from

armed conflict. ICOMOS acknowledged the continuing commitment of the General Organization for the Preservation of Historic Cities in Yemen to undertake rapid field assessment, conserve cultural heritage, repair damaged buildings, conduct training awareness, and maintain communication with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. A Reactive Monitoring Mission, which could advise on short-term repair works and longer-term strategies, was a priority, as soon as the security situation allowed. Training and access to expert advice was also considered essential.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.53 adopted to retain Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited Ms Nada Al-Hassan to read the list of cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Arab States region for which the reports were proposed for *adoption without discussion*.

ARAB STATES

Ms Nada Al-Hassan presented the cultural properties: Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90), Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) (C 276 rev), Old Town of Ghadamès (Libya) (C 362), Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libya) (C 287), Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem (Palestine) (C 1433), and Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines – Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir (Palestine) (C 1492).

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7A.32, 41 COM 7A.35, 41 COM 7A.40, 41 COM 7A.41, 41 COM 7A.42 and 41 COM 7A.43 adopted.

ASIA-PACIFIC

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Centre, to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Asia-Pacific region that were *open for discussion*.

Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz (Uzbekistan)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.57](#)

The Secretariat noted that before the present session, a debriefing meeting was held with the Uzbek delegation to UNESCO. Mr Jing recalled that in July 2016, the property was put on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to the following threats: i) large-scale urban development projects carried out without informing the Committee or commissioning a necessary Heritage Impact Assessment; ii) the demolition and rebuilding of traditional housing areas in the property; iii) irreversible changes to the original appearance of a large area within the historical centre; iv) significant alteration in the setting of architectural monuments and overall historical town planning, structure and layers; and v) an absence of a

conservation and management plan. The State Party had submitted a State of conservation report in December 2016 and responded to some of the requests by the Committee. At the invitation of the Ministry of Culture and Sports of Uzbekistan, a joint World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission (from 9–12 December 2016) assessed the state of conservation of the property. The mission reviewed in particular the scope, extent and impact of the work carried out within the property, as part of the State programme of complex measures of development and the reconstruction of Shakhrisyabz city (2014–2016), and how this had impacted adversely on the property's OUV. The mission was requested to make a full assessment of the overall threats of the OUV to the property as a result of the work undertaken as part of the redevelopment project. The aim was to understand whether or not comprehensive mitigation measures could be identified in collaboration with key local, national and international stakeholders that might allow for the reversal or mitigation of these threats, or whether the OUV of the property had been so substantially damaged that the entire property could no longer manifest the OUV for which it was inscribed. The negative interventions of the development programme noted by the Reactive Monitoring Mission were summarized in the mission report and also in the present working document.

The Secretariat explained that when work on the redevelopment project was eventually halted, following the Committee request in 2016, the mission could only reach the conclusion that key attributes of the OUV had been damaged to such a degree – for the most part irreversibly – that the OUV could no longer be conveyed. The mission concluded that there did not appear to be any possibility to recover sufficient attributes to justify the OUV that existed at the time of inscription. Nevertheless, although the recovery of sufficient attributes to justify the OUV identified at the time of inscription seem impossible at this stage, it recommended that the Committee invites the State Party to provide further details and documentation to allow assessment of what, if any, parameters could be recovered. On the basis of the documentation requested, an assessment could be made by ICOMOS as to whether there was potential for a re-nomination of the property or a significant boundary modification, including some of the monuments and some of the remaining urban areas, or whether the property had deteriorated to the extent that it had lost the characteristics of its World Heritage status and should therefore, in line with paragraph 192 of the Operational Guidelines, be deleted from the World Heritage List. Moreover, there was a need to reach a solution on the way forward as quickly as possible. The World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM recommended that the Committee make a decision at its 42nd session in 2016.

The Representative of ICOMOS noted that the Reactive Monitoring Mission report concluded that the destruction of the town centre and the lowering of the ground level in order to construct a public park had torn the heart out of the centre of the town. Shakhrisyabz was inscribed for a combination of monumental buildings and tightly clustered urban dwellings within the remains and encircling town wall, all of which was considered at the time of inscription to have survived here in a way that had no parallels in Central Asia in the Islamic world. This was the Timurid city based on much earlier foundations, evidence for which lay within a mound at its centre, near where the two main roads crossed; all of which had been now destroyed. The monumental buildings were disengaged from their urban surroundings, and the Timurid town planning and the integrity of the town had been lost. All the tightly packed vernacular buildings in the oldest part of the town had now gone, and the archaeological layers destroyed. What is left is an ensemble of monuments within a public park. The mission was able to carry out detailed consultation with stakeholders, including representatives of the town's *mahallas* [neighbourhoods]. It also undertook site visits to both the destroyed areas and those remaining, and it inspected material on the project provided by the State Party. The mission report was thus not lacking in ample evidential details. The key findings of the mission were that the attributes of OUV had been damaged to such a degree, and for the most part irreversibly, that the OUV for which the property was inscribed could no longer be conveyed. In the centre of the town, there are no houses or any urban life, just an open park, extending some two kilometres from the Ak-Saray Palace in the north to the Dorus-Saodat Complex in the south, encompassing some 70 hectares within which

there were a few tourist buildings along one side, and beyond the remaining houses and streets cut off by walls and therefore not visible. Large numbers of families were moved out of the town to the surrounding areas as part of the work. Although the mission report concluded that there may not be any possibility to recover attributes to justify OUV, it nevertheless recommended that the State Party be invited to provide further details and documentation to allow an assessment of what could be recovered, or to suggest whether a major boundary modification might be a possibility. On this basis, the Committee could make an assessment at its next session as to whether the property had lost its OUV and should be deleted from the World Heritage List in accordance with paragraph 192, or whether other options might be pursued.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Liban** remarque que cette histoire est véritablement triste mais que la responsabilité n'est pas seulement celle de l'État partie, des personnes ou organismes qui ont décidé les travaux concernant « le programme d'État de mesures complexes pour le développement et la reconstruction de la ville ». Ceux qui ont établi ce plan, qui ont décidé de démolir les maisons traditionnelles, les structures urbaines dans le centre-ville, d'abaisser le niveau du sol, de créer un grand parc urbain avec des monuments au milieu, pensaient qu'ils faisaient bien. Pour eux il s'agissait là de vieux quartiers qu'il fallait enlever pour mettre en valeur les monuments. Le Liban questionne où était le Comité à ce moment-là, comment le système de rapports périodiques n'a pas fonctionné, et comment le système de suivi réactif n'a pas fonctionné. Il demande des clarifications sur les raisons pour lesquelles ce genre de drames puissent arriver sans être rapporté immédiatement. Car le système mis en place par la Convention doit normalement éviter ces types de situations.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that the Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission in March 2016, and confirmed by the mission in December 2016 had reported drastic and irreversible damage. Finland supported the view of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in the draft decision, which included the possible deletion of the property from the World Heritage List in 2018. In light of the current information, it was however alarmed that the Reactive Monitoring Mission introduced the possibility of a significant boundary modification, even though a two kilometre swathe of the old city had been demolished, as well as the destruction of almost the entire historic mahalla districts and the removal of 2–2.5 metres of the archaeological layer from the site. The delegation added that this might give other States Parties an indication that irreversible decisions could be taken and work could commence on major projects, as there was always a possibility to correct the damage with a significant boundary modification. At the other end of the scale, some properties were threatened with danger listing for a few visual impact issues, for which there was still not proper guidance. The delegation concluded that as a Committee Member, who should base decisions on objective and scientific considerations, this imbalance made it very difficult to deal with such different cases.

The **Delegation of Poland** recalled that the Committee requested a Reactive Monitoring Mission in 2016 and the mission report was very clear in its findings. Of course, the site could be retained on the list with justification for a re-nomination and significant boundary modifications, as suggested in the draft decision, but the Committee should keep in mind that such a proposal, whereby part of the property loses its values by a change of the boundaries, would suggest that the problem could be solved. What was more important to some extent was the Committee's original decision on the identification of values and justification at the time of inscription. The delegation recalled that the Committee's role was to encourage, not discourage, State Parties in their efforts to protect their properties of outstanding universal value.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** was deeply concerned by the analysis of the Secretariat and other bodies regarding the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Shakhriyabz, which was inscribed on the Danger List in 2016. The constructive comments

made by Lebanon would certainly guide the Committee in better equipping the system in the future and should be looked into for possible improvements to deal with these extreme cases. Such a large-scale change afflicted on the overall heritage with regard to the material change without any heritage impact assessments or documentation conducted in a deliberate manner should be considered a very serious situation. The delegation strongly requested the State Party to provide the Advisory Bodies and the Committee with the documentation and reports previously requested, including the assessment of changes to the historic district and the current detailed information of the town centre, as well as a master plan of the city. It also believed that there should be careful approaches to the redevelopment project and conservation work, including construction that would compromise the authenticity of the property. The delegation supported the current draft decision.

La **Délégation du Portugal** remarque que le Comité se trouve devant une situation qui est effectivement très triste. Elle regrette l'état du bien et rejoint les remarques faites par la délégation du Liban sur les raisons pour lesquelles cet état d'affaire n'a pas pu être discerné préalablement ; il y a des questions de méthode d'accompagnement, d'interlocution avec les responsables de ces sites. Celles-ci devraient être mises en cause et revues pour empêcher de répéter cette situation dans un futur proche et devrait servir de point de départ pour une réflexion sur les méthodes, les techniques et les manières d'accompagner ces processus qui concernent les biens menacés.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** recalled the Committee's decision in 2016 on the situation with this property, noting that all were concerned with the development with regard to the conservation of the site. However, the State Party had engaged some effort; they had provided the State of conservation report in which it was reported that some efforts were put in place, namely, the works according to the State's programmes were suspended, the special commission to investigate this issue was established, and a Heritage Impact Assessment was provided to the World Heritage Centre, although it was done very late when some reconstruction work had already irreversibly impacted the historical city and its OUV. Thus, the Committee should recognize the efforts and understand the situation of the State Party and their willingness to work and cooperate with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies. The delegation also agreed with Poland's remark to encourage rather than discourage the State Party on this issue. Of course, there were many things that should have been done, and the delegation invited the State Party to comment on the situation and provide more detail than was provided in the state of conservation report.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** regretted the gradual deterioration of not only this special site but also the other World Heritage sites, and it shared Lebanon's concern with regard to this situation. The Committee should also rethink the efficacy and effectiveness of the current system and governance, as well as the reactive approach in the protection of sites.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** invited Uzbekistan to respond to the questions.

The **Delegation of Uzbekistan** informed the Committee that the Government was planning the implementation of several actions based on the recommendations by ICOMOS in all the places of the Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz. The main objective of these measures was to maintain the OUV of the Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz. Measures included essential amendments to the national legislation for the protection of the heritage, creation of the procurement for the protection of the architectural monuments at the Shakhrisyabz Town Municipality, and the utilization of traditional technologies of preservation of urban housing and protected areas in the buffer zone. The Government of Uzbekistan would consider the new management plan for the Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz by the end of 2017, and the monitoring of the heritage preservation [activities] would be carried out in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

La **Délégation du Liban** pense que le Comité a le droit de savoir ce qu'il s'est passé. Elle demande au Secrétariat de présenter un rapport à la prochaine réunion du Comité pour

expliquer pourquoi et comment ce drame a eu lieu sans alerter personne et savoir quelles mesures doit être prises pour éviter ce type de drame à l'avenir.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted the very important questions and legitimate concerns, which would be duly taken into account, not only in the draft decision but by the Secretariat.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

La **Délégation du Liban** demande au Secrétariat de fournir pour la prochaine session un rapport détaillé sur les raisons pour lesquelles le système de rapports périodiques de suivi réactif n'a pas fonctionné.

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to respond.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** took note and agreed that this was indeed a good suggestion and should be added to the draft decision. The Director recalled that there were several processes under this Convention, namely periodic reporting and reactive monitoring, as mentioned by Lebanon, as well as paragraph 172 [of the Operational Guidelines] in which a State Party must inform the Secretariat if it undertakes major projects, which is in fact a very rare occurrence, i.e. very few States Parties actually inform the Secretariat in advance of such major decisions. Generally speaking, more information is received from civil society, NGOs, and so on. With regard to periodic reporting, it was noted that not all information is included in the periodic reports. As the Committee was aware, there was currently a reflection on the process of periodic reporting, concluding in 2017, and which would be discussed in the present session [under agenda item 10A]. Thus, improvements to the processes were ongoing and further improvements could also be made in the process of reactive monitoring. The Director concluded by appealing to States Parties to use paragraph 172 to the extent possible.

The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

La **Délégation du Liban propose** un nouveau paragraphe 13, qui lit : « Demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial de fournir pour la 42^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, un rapport concernant les dysfonctionnements du système de rapports périodiques et de suivi réactif concernant ce bien ».

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Portugal** fully agreed with the suggestion by Lebanon, which addressed this specific property. However, it wondered whether this general concern could also be expressed in the *chapeau* decision in terms of future action on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee that the draft decision 41 COM 7 would stay open until the 11 July when it would be adopted.

The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, pronouncing paragraphs 1–12 adopted. He then turned to paragraph 13 and Lebanon's amendment.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** fully supported the recommendation by Lebanon. However, the wording suggested that there was no responsibility on the part of the State Party, when, as mentioned by the Director, the responsibility did not lie at the feet of the World Heritage Centre. It therefore suggested the following wording, '[...] a report concerning the clarification of the processes followed associated with the Periodic Reporting and Reactive Monitoring and future actions'.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** propose une modification de forme pour éviter de répéter le mot 'concernant', qui lit, '[...] suivi réactif relatif à ce bien'.

La **Délégation du Liban** note un problème avec le texte en français, notamment la mention de 'suivi', et suggère : « [...] des processus liés aux rapports périodiques et de suivis réactifs ».

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.57 adopted as amended to retain Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz (Uzbekistan) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ASIA-PACIFIC

The Vice-Chairperson then invited The Secretariat to read out the list of cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Asia-Pacific region for which the reports were proposed for *adoption without discussion*.

The Secretariat presented the cultural properties: Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 rev), Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 rev), and Nan Madol: Ceremonial Centre of Eastern Micronesia (Federal States of Micronesia).

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7A.54, 41 COM 7A.55, and 41 COM 7A.56 adopted.

ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2](#)

The **Vice-Chairperson** explained that the item would begin with reports on the natural properties, followed by the mixed and cultural properties in the same order as presented under Item 7A. Committee Members who requested a specific State of conservation report to be opened for discussion were expected to explain the reason why they felt it was important to do so.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE/NORTH AMERICA

Doñana National Park (Spain)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B](#)
Decision: [41 COM 7B.9](#)

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited Portugal to explain the rationale behind opening the report.

The **Delegation of Portugal** noted some discrepancies between Decision [39 COM 7B.26](#) and the draft decision on a number of key issues, which may affect the understanding of the exact and current state of conservation of this property. The delegation sought more accurate information from IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to reports that were not requested by the State Party in Decision 39 COM 7B.26 and was thus not included in the recommendation provided to the Committee. The issues concerned the dredging project, referred to in paragraph 3 of the decision, which was in fact cancelled by the Spanish Supreme Court, with Spain reiterating its commitment not to authorize the project and would remove any mention [of the project] in the next revision of the Hydrological Plan. So the recommendation had been fulfilled, and thus there was no need to ask the State Party to

permanently commit to cancelling something that it had already cancelled. Another issue concerned the aquifers mentioned in paragraph 4, and the reference to the report of the Guadalquivir Hydrographic Confederation on Doñana aquifer, which was neither complete nor exact. Another point related to the water management plan. Spain had conducted regular monitoring and approved the water management plan, as requested by the World Heritage Centre in 2015, and started its implementation. Therefore, it would be important to clarify which elements informed the proposed draft paragraph 5, which recalled the declining condition 'of the Doñana aquifer are considered as potential danger', as the declining condition had already been addressed by the State Party, as stipulated in paragraph 6 of Decision 38 COM 7B.79. Another issue was related to gas extraction. The State Party mentioned in its report that all gas extraction storage projects located outside the site had the necessary Environmental Impact Assessment, and that even though one project had not been authorized in order to protect the OUV, a second one would merit a similar decision if the same criteria applied. The delegation thus wished to have more accurate drafting on this issue, and the recognition that Spain had implemented – and in fact gone beyond – the two recommendations. The fifth point was related to the mining project in which a risk-preparedness plan was requested in Decision 39 COM 7B.26 in the event of the reopening of the mining project prior to the commencement of mining operations. It was noted that there was no reopening of the mining project, only a research project. Thus, the delegation did not understand the link between the research project and the request for assessment of cumulative impacts of the research project in the Strategic Environmental Assessment in paragraph 7 of the draft decision.

Concerning the Agrio dam, as stated by the State Party, the **Delegation of Portugal** noted that there was no project to be evaluated. In paragraph 9, in the analysis and conclusions of the draft decision there was a request for a report on the State of conservation to be submitted by February 2018 for its presentation to the Committee in 2018, i.e. only six months for the reporting on urgent measures, which in environmental matters was indeed very short. It would thus be more logical to report to the 2019 Committee session as this would give Spain a one-and-a-half-year period to report, in line with the usual two-year cycle of provisions. Finally, the absence of action by the State Party to reverse the status of depletion of the aquifer was given as grounds for potential danger listing, which had been addressed by Spain, and the delegation requested the suppression of the phrase, 'with a view to considering [the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger]', as there was no legal ground for that proposal in the Convention. For these reasons, it wished to open the debate on draft decision in order to clarify the requests made to the State Party in response to Decision 39 COM 7B.26, as well as to acknowledge the implementation by the State Party of the recommendations, including in the latter decision. It was noted that the delegation had submitted an amendment to the draft decision and sought clarification from the State Party on these issues, preferably at the beginning of the debate.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted the many speakers, reminding the Committee Members to focus specifically on Doñana National Park.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** fully agreed with the outstanding scientific and rigorous analysis by Portugal, and supported the opening of the debate.

La **Délégation du Koweït** soutient la demande de l'Espagne d'ouvrir le débat sur ce site, en réponse aux recommandations du Comité du patrimoine mondial à Bonn, en Allemagne. Selon son évolution depuis 2015, le site Donana a été confirmé comme étant assez protégé pour conserver ses valeurs universelles qui ont contribué à son inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Le Koweït soutient la demande de la délégation du Portugal.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** took note of the report by the Advisory Body, commending its hard work in providing the comprehensive, yet applicable recommendations to the State Party. It also wished to commend Spain on its continuous efforts in protecting Doñana National Park, and took note with pleasure the improvements made by the Government

within the property, notably by increasing the size of the park in 2016 and the establishment of a new plan for carrying out that work, which would further enhance the situation of aquifers near the park. In this regard, Indonesia acknowledged the strong commitment by Spain to implement the decision of the Committee and it encouraged the Government to continue its close work with the Advisory Bodies to implement their recommendations. However, the delegation noted that the information given by Spain on the positive developments were not included in the draft decision. It thus invited Spain to give further information and clarification to the Committee in this regard.

The **Delegation of Cuba** supported the proposal by Portugal, adding that it sought more information from Spain on this subject.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that most of the issues had been addressed by Spain, and Doñana National Park still had its OUV intact. Nevertheless this presented a good opportunity for Spain to explain how the Government was dealing with the large numbers of illegal wells, and whether this was addressed in the revised Hydrological Plan. The delegation believed that the waters used from the wells were free [of charge], adding that maybe a charge for water usage would reduced the excess water drained from the aquifers.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** soutient les propositions du Portugal, en prenant note des actes entrepris par l'État partie d'Espagne pour répondre aux demandes du Comité, notamment sur l'engagement de l'État de ne pas autoriser le projet de dragage, la confirmation que les projets d'extraction de gaz sont tous à l'extérieur du bien, et les initiatives supplémentaires mises en place pour améliorer la connaissance de l'état des eaux souterraines. Ainsi, nous soutenons les modifications du projet de décision proposé par Portugal.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the proposal by Portugal to open debate on this matter, and it recognized that the State Party had addressed the recommendations made by the Committee in Bonn. The delegation also agree that the draft decision did not allow the State Party enough time to prepare the State of conservation report, and it supported the request to hear directly from the State Party on the steps they had taken on this matter.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that based on the premise that danger listing should not be seen as a sanction but a tool to reinforce conservation it encouraged the State Party to take a constructive view of the matter. At the same time, since significant progress and concrete action had been made by the State Party to address threats to the property. The Committee would continue to review the various concerns reflected in the draft decision, and it supported the amendments presented on this property.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** would continue its efforts and cooperation with the State Party and IUCN, adding that it wished to hear confirmation from the State Party on their commitment not to authorize the threatened project of the Guadalquivir River in the future. It recognized the grave situation, which would cause irreversible damage if groundwater extraction continued, and thus it emphasized the importance of expediting the implementation of the special Management Plan of the Irrigated Zones with the objective of controlling and reducing groundwater withdrawals.

The **Delegation of Peru** thanked the Secretariat for the report presented and recognized the progress made by the State Party in the preservation of the Doñana National Park. It agreed with the proposal by Portugal, as supported by several other Members, to hear the opinion of the State Party on its actions and approaches so as to give greater clarity on the real state of the property and the intention of the Government to undertake its responsibilities.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** conveyed its gratitude to the host country and to the Secretariat for their dedication and hard work in preparing this session. The delegation fully supported the opening of the debate and the amendments to the draft decision proposed by Portugal. It recognized these proposals as an additional stimulus for the State Party to continue its significant progress in the protection of the unique ecosystem of Doñana National Park.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** souligne avec satisfaction les efforts menés par les autorités espagnoles au sujet du Parc national Donana et les encourage à les continuer. Elle soutient la proposition du Portugal.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** supported the proposal by Portugal to open the debate and thanked the Secretariat for its report. Jamaica commended the State Party's efforts, which included the confirmation that dredging would not be allowed in the Guadalquivir River and a cessation of the Marisma Oriental gas project located close to the boundaries of the property. However, the draft decision conflicted with some reports from the State Party and it welcomed the opportunity to hear directly from the State Party on this matter.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** echoed the comments by Portugal in recognizing the efforts of Spain with regard to the conservation of this site, namely the dredging of Guadalquivir River and the commitment of the Spanish Government not to authorize the budget for this project. It also wished to hear from the State Party regarding the environmental authorization for the gas project and the assessment report provided in this regard, as well as the issue of mining, which would need to be environmentally assessed in order to evaluate the risk-preparedness plan and to ensure compliance with the recommendation of the mission. Azerbaijan joined the other Members in encouraging the State Party to work further with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN in terms of water use and management, and it supported the changes in the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Finland** welcomed Spain's announcement to cancel the dredging project in Guadalquivir River. However, it was concerned about the declining state of the area's aquifer as it was the foundation of the whole ecosystem. The delegation thus wished to hear from the State Party on how they were going to address the long-term water management scheme. Finland supported Portugal's amendment and it also submitted a minor amendment to the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Poland** supported the proposals by Portugal, adding it would be very useful to hear from the State Party.

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited Spain to respond.

The **Delegation of Spain** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to explain the efforts and commitment made towards the protection of this property, noting that most comments specifically referred to water management. Since the Decision in 2015, Spain has had a specific plan on irrigation with the community and had considered different measures to improve the aquifer situation. The delegation explained that Doñana comprises different masses of water in good condition, but in order to improve the aquifer zone, and what is called the North [of the Forest] Crown of the Doñana, the Government had been implementing a [Special Management Plan of the Irrigated Zones] plan. It was also noted that 305 of the illegal wells had been closed. In addition, extraordinary measures had been taken in order to bring water to the aquifers within 4.9 hectares. New hydrological planning instruments had been developed in order to better understand the issues of water and the ecosystems. Other measures included incentives to improve farming systems outside of the Doñana Park itself, the acquisition of an additional property to recover 6.8 hectares of extraction rights, and eleven private excavations were closed. The Government was also working on water management and taking measures at the regional level in cooperation with the central authorities. Moreover, it had complied with and respected each of the recommendations in the 2014 Decision, as well as the recommendations of the Committee in Bonn (2015). Spain would continue to cooperate and provide a State of conservation report for 2019, and would have wished for better dialogue with the Advisory Bodies, which unfortunately had not been possible until now. The delegation thus reiterated its commitment to protecting Doñana, and thanked all the experts involved in the dialogue with its delegation.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers for comment.

A **Representative of the Doñana community and WWF** thanked the Vice-Chair for the opportunity to address the plenary, and thanked the firefighters who had worked day and night to control the fire that threatened Doñana World Heritage Site just one week ago. She spoke of how lucky she was to have known Doñana as a child with its endless landscape of wetlands, the smell of camomile in the spring, and the sound of flamingo wings, adding that she wanted this special place to continue living. She represented the hundreds of thousands of people who joined a petition online and participated in its origami campaign to ask for a future for Doñana, which is under threat, as seen in the continuous decline of groundwater levels and in the number of species, and the decline of endangered bird populations. Doñana was also threatened by 3,000 hectares of illegal farms that overexploit the aquifer through more than 1,000 illegal boreholes. It was also threatened by the dredging of the river that had been suspended, but never cancelled, and by underground gas storage, which had not been properly evaluated, and by the reopening of mines that already caused the worst environmental disaster in the history of Spain. However, Spain has the capacity, the legal framework and the necessary resources to ensure a future for Doñana, which is why WWF strongly encouraged the Committee to adopt the decision on Doñana without any amendments.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted the extensive amendments from Poland and Finland in many of the nine paragraphs. Paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unchanged, but paragraph 3 was modified by Portugal, which read, 'Welcomes the State Party's commitment not to authorize the dredging projects to deepen the Guadalquivir River', with the second part deleted. Finland however wished to add to it, which would read, 'takes note of the State Party's statement to remove this project from the Guadalquivir River Basin Hydrological Plan when it is next revised'. Paragraph 4 was also modified, which would read, 'Takes note with concern the conclusions of the 2016 annual report of the Guadalquivir Hydrographic Confederation which confirms that the current level and the use of underground resources in a insignificant part of the groundwater bodies, if sustained, would compromise the good state of underground water bodies and the terrestrial ecosystems', and the second part would read, 'requests to expedite the full implementation of the Special Management Plan of the Irrigated Zones to the North of the Forest Crown of Doñana, and submit to the World Heritage Centre the findings of the current initiatives on monitoring of the hydrological processes to inform the status of the Doñana aquifer, once they are available'. Paragraph 5 was also modified, which read, 'Recalls that the continued declining condition of the Doñana aquifer, if not reversed, could represent a potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines'. Only the first part of paragraph 6 was modified by Portugal, which read, 'Welcomes the decision of the State Party not to authorize the gas and storage projects in Marisma Oriental', with the rest of the paragraph unchanged. Paragraph 7 remained unchanged. Paragraph 8 was slightly modified, which read, 'Requests further the State Party to present an updated SEA of the Guadalquivir River Basin to ensure that it includes a specific chapter on the OUV of the property, and submit it to the World Heritage Centre'. Paragraph 9 was also modified with the first and second parts deleted, which would read, 'Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2018, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019'.

The **Delegation of Finland** noted in paragraph 4 'request to expedite', adding that it should specifically state 'requests the State Party to expedite'.

The **Vice-Chairperson** examined the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and duly adopted paragraphs 1 and 2.

The **Delegation of Cuba** wished to add in paragraph 3 that it welcomed the information provided by the State Party and its commitment to working on safeguarding water supplies, adding that it could go along with the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** asked Cuba to specify its proposal in paragraph 3.

The **Delegation of Cuba** wished to add, 'Welcomes the information provided by the State Party and encourages the State Party to continue working on enhancing water resource management so as to guarantee continued water quality', which could be listed as a separate paragraph.

The **Delegation of Portugal** agreed with the suggestion by Cuba, but felt that it did not correspond to the rest of the paragraph, and would thus be better placed as a new paragraph 4. The original paragraph 4 would become paragraph 5, and so on.

The **Delegation of Cuba** concurred that it wished to have a separate paragraph, while not modifying the meaning of the changes proposed by Portugal and Finland.

The **Delegation of Finland** sought clarification in Cuba's amendment in its mention of 'continued water quality', as it appeared not to be an issue.

The **Delegation of Cuba** concurred that it was a language issue.

The **Delegation of Portugal** wished to return to paragraph 4, which mentioned water management and not water balance.

The **Delegation of Finland** noted that the paragraph was unclear as it mentioned both resource management and natural water management.

The **Delegation of Portugal** agreed with Finland and suggested, 'Welcomes the information provided by the State Party and encourages the State Party to continue working on enhancing water resource management'.

The **Delegation of Turkey** added that water quality was an important issue because water could be managed but water quality could be polluted by agriculture or other activities.

The **Delegation of Cuba** agreed that the issue of water quality could be very important, and proposed the following, 'Welcomes the information provided by the State Party and encourages the State Party to continue working on enhancing water resource management so as to guarantee the state of conservation of the property'.

The **Delegations of Croatia and Portugal** agreed with the proposal by Cuba.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the remaining paragraphs, which were duly adopted.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.9 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** informed the Committee that it had submitted two amendments to the draft decision 41 COM 7B.1 on the Bialowieza Forest to the Secretariat, and wished to open the debate on this subject.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** remarked that the INF.7 document regarding the list of sites open for discussion was sent to Committee Members on 7 June, and the INF.7 Rev. was sent on 26 June. There were also additional requests to open reports by the Bureau, and INF.7 Rev.2 was distributed to all Committee Members the previous day after the opening of this item. The Director reminded the Committee that the Secretariat could not take on any amendments to State of conservation reports not open for discussion, even though the Committee was of course free to open reports. However, Members should send amendments to the Secretariat in cases where the reports were not opened. The Director understood that Kazakhstan now wished to open the case of Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland) and its Decision 41 COM 7B.1.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** concurred that it was indeed the case.

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Secretariat, to read the list of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the Europe/North America region for which the reports were proposed for adoption without discussion.

The Secretariat presented the natural properties: Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada) (N 256), Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia) (N 98bis), Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (Germany, Slovakia, Ukraine) (N 1133bis), Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768rev), Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754), Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023rev), and Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900).

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7B.2, 41 COM 7B.3, 41 COM 7B.4, 41 COM 7B.5, 41 COM 7B.6, 41 COM 7B.7 and 41 COM 7B.8 adopted.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Representative of the First Nation (Canada)** spoke on behalf of the North West Territories Métis Nation with respect to the Wood Buffalo National Park, the recognized Aboriginal Government representing indigenous Métis peoples from three communities from Northern Canada in and around the Park that has been and continues to be part of their traditional homeland. The history of the Métis experience in the Park has been difficult. In 1923, shortly after its establishment, a decision – not supported by the Métis or other Aboriginal people – unwillingly removed Métis hunters and trappers and their families from this newly established Park. These were Métis who engaged in traditional practices and livelihoods for generations. In their view, the State Party had only recently reluctantly acknowledged this history, and recognized the challenges the Park faces and the change and approaches required. They therefore welcomed and fully supported the Committee's decision, and particularly [paragraph 3b], in which the State Party shall 'ensure a process, enabling fair, transparent and meaningful involvement of all legitimate stakeholders and rightsholders, including First Nations and Métis based on mechanisms agreed to by the stakeholders and rights-holders'. Therefore, in full accordance with the United Nations DRIP [Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples], they looked forward to the State Party's engagement with the Métis Nation along a path to reconciliation.

A **Representative of the Mikisew Cree First Nation (Canada)** acknowledged the interest shown by the Committee Members who were willing to help strengthen the decision. After 30 years of Canadian inaction to the pervasive problems in Wood Buffalo, it was critical to have a strong decision. Unfortunately, Canada had demonstrated resistance to making even the most modest alterations to this decision. Constructive attempts at dialogue and resolution with Canada had been entirely dismissed. The Representative did not believe Canada's claim that they were committed to a genuine partnership, and had yet to see any actions from Canada to demonstrate that it would protect Wood Buffalo in a manner required under the Convention. It had been 11,000 days since Canada had said that it would fix the delta, and over ten years since Canada said it would address the health concerns in the community where there are high rates of cancer. The community was not convinced that Canada was acting in good faith. Indeed, Canada's actions have contradicted the Committee's 2015 Decision that requested the State Party not to take any decisions relating to the development projects that would be difficult to reverse. By giving Canada such a generous timeline, more adverse developments will occur. The Park was already in danger. The health of the community, the quality of life and ecological integrity of the delta were diminishing due to increasing water loss, contamination and the prioritization of industrial development over local well-being. As the original petitioners to the Committee, the Mikisew would continue to fight for the ecological integrity of the world's largest freshwater delta. They were committed to the protection of the OUV, as the Convention required. Moving forward, the community would require the Committee's strong support in holding Canada accountable to protect Wood Buffalo National Park.

A **Representative of Green Destruction**, a group of Russian NGOs wished to speak about the Western Caucasus site.

The **Vice-Chairperson** asked the Representative to address this issue in the afternoon.

The **Delegation of Canada** thanked Poland for its warm hospitality, and the Committee for considering the State of conservation item. Canada welcomed the report of the mission to Wood National Buffalo Park that took place in September 2016. It also welcomed the adoption of decision 41 COM 7B.2 and was committed to responding to the recommendations put forward. The findings of the mission and IUCN's recommendations to the Committee represented a call to action. A true response to this report would only be possible through collaboration at all levels within Canada, between Federal, Provincial and Territorial governments to engagement with indigenous partners and through consultations with industry and other stakeholders. The delegation noted that two of its 11 indigenous partners involved in this property had spoken. The Government was pleased to continue its work with all these partners to develop an action plan guided by the mission's recommendations and the Committee's decisions.

The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked everyone for the contributions, adding that the afternoon session would begin with the Observer who requested the floor on Bialowieza Forest.

The **Secretariat** made some announcements on the side events, including an event organized by the Korean National Commission on World Heritage and Peace – Heritage reconstruction, and an event organized by IUCN African Indigenous Peoples and World Heritage. An opening of an exhibition [by the Warsaw Uprising Museum] would also take place.

[Close of morning session]

THIRD DAY – Wednesday 5 July 2017

SIXTH SESSION

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

Vice-Chairperson: Mr Byong Hyun Lee (Republic of Korea)

ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE [Continuation.]

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the session by giving the floor to the previous speaker representing an NGO from Russia.

A **Representative of Green Destruction**, a group of Russian NGOs, wished to highlight several important issues related to the Western Caucasus property. In their view, there were a number of threats to OUV in the property, and the Russian Federation regularly ignored the recommendations of the Committee. For example, the Committee's Decision [37 COM 7B.23](#) clearly demanded a halt to all construction and the extension of buildings and facilities in the upper Mzymta Valley within the property, and to upgrade the legal protection status of this area, which were not fulfilled. Instead, in 2016, Russia approved a law that permitted road construction in the World Heritage site, which – it was argued – was already a reason for its inclusion on the World Heritage List in Danger according to paragraph 180(b) of the Operational Guidelines. It was further developed in March 2017 when the Russian Government decided to lease several land plots on the boundary of the property for other hotel ski resorts with the purpose of further developing recreation facilities. Transport infrastructure began and was already negatively affecting the property. It was important to recall that in 2008 there was already an attempt to construct an Olympic sports facility at the boundary of the site. However, thanks to the principal opposition of the Committee, it was prevented. The exact same situation is being faced as in 2008, but with the Olympic road replaced by mountain ski resorts. Moreover, there were several decisions from the 32nd, 33rd, 34th, 35th, 36th and 37th sessions of the Committee that had not been implemented. On this basis, if the threat to the property was not be eliminated, Russian NGOs would call upon the Committee to inscribe the Western Caucasus on the World Heritage List in Danger at its 42nd session.

Bialowieza Forest (Belarus / Poland)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.1](#)

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited Kazakhstan to provide the reasons for opening the report on Bialowieza Forest.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** began by commending the work done by IUCN on Bialowieza Forest and the efforts undertaken by the States Parties to respond to the concerns previously expressed by the Committee. Poland and Belarus had put a lot of effort into fulfilling the obligations set out in Decision [40 COM 7B.92](#) and had provided the required documents by the designated deadline, including the report on the State of conservation and other documents. There was currently no evidence of adverse impacts on the implementation of the forest management plan. Poland had recently stated that the felling of trees affected by the bark beetle was essential in order to preserve the natural habitat and to

ensure public safety. These actions were strongly supported by the local community. The delegation therefore proposed two modifications to the original draft decision. It was emphasized that these amendments were discussed at length with IUCN and reflect the results of those discussions. In paragraph 5, the draft decision seemed to suggest that the Committee should become involved in the so far unresolved dispute between Poland and the European Commission, which is still at the pre-court stage. The delegation found it expedient to wait for the outcome of the discussion before bringing it to the UNESCO forum and into an officially adopted decision. For this reason, the delegation proposed deleting the part that referred to the European Commission's opinion and to add wording that only referred to on-site operations in accordance with the UNESCO standards for such sites, and that the only purpose of site activities leads to the protection of the site. Concerning modifications to paragraph 9, the delegation clarified that since Poland and Belarus were given such a short time span in the last decision, and have made substantial progress in the preparation of the final documents, considered it justified to give the State Party a more reasonable period of time to prepare the updated report on the State of conservation. In addition, there was no evidence that active protection caused damage to the Bialowieza Forest, and therefore the Committee should not suggest launching the procedure for the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. For this reason, the last part of the paragraph was proposed for deletion.

The **Delegation of Portugal** expressed concern on two issues of method and substance. Concerning the method, the delegation regretted the sudden way the item was re-opened for discussion, adding that if the Committee preached transparency then it should practice it. Delegations had been given sufficient time to prepare in accordance with established practices, and perhaps Poland could later explain this sudden change in its position. With regard to substance, the delegation recalled that this issue had been thoroughly addressed in 2016 during which the concerns and arguments were carefully put forward and the Committee acted accordingly. Despite the differences of opinion, all shared the concern that the then recent amendments to the Forest Management Plan were worrisome and had requested the State Party to submit to the Committee an evaluation of potential impacts of those amendments on the OUV of the property. The IUCN had stated that the Strategic Environment Assessment of the amendments of the Forest Management Plan did not adequately respond to the question. The threefold increase in tree felling, including immature stands, *does* impact on the OUV of the property. It recalled the statement of OUV for this property and the importance of natural processes and the richness in deadwood, both standing and on the ground. The delegation was therefore strongly concerned that the actions engaged by the State Party through the so-called sanitary cuttings were indeed not preserving the natural habitat of the Bialowieza Forest and were instead impacting negatively on the biodiversity equilibrium. As in 2016, the delegation believed that this Committee should further request from the State Party its full commitment to ensure that no commercial timber extraction is permitted in the entirety of the Polish part of the property as it presented a potential danger to its OUV. The delegation therefore called upon Poland to uphold its commitments to the Committee to maintain the continuity and integrity of the property. At this stage, and due to the various and serious concerns, the delegation agreed that there was a need for a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property to assess the current and potential impacts of ongoing forest management operations on the OUV of the property, and it encouraged Poland to issue shortly an invitation for such a mission. The delegation looked forward to Kazakhstan's concrete suggestions concerning the decision in order to be able to comment further, but from this moment, while trusting that Poland would do its utmost to address the Committee's very legitimate ongoing concerns, it deemed paragraph 9 appropriate, as proposed in the draft decision. In addition, as IUCN was mentioned by Kazakhstan as having collaborated in this new draft decision, the delegation appreciated IUCN being given the floor to have its opinion on this issue.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** understood the sensitivities of the issue, but fully understood the importance of the sanitary cuttings for the protection of the natural habitat, as sometimes

it is necessary for the safety of the habitat and the property. It welcomed the improvement of the first management plan of this area, adding that it would be the main tool for the sustainable use and the the ecological needs of this area. In addition, it was a sensitive issue to the local community and to Polish people, and the delegation invited the Polish authorities to work closely with the local community and to increase capacity-building and public awareness of this issue.

The **Delegation of Finland** recalled that the Bialowieza Forest had been inscribed on the World Heritage List due to its oak grove forest where natural processes were ongoing. In a way, bark beetle infestations were part of these processes. The property was significantly extended by a decision by the Committee in 2014 based on the State Party dossier, including a map of different management zones of the property. The vast majority of the property consisted of a strict protection zone and two so-called partial protection zones 1 and 2 where no logging should occur. The Committee's decision on the extension of the property was of course based on the information provided by the State Party. Finland's view is that the Committee should base its decision from these facts, and was of the opinion that the original draft decision reflected the situation accurately. In addition, working in this disorderly manner was not good for the credibility [of the Convention].

The **Delegation of Turkey** began by thanking the Polish hosts for their hospitality, adding that it was likely that its evaluation of this issue could not please both sides. It was noted that the site had been expanded in 2014 when the core area of the National Park became larger with the previously managed forest. The report noted that heavy logging occurred in an area that had been planted about a hundred years ago, but the introduced spruce forest was not natural. The introduced species have not adapted well to the site such that the bark beetle infestation and other insects or diseases were infecting the plants and trees, resulting in death. In classic forestry management practices throughout Europe, the treatment of this kind of problem would involve removing all the dead wood and replanting the trees. However, in terms of ecosystem management, the dead trees should be left on the forest floor. Thus, there had to be some balance between the two routes. The delegation understood that leaving the trees was not aesthetically pleasing, however, over the years the cyprus forests might replace all the cedar forests. Thus, there should be some form of management, but this should not be clearcut logging. It has to be determined by both the ecosystem approach system and forest management so as to best protect the site's OUV. If the forest is unmanaged, the originally inscribed OUV would no longer exist. So some management should be allowed. The delegation suggested that the IUCN expert could probably advise as to the level of management activity that could be applied to keep the original combination of forest. The delegation thus proposed that the Polish Forest Service State managers and the IUCN find some common ground so that they can better manage and sustainably maintain this property.

The **Delegation of Angola** supported the recommendation made by Portugal to protect this forest and that activities likely to lead to degradation and the loss of forest should be halted, including sanitary or salvage cutting that recent studies have shown to be detrimental to biodiversity. This is an important stretch of low-lying forest in Europe and to allow the increase of wood extraction would have a significantly negative impact on the forest, which is a vital ecosystem. The delegation requested that the State Party comply with the recommendations made, including a management plan that should protect the forest and not the loggers. Angola had given careful consideration to this issue and further recommended that a Reactive Monitoring Mission be undertaken to further clarify this issue and provide the appropriate guidance to the State Party, in accordance with the Committee's decision, so as to save the OUV status of this property.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the draft decision as it currently stood, adding that there were recommendations that the State Party had to carry out, particularly with regard to the development of a management plan and the issue of logging currently taking place. It

also urged the State Party to work with the other stakeholder communities affected by the forest.

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited Poland to respond to the questions raised.

The **Delegation of Poland**, speaking [on a personal basis] as a scientist working in Bialowieza Forest, explained that there had been an exceptional outbreak of spruce bark beetles six years ago and since then almost all the oak grove spruce forests from that area had been lost, which would mean almost losing one of the outstanding values of the forest. The outbreak thus changed the picture of the forest. With regard to the natural processes in Bialowieza Forest, the delegation further explained that over one-third of the forest was strictly protected, where natural processes could be observed. In addition, the delegation was of the opinion that those processes were not natural nowadays as the area was too small to observe these processes. The delegation then mentioned criterion (x) concerning biodiversity, noting that much scientific research had concluded that species and habitats could not be safeguarded without active protection, which could occur when hands were tied. With regard to sanitary cuttings, the delegation explained that this was to protect the oak grove spruce forests, adding that the amount of deadwood in Bialowieza Forest was more than enough. It was also noted that problems arose due to the fact that there were six forms of nature protection in the forest, which created a certain conflict. However, the management plan to be developed over the years would resolve this situation so that protection could be achieved in the forest with the cooperation of Belarus. It was also noted that an inventory of plants and animals, and many other aspects, had been ongoing for the past two years and it was observed that certain species and habitats had disappeared from the forest, which could only be halted through active protection.

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited IUCN to make an intervention.

The **Representative of IUCN** clearly stated that IUCN was not recommending any amendments to the draft decision. IUCN had been able to discuss, and indeed very much value the opportunities to exchange on the issues at hand, but did not get to the point of agreeing on an alternate text. IUCN saw the decision and the prospect of a Reactive Monitoring Mission as an opportunity to respond to exactly the sort of issues discussed, i.e. on how to engage forest management and to protect the OUV of the forest. In this way, the mission would address the concerns and move to finding some solutions. However, the key point, before addressing any amendments proposed by Kazakhstan, was to be clear that IUCN was not recommending any changes to the draft decision.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted an NGO wishing to take the floor.

A **Representative of the Mammal Research Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences** in the Bialowieza Forest, Mr Rafał Kowalczyk, spoke as a scientist and educated forester, but also as a member of the local community of Bialowieza. Speaking on behalf of the majority of Polish scientists, NGOs and other societies, he asked the Committee to save the Bialowieza Forest. It is one of the best preserved forest complexes in the European lowland and as unique and majestic as the Great Barrier Reef. It was created and shaped by natural processes with little human impact compared to other European forests, and it is characterized by enormous biodiversity. Around 50 per cent of its biological diversity is depended on dead wood. The bark beetle outbreak and dying spruces trees are natural processes, creating the richness of this forest and should not be controlled by logging, which is in fact one of the main threats to this ecosystem. It was noted that the forest was currently being destroyed with heavy machines and that this had nothing to do with active protection. In addition, the most important academic and scientific bodies, among them the main universities and the Polish Academy of Sciences, had denounced the present destruction of the Bialowieza Forest. Also, the European Commission had launched an infringement procedure against Poland because of the logging and its breach of environmental law. The protection of the Bialowieza Forest was thus very urgent. Changes, especially under paragraph 5, allowed for the continuation of extensive logging, which damaged the forest

every day. Mr Kowalczyk strongly encouraged the Committee to stand for the protection of the property's OUV, and he asked the Committee to adopt the decision for the Bialowieza Forest without any amendments.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision, giving the floor first to Kazakhstan.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** noted that the item was disputed, adding that it was important to open the debate to hear the views of the Committee Members and the wider community. The delegation requested the Secretariat to display the proposed amendments on the screen.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Kazakhstan, comprising a draft proposal of six paragraphs. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 remained unchanged. Paragraph 5 had been modified with the first part of the paragraph unchanged, but the second part would read, 'therefore, the only cutting within the property are related to the safety reasons and protection of continuity and integrity of the old forest threatened on all areas of the property by spruce bark beetle, the wood, in which harvested for the above-mentioned purpose, would also be available to the communities supporting the sustainable development of the Bialowieza Forest region'. Paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 remained unchanged. Paragraph 9 was also modified, which would read, 'Also requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by December 2019, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its subsequent session'. The Rapporteur asked Kazakhstan to clarify the session to which the paragraph alluded.

The **Delegation of Portugal** proposed not to change the draft decision in any way, and explained that it was surprised to see how a decision and advice by the European Commission was simply erased and replaced by very vague text about woodcutting. The delegation added that the European Commission is a respectable institution, with Poland part of the European Union, and thus there should be greater consideration towards institutions that many countries present in the room share, or at least enjoy very close relations. The delegation was thus perturbed by the ease at which the very pertinent reference to the European Commission was deleted as if it were a third rate organization. With regard to paragraph 9, the delegation also believed that the draft decision was reasonable in that the report should be submitted in February to be examined at the next Committee meeting when it would be examined, and on the basis of the information provided the Committee would consider the inscription of the property on the Danger List at that time.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** clarified that it proposed December 2018 and the 43rd session.

The **Delegation of Finland** supported the original draft decision and thus supported Portugal's position. However, it believed that it was very important to continue the discussions between the State Party and the various stakeholders, such as the local communities, the scientific community, NGOs, and so on.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** fully understood the concerns of the local communities and the NGOs on this very sensitive issue. Nevertheless, the State Party should be given time to provide its State of conservation report, and it also believed that active protection is an important tool to protect this site from potential danger and risks, and it thus supported Kazakhstan's amendment.

The **Delegation of Angola** concurred with the recommendations by Portugal and Finland to keep the original draft decision. It believed that giving more time would postpone an important decision that needed to be made. It thus supported keeping the original date.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that there were two amendments out of the 9 proposed paragraphs, and opened the floor for further comment.

The **Delegation of Belarus** asked whether it could speak.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that according to the Rules of Procedure, non-Members of the Committee could not speak during the adoption of decisions. The Vice-Chair noted that four Committee Members supported the original formulation, and Kazakhstan and another Member supported some modifications. The Vice-Chair encouraged the Committee Members to make known their positions, inviting Turkey to clarify its position.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that having read the report and the draft decision noted that there were three zonations. It understood that sanitary logging, considered a 'loose term', was mainly practised in the tree zone, adding that logging, sanitary or management type zoning, should only be practised in the buffer zone. However, the State Party had defined the zone to be the forest region and that the managed forest should provide wood to the local people. The delegation thus believed that the core zone should not be open to any logging until a complete agreement was reached in the next reporting cycle. Thus, it did not support keeping the original [decision], but nor did it accept the modification.

The **Vice-Chair** thanked Turkey for the encouragement, but found that its position was still unclear.

The **Delegation of Portugal** suggested a compromise in which paragraph 5 remain unchanged, while paragraph 9 could be modified to accept the new date of 1 December 2018 for the report, which would be examined at the Committee's 43rd session. The delegation suggested that IUCN first be consulted to see whether it could agree.

The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked Portugal for its spirit of compromise.

The **Delegation of Cuba** supported the consensus proposal by Portugal and the change to paragraph 9 only.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** tient à ce que le paragraphe 5 reste inchangé mais croit que la proposition du Portugal d'aménager la date au 1^{er} décembre 2018 peut être un bon équilibre.

The **Delegation of Portugal** clarified that its proposal was to keep what was written in French in the last part of paragraph 9, i.e. with a view to considering the potential danger to OUV and the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The date of 1 December 2018 for the submission of the report and its examination by the Committee at the 43rd session would remain.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the consensus paragraph 9 would read, 'Also requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2018, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019, with a view to considering in case of confirmation of ascertained or potential danger to Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** considère qu'il reste des préoccupations quant à la gestion de la forêt et estime que la possibilité offerte à l'État partie de revenir avec un rapport actualisé à la 42^e session est un bon compromis qu'elle soutient.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the compromise proposed by Portugal.

The **Delegation of Cuba** agreed with the compromise put forward by Portugal, but was worried by the fact that it was negatively conditioning the result in two years' time by citing the possibility of inscribing the property on the Danger List. Thus, it was better to delete that reference in the paragraph. Paragraph 5 would remain unchanged.

The Delegation of **Peru** supported the compromise proposed by Portugal.

The **Delegation of Portugal** understood the reasonable concern raised by Cuba, but that the paragraph should have an operational conclusion without prejudgment, as referenced by 'with a view' and 'in the case of confirmation', which were in a conditional form that did not presume a conclusion. The delegation hoped Cuba could go along and join the consensus,

adding that Poland would surely abide by its commitments and would thus obtain a very positive result.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the compromise proposed by Portugal of keeping the original paragraph 5 with the modification in paragraph 9.

The **Delegation of Cuba** could go along with the consensus to move forward even though it believed that the wording had a negative connotation.

The **Chairperson** declared **Decision 41 COM 7B.1 adopted as amended**.

The **Delegation of Portugal** noted that the terms on the screen were not those agreed.

The **Vice-Chairperson** recognized the technical error, which was duly corrected.

The **Delegation of Poland** thanked the delegates for this discussion, adding that it would respect the decision despite the very divided opinions concerning the protection measures. Nevertheless, it would do everything possible to protect the OUV of the Bialowieza Forest.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the reports on the State of conservation of the natural properties located in the Latin America and the Caribbean region for which the reports were *open for discussion*.

Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.10](#)

The **Secretariat** remarked that in 2016 the Committee in its Decision [40 COM 7B.71](#) reiterated its concern that the majority of the Chapada dos Veadeiros components of the property did not continue to benefit from National Park status and that its integrity was therefore no longer guaranteed. The Committee had considered the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger if significant progress to address the lack of protection of the Chapada dos Veadeiros component had not been achieved. On 1 February 2017, the State Party submitted its SOC report by which it reiterated that most of the territory of the Chapada dos Veadeiros was covered by several protected areas of different categories. Furthermore, the State Party reported that the proposal for the expansion of the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park was still ongoing but not completely achieved since it required further technical discussions related to land tenure issues. Considering that the Chapada dos Veadeiros component of the property remained without the required protection, and following the concerns expressed in the previous Committee Decision 40 COM 7B.71, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommended the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as expressed in draft decision 41 COM 7B.10. The Secretariat also explained that new information had been received by the **World Heritage** Centre, as submitted by the State Party on 16 June 2017, with additional and very positive information. First, an official letter confirmed that the Presidential Decree was passed on 5 June 2017 in response to the Committee's request to conclude the extension of limits of the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park to now cover an area of 240,600 hectares. The cartography of the new limits of the property had also been presented. There was further information in that the Brazilian Chico Mendes Institution for Biodiversity Conservation had adopted a new management approach, an integrated file management system. Based on this additional relevant information, and following consultation with the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, a revised draft decision was proposed, which was distributed to the Members of the Committee earlier in the day.

The **Vice-Chairperson** was impressed with this additional information received on the 16 June 2017 and incorporated [into the draft decision].

The **Representative of IUCN** noted that the original draft decision presented to the Committee recommended the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. When the working document was prepared, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre considered that insufficient progress had been made to address the situation where significant areas of the Chapada dos Veadeiros component of the property no longer benefitted from National Park status. However, as just mentioned, the State Party made significant progress in expanding the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park with the issuance of a Presidential Decree on 5 June [2017] establishing the new boundaries of the National Park. Taking the significant new development into account, IUCN considered that the key request of the Committee – to restore the legal protection of the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park – had been addressed and therefore the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger was not recommended at this session. However, as an urgent next step, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre recommended that the Committee requests the State Party to prepare and submit a proposal for a boundary modification of the property in line with the provisions of the Operational Guidelines in order to ensure that the new boundaries of Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park were reflected in the boundaries of the serial property. It also recommended that the Committee requests the State Party to fully address the remaining land tenure issues around the new National Park in order to guarantee that all local stakeholders accept the extended boundaries.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Portugal** félicite ce développement très constructif et rappelle les décrets présidentiels adoptés le 1^{er} juin qui affectent cette propriété. Elle remarque le bel exemple du travail de coopération entre l'État partie et l'UICN où l'UICN présente un projet de décision révisé en totale coordination avec l'État partie. La délégation est convaincue que l'État partie suivra les recommandations de l'UICN sur le changement de limites de la propriété. La délégation demande au Président d'inviter l'État partie à intervenir pour donner des précisions sur les derniers développements et réitérer son compromis pour le futur proche.

The **Delegation of Finland** recognized with great satisfaction the recent decision by Brazil to expand Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park by implementing the request by the Committee. It fully supported the revised draft decision.

The **Delegation of Peru** highlighted two aspects in particular. Firstly, the Committee recognized the actions of the Brazilian President as a very positive development, and secondly, the decision took note of the level of understanding and cooperation between the Member State and the IUCN. It hoped similar cases of cooperation would be seen in the future.

La **Délégation du Liban** tient à rappeler la belle décision de la Côte d'Ivoire, et félicite la décision brésilienne, tout en espérant que des leçons puissent être apprises. Elle avance ses félicitations à l'Ambassadeur brésilien qui n'a pas pu être présent à la session. La délégation espère que ce sera une leçon à tous pour améliorer la Convention.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended the State Party for its efforts in protecting and maintaining the OUV of this site, and noted the revised draft decision from the World Heritage Centre and IUCN indicating a recent Presidential Decree that approved the expansion of the National Park. This was accomplished through a participatory process of discussions with stakeholders that had been taking place since 2003. Jamaica urged the State Party to submit the requested proposal for the boundary modification as soon as possible and it thus supported the revised draft decision.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** welcomed the strong commitment and efforts of the Government of Brazil to protect the Cerrado protected areas. It commended the positive results of the State Party to modify the boundaries of the National Park, even more so by the

very long and difficult participatory processes between all the stakeholders, communities and local institutions. The delegation added its voice in requesting the State Party to follow the modifications of the property boundaries, adding that it was happy to support the revised decision.

The **Delegation of Cuba** joined in congratulating the State Party for the work accomplished and for having provided this information to the Advisory Body so as to amend the draft decision, adding that this was a wonderful example of a State working alongside the Advisory Bodies.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** congratulated the State Party and the IUCN for agreeing on the revised decision, which it welcomed, noting that the property had addressed the major concerns and no longer needed to be included on the Danger List.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** was satisfied with the state of conservation of this beautiful site and noted that the main issue remained the boundary modification that would integrate an additional area proposed for annexation to National Park status. Although this proposal was not yet accomplished at the time of the SOC reporting, it was clear from the analysis that the OUV had been safeguarded. In addition, the State Party had undertaken commendable efforts in the difficult process of adding land to the proposed annexation. It strongly supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Croatia** added its voice to those who commended the efforts by the State Party. It also supported the revised draft decision.

The **Delegation of Turkey** congratulated the State Party for its achievement and it strongly supported the revised draft decision.

La **Délégation du Koweït** félicite le Gouvernement du Brésil pour les efforts déployés afin de protéger leurs parcs.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** added its voice in congratulating IUCN and Brazil in their successful dialogue and agreement on the modification of the boundaries. It also supported the revision of the draft decision.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** took note of the revised draft decision.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.10 adopted.

The **Delegation of Portugal** asked that the State Party be given an opportunity to share with the Committee their commitment to this marvellous outcome.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to Brazil.

The **Delegation of Brazil** thanked Poland and UNESCO for the organization of this Committee session. The long process related to the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park started at the World Heritage Convention in 2001 with the inscription of the Cerrado natural site onto the World Heritage List, although for Brazil it had already started 40 years before. This property needed the protection of the Convention from 2003 with the cancellation by Brazil and [its] justice [system] of the decree that had attempted to enlarge the natural park due to insufficient public consultations. It was recalled that the Committee began discussing the property in 2011, requesting Brazil to re-establish the level of legal protection followed by several other decisions in the ensuing years. From 2015 the Committee, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre were particularly supportive, offering guidance and extra time to the State Party, as it understood the renewal process Brazil had engaged in. In parallel to the Convention, but positively influenced by it, the national process took several difficult years but happily concluded recently in June with the Brazilian Presidential Decree defining a fourfold re-enlargement of this National Park. This re-established the legal protection status of this property, guaranteeing its integrity and its OUV. Interestingly, the non-inclusion of the

Cerrado protected area site in the List of World Heritage in Danger helped to promote national and local pride and awareness, convincing social actors to engage in nature conservation processes related to the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park, even though these elements had always been present in the management of this protected area. Brazil believed that this was another successful case related to the importance of the Convention in which its standards and procedures helped in conservation and stakeholder engagement. Brazil reiterated its commitment to the implementation of the Convention.

The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked Brazil for its intervention.

[The Chairperson, Mr Jacek Purchla, reprised his role]

The **Chairperson** expressed his deepest gratitude to the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea for his chairing of the session in a highly professional way, as well as the Ambassador of Brazil for his dedication and patience concerning the forest site.

Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California (Mexico)

Document: [41 COM 7B.Add.2](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.15](#)

The Secretariat recalled that in 2016 the Committee in its Decision [40 COM 7B.75](#) noted with utmost concern that the population of vaquita had become extremely critical and the species was threatened with extinction. The Committee therefore requested a joint Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property. On 2 March 2017, the State Party submitted its DSOCR report, providing a comprehensive overview of various conservation and research programmes in the different components of the property. As requested by the Committee, a Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission visited the property from 9–15 April 2017. The mission noted in its conclusion that the decline of the critically endangered vaquita continued and the main cause of its mortality was due to entanglement in illegal gillnets, mainly linked to the trafficking of the totoaba swim bladder. The mission considered that the risk of imminent extinction of the vaquita, which is specifically recognized as part of the property's OUV under criterion (x), represented a danger to the OUV of the property. The mission therefore recommended the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Considering the evaluations made by the Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission and the information provided in the State Party's DSOCR report, and following the concerns expressed in the previous Committee Decision 40 COM 7B.75, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommended the inscription of the property on the World Heritage in Danger.

The Secretariat drew the Committee's attention to the fact that following the publication of the draft decision, the State Party submitted on 26 June 2017 new and relevant additional information with very positive developments. First, a position paper described the actions undertaken by the State Party in response to all six recommendations of the Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission report of April 2017. Second, a joint decree signed by the Secretary of the Environment and Natural Resources and the Secretary of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food prohibited systems, methods, techniques and hours for fisheries in the marine waters under federal jurisdiction of the Upper California Gulf, and established boarding points and a monitoring system for watercrafts. This decree also permanently banned the use of gillnets during night hours. Third, the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Mexican Government, Leonardo di Caprio and the Carlos Slim Foundation to support the transition from a temporary ban in the use of gillnets to a permanent ban covering all fisheries throughout the range of the vaquita in the Upper Gulf of California. Fourth, international cooperation with China and the United States, with a trilateral meeting to be held with the three countries in Mexico in August 2017 to discuss measures to fight the illicit traffic of totoaba. Finally, the Secretariat informed the Committee that on 1 July 2017, two official letters were received from the Mexican Government inviting the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to provide technical advice in the

process of implementation of the MoU, inviting them to participate in the trilateral meeting just mentioned. This series of information was published on the World Heritage Centre website as additional information to the DSO CR report. Following this additional information, new consultations were held between the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and the State Party to ensure an appropriate follow-up to the recently adopted measures.

The **Representative of IUCN** remarked that the World Heritage Centre had given a very comprehensive explanation of the situation. As noted, the recommendation was based on the findings of the Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property in 2017, which concluded that the population of the critically endangered vaquita – the smallest cetacean species in the world and found only in the northern part of the Gulf of California – had dramatically declined to an estimated 30 individuals. If this decline could not be reversed, the vaquita would be in severe risk of imminent extinction, which would represent an ascertained danger to the property in line with paragraph 180 a.i of the Operational Guidelines. This is an issue driven by illegal trade, which has an international dimension, so it was also very much an issue where the international community has an important role. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre have had extensive discussions with the State Party, both before the Committee and at the present Committee meeting, and it was clear that the State Party was taking this issue very seriously. In this regard, IUCN wished to thank the Minister and the senior officials of the delegation of Mexico who were committed to addressing this very significant challenge to this property. So the range of initiatives taken up since the mission's visit were being put in place and the IUCN believed that it was thus important that the Committee welcome these efforts. Nevertheless, the challenges were very significant and IUCN considered that until it could be demonstrated that the vaquita's decline had been reversed and fishing for the totoaba had been brought under control, the property remained in danger, irretrievably losing a key element of its OUV with the serious prospect of the first global species extinction. For those reasons, and because of the criteria being so clearly met, the decision articulated the recommendation to recognize this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN welcomed the State Party's clear willingness to invite a second Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property later in 2017 or early 2018. This mission would provide an important opportunity to understand the progress being made in putting in place this ambitious programme to recover the vaquita and to understand the needed corrective measures that are required to secure the OUV of the property.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Peru** welcomed the report presented and especially the assessment by the Secretariat of the state of the property and the threat to the preservation of the vaquita species in this Gulf. However, it was also aware of the situation, as set out by IUCN and the Secretariat, and Peru therefore believed that a number of emergency measures were required, as in the case of one of its own properties. The delegation noted however that the report had been drawn up by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN before this session, but a number of measures had been put in place by the Mexican authorities since, following consultations with various stakeholders. The delegation therefore wished to table an amendment to the draft decision that called for the implementation of emergency measures. The conclusions of the Advisory Body were clear in that a number of urgent measures need to be carried out. For this reason, the delegation believed that the draft decision should not in fact inscribe the property on the Danger List, but instead consider that measure at the next Committee session. In the meantime, the State Party would be called upon to submit a new State of conservation report within the next year after receiving the Reactive Monitoring Mission. Moreover, the draft decision provided for that provision by introducing a number of progressive measures while taking note of the commitments by Mexico.

The **Delegation of Cuba** noted that this was a very important property for the world's maritime biodiversity and also for the preservation of its ecosystems. It welcomed the efforts by the State Party over the last few years within the Gulf of California, including work that had been implemented institutionally over a number of years with local communities with

major efforts to preserve the site. The delegation believed that the State Party should be given the floor so that it might inform the Committee of the most recent measures in place to conserve of property, noting some very positive measures implemented that could possibly reverse the current situation.

La **Délégation du Liban** soutient l'amendement proposé par le Pérou et souhaite attendre l'avis spécialisé de la délégation du Mexique.

Having listening to the World Heritage Centre report and IUCN's updated information, the **Delegation of Turkey** strongly commended the State Party for its efforts to conserve this site, especially the two endemic and endangered species, the vaquita and totoaba, by initiating corrective measures, programmes and a mission in April 2017. Nevertheless, the delegation remarked that there was a lot of information gathered that was not reflected in the draft decision, including the surveillance programmes banning the fishing gillnets, the establishment of new committees guided by the Mexican Navy, and the cooperation to ban the illegal trade in [totoaba] swim bladders, which was also endangered. For this reason, the delegation felt that it was too early to take the property out of the Danger List at this stage. The Committee should provide an additional year after which the progress report, especially from the Reactive Monitoring Mission by IUCN, would be available so as to discuss these issues at the next Committee meeting. The delegation therefore strongly supported that the State Party be given a platform so that it could explain why it wished to [be removed from the Danger List], while encouraging Mexico to carry out all the proposed activities.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** félicite l'État partie pour ses actions d'application des recommandations du Comité, dont plusieurs ont été entreprises en collaboration avec l'UICN. Elle apprécie le décret promulgué par le Mexique d'interdire l'utilisation de filets maillants, qui est le premier décret de ce genre dans le monde, et salue ses efforts pour mettre en œuvre le programme « Aidons les pêcheurs à changer leurs méthodes et leurs équipements de pêche pour qu'ils ne nuisent pas aux mammifères marins dans le Golfe ». Le Viet Nam encourage l'État partie à continuer et intensifier ses coopérations pour résoudre le problème de commerce illégal des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages menacés d'extinction. Tenant compte de la volonté de l'État partie d'inviter une mission conjointe de suivi réactif au pays, le Viet Nam estime raisonnable de lui donner du temps pour que ses efforts portent ses fruits. Ainsi, la délégation appuie l'amendement du Pérou.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** commended the Advisory Body on its report on the state of conservation of the site and took note of the grave concern resulting from the 2017 Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission on the decline of the critically endangered species in the property. It also noted that the State Party had provided information regarding national and scientific programmes on the property, and it commended the State Party for providing a comprehensive overview of the strategies to protect the endangered species, including the increasing conservation efforts and the suspension of all commercial fishing using gillnets. Taking into account the good intentions of the State Party to protect and conserve this property, the delegation was of the view that it was appropriate to allow the State Party to provide further clarification on the efforts taken.

La **Délégation du Koweït** note que ce site bénéficie d'un programme efficace entrepris par la Mexique pour éliminer la pêche illégale et est convaincu que le Gouvernement fera tout ce qui est en son pouvoir afin de protéger ce site le plus efficacement possible. Elle remarque que le Mexique a pris six mesures urgentes visant à maintenir le site et a répondu aux recommandations de l'UICN qui demande que ce site soit retiré de la Liste du patrimoine en péril. La délégation soutient donc l'amendement proposé par le Pérou.

The **Delegation of Finland** was impressed by Mexico's resolute action and focused approach to save the critically endangered dolphin species, the vaquita. With the received information that only about 30 individuals were left, the situation was indeed very serious. In the statement of OUV for this property, the vaquita dolphin was explicitly mentioned and it was already endangered when the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in

2005. Despite the State Party's efforts, the actions so far did not seem to be enough to start the recovery of the vaquita dolphin population. It noted that the threat to the vaquita was in fact closely related to illegal fishing of the endangered fish totoaba with gillnets, which has a high value on the international market. Thus, there was a clear need for international collaboration, especially with countries where the market for the fish species is situated. Finally, Finland recognized that the State Party had recently taken action to permanently ban gillnets, to intensify surveillance, and to address the illegal trade of totoaba. The delegation welcomed these recent additional actions taken by Mexico and it was thus reasonable to postpone the consideration of the property's inclusion on the Danger List by one year.

The **Delegation of Portugal** remarked that one of the main reasons for the recommendation to inscribe this property on the List in Danger was, that despite of the commendable efforts undertaken by the State Party, the extinction of the vaquitas may be imminent, which was a very serious concern. However, the Committee also learned that Mexico had committed itself very strongly to address this challenge in an inclusive and sustainable manner, and one example is the MoU signed in June 2017 by the Mexican President, Mr Enrique Peña Nieto, and Leonardo Di Caprio and the Slim Foundation. The delegation expected the MoU to be an important instrument to help the State Party rescue and preserve the vaquitas, as well as many other species such as the totoaba fish, which contributed to the rich biodiversity of this outstanding property. Taking into consideration these new developments and the seriousness of the Mexican authorities to fully address the situation, the delegation agreed that the Committee should postpone the decision to inscribe the property on The Danger List, and request instead that the State Party invite the Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission to evaluate the result of all the measures undertaken. The delegation concluded by congratulating Mexico for its commitment to address this very serious challenge.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** thanked the Advisory Body for sharing this most recent information from the State Party, adding that this was yet another example of what was possible with collaboration and open communication. In this vein, the delegation wished to hear directly from the State Party on the progress it has made since the DSOCR report. It also encouraged that the joint Reactive Monitoring Mission be finalized at the earliest, given the extreme case of extinction of the vaquita species. It thus supported the draft decision without paragraph 6.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** expressed appreciation in the way the Chairperson was guiding the deliberations. It believed that for the past ten years, the State Party had been given the highest priority to save the endangered species. Moreover, as mentioned in the report, the Mexican Government had launched a new integral national strategy to save the vaquita species from its fast declining population. The delegation believed that these actions were even wider in scope than the recommendations contained in the April 2017 report of the Reactive Monitoring Mission to the site. It therefore supported the postponement of the decision on possible danger listing until the results of the new reactive mission could be considered at the Committee's 42nd session. Finally, noting that the State Party fully recognized the necessity of implementing further steps towards keeping the property's OUV intact, the delegation believed that the site should not be placed on the Danger List at this session.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** very much welcomed and commended the strong efforts and progress made by the State Party, not only on the progress made on each of the six points mentioned in the most recent joint Reactive Monitoring Mission, but especially on the substantial progress on its national cooperation with China and USA to prevent illegal trade and trafficking. Such collaborations were imperative to protect the marine biodiversity that could not be undertaken solely by the State Party. The delegation echoed the voice of others to give the State Party the chance to directly present the status of the implemented changes, while encouraging Mexico's commitment to invite a new Reactive Monitoring Mission. Although the current number of vaquita species were not in recovery as of yet, the

positive progress made were quite substantial and it wished to see this new information reflected in the draft decision.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** thanked the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the updates and took note of the positive developments and commendable actions taken by Mexico to address the concerns and recommendations of the Reactive Monitoring Mission. In particular, it recognized the considerable efforts to save the vaquita, an endangered species that contributed to the OUV of the property, adding that the effects of these actions needed time to be fully realized. In light of the progress made, the Philippines supported the proposed amendments by Peru to the draft decision, but wished to remind Mexico that inscription on the Danger List should not be seen as a sanction but a tool to further reinforce conservation. Mexico was further encouraged to intensify efforts towards compliance with the proposed corrective measures.

The **Delegation of Poland** noted that the State Party had made considerable effort to save the endangered vaquita dolphins. It hoped that the ban on the use of gillnets would bring some positive results to solve this problem. In this regard, it agreed with the proposed decision.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended the efforts by the State Party to maintain the OUV of the property, as well as its efforts to ban gillnet fishing and other efforts made to protect the endangered species. It commended the partnerships that the State Party had taken in a joint community effort to save the OUV of the property. The delegation noted and supported the IUCN recommendation for a Reactive Monitoring Mission early in 2018 in order to assess the situation, adding that it was only after this mission that the Committee could consider whether the property should be put on the Danger List. It thus supported Peru's amendment to delete paragraph 6.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** welcomed Mexico's efforts to conserve and restore the highly important biodiversity of the site, and the State Party's efforts to involve the main stakeholders, NGOs and international organizations. The delegation also wished to give the floor to Mexico.

The **Delegation of Croatia** was grateful for the additional information by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. However, it sought additional guarantees from the State Party that it would meet all the requirements and goals. The delegation was nevertheless optimistic that the population of vaquita could be saved by the implementation of these measures, and it also agreed with the postponement by one year of the inscription of this property on the Danger List.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** also regretted the steady decline of the biomarine species for this important site, in particular the vaquita under criterion (x). It took note of the State Party's strong determination in planning and undertaking a range of management and legal options towards rescuing the situation. The delegation supported the position of Turkey, Finland, Kazakhstan and others to give the State Party time to translate these planned measures into fruitful interventions.

The **Chairperson** noted 18 interventions and turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted a number of amendments by Peru. Paragraph 3 would read, 'regrets that the Integral Strategy for the Protection of the vaquita has not delivered the expected results and that illegal fisheries are still threatening both totoaba, as the target, and vaquita, as bycatch'. Paragraph 4 was slightly amended with the addition of 'for'. Paragraph 5 was also modified with the deletion of the second part, which would read, 'Notes the confirmation of the mission that other attributes of the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) remain in good condition and that the State Party has started the implementation of the most urgent recommendations made by the mission'. The original paragraph 6 was deleted and a new paragraph 6 was proposed, which would read, 'Also notes the adoption of a joint Decree by the Secretary of Environment and Natural Resources and the Secretary of Agriculture that

permanently bans gillnets use in the vaquita area, while prohibiting night fishing and enforcing control and monitoring of small vessels; and further notes that the State Party signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Leonardo DiCaprio and Carlos Slim Foundations seeking at working with communities to promote sustainable fishing practices and remove illegal fishing gear from the vaquita habitat'. Paragraph 7 was modified into two paragraphs. The new paragraph 7 would read, 'Urges the State Party to ensure fully effective implementation and enforcement of the recently established permanent ban on gillnets use, sale, manufacture and possession at sea and on land within the Vaquita Refuge and the current gillnet and longline suspension zone and in the adjacent land areas'. The second part of paragraph 7 would become a new paragraph 8, which would read, 'Also urges the State Party to fully implement the programme on development of alternative gear for legal fisheries which would not cause bycatch of vaquita and other marine mammal species, sharks and turtles'. The original paragraph 8 would become paragraph 9, which would read, 'Welcomes the initial efforts by the State Party aimed at strengthening cooperation with State Parties that are transit and destination countries for the illegal trade of totoaba swim bladder, and reiterates its calls to other States Parties to support the State Party of Mexico to halt this illegal trade, in particular through the implementation of the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)'. The original paragraph 9 would become a modified paragraph 10, which would read, 'Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the recently adopted measures for the protection of the threatened vaquita'. The original paragraph 10 would become paragraph 11. The first part remained unchanged, but the second part would read, 'with a view to considering, in the case of the absence of significant progress in the implementation of the above, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger'.

The Delegation of **Cuba, Turkey and Jamaica** supported the amendment by Peru.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and duly pronounced paragraphs 1–11 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.15 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Mexico** congratulated the Government of Poland for the organization of this session and for its warm welcome. Mexico appreciated the postponement and extra time given for the Reactive Monitoring Mission to establish the state of conservation of the islands, in particular in the Gulf of California. In 2017, the mission was carried out on the basis of the Decision taken at the Committee's 40th session, and the delegation thanked the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for their willingness to carry out the mission, recognizing that the evaluation provided very valuable guidelines in terms of orientation. Therefore, it fully appreciated the quality, as well as the relevance of the decisions and recommendations contained in the report, which it was currently implementing so as to fulfil its duties to take care of the heritage of humanity. The Government of Mexico reiterated its thorough commitment to the proper implementation of the Convention. Over the five years that President Peña Nieto has been in office, the Government has undertaken historic efforts to preserve the OUV of the islands, in particular the Gulf of California. It has implemented a national strategy for the protection of vaquita, which involved many national and international institutions. In that framework, the Government has carried out decisive actions, including guaranteeing the protection of the vaquita habitat through the permanent prohibition of gillnet fishing, reinforcing vigilance in prevent illicit activities that were now punishable by prison, and developing alternative fishing that did not harm the species and the OUV of the property. The Government had pioneered a programme to recover the population of the vaquitas, while supporting the indigenous peoples through large-scale social programmes to promote the sustainable use of natural resources. In addition, it was cooperating with China and USA to fight the illicit trafficking in protected species. The delegation emphasized Mexico's deep commitment in facing the challenges mentioned in the report of the Reactive Monitoring Mission. It was currently implementing each of the six recommendations, as well as other

actions that go beyond those contained in the report. In the coming months, the Government would be in a position to prove significant progress in reducing the threats to the vaquitas. It thus requested the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the IUCN to continue to advise and assist Mexico in each of the steps of its integrated strategy. It also invited other States Parties to join Mexico in carrying out actions to bring about the recovery of the vaquita species and thus recover common natural heritage. The delegation thanked the Committee for their confidence, reiterating the commitment of the Mexican Government to provide detailed information to this Committee in 2018 as it awaited the results of the monitoring undertaken in order to preserve the OUV of the property.

The Chairperson noted an NGO Observer wishing to speak.

A **Representative of WWF Mexico**, Mr Enrique Sanjurjo, spoke of the Gulf of California as a place where one finds whales, sharks, dolphins and other amazing biodiversity, where many people make a living by fishing. However, gillnet fishing was killing the biodiversity and driving the vaquita to extinction. Ten years ago, there were 250 vaquitas. Today, there were fewer than 30. If urgent action was not taken immediately the vaquita would become extinct within months. There were too many users of gillnets, among them legal fishermen who use the wrong type of gear, but also criminals who destroy the biodiversity and damage the social fabric of the coastal communities. These species could only be saved by eliminating these illegal activities and by replacing gillnets with less harmful fishing gear for the legal fisheries. In only six weeks, 220,000 people around the world had joined WWF Mexico to ask the Mexican Government to save the vaquita. The world is watching. WWF commended the expertise that the World Heritage Centre and the IUCN applied to the draft decision. It was now critical to have a transparent process to monitor its implementation. Mr Sanjurjo sought closer engagement between the Mexican Government, IUCN, UNESCO and civil society, adding that the vaquita was a vital part of the OUV of the Gulf. Losing the vaquita would forever diminish this value.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** souhaite ouvrir le débat au sujet de Décision 41 COM 7B.78 relatif au site Memphis et sa nécropole en Égypte.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked Tunisia for informing the Committee, and she reminded Members to provide advance notice in future, as the updated list of SOC reports was about to be distributed.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat for its readiness to accept the unexpected issue. He then invited the Secretariat to read the natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the Latin America and the Caribbean region for which the reports were proposed for *adoption without discussion*.

The Secretariat read out the list of natural properties: Los Katíos National Park (Colombia) (N 711), A rea de Conservación Guanacaste (Costa Rica) (N 928bis), Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica, Panama) (N 205bis), Morne - Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica) (N 814), Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290) and Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138rev).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7B.11, 41 COM 7B.12, 41 COM 7B.13, 41 COM 7B.14, 41 COM 7B.16 and 41 COM 7B.17 adopted.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the Africa region for which the reports were *proposed for adoption without discussion*.

The Secretariat read out the list of natural properties for which the reports were proposed for adoption without discussion: Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407), Sangha Trinational (Cameron / Central African Republic / Congo) (N 1380rev), Tai National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195), Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley (Kenya) (N 1060rev) and Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia, Zimbabwe) (N 509).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7B.18, 41 COM 7B.19, 41 COM 7B.20, 41 COM 7B.21 and 41 COM 7B.22 adopted.

ARAB STATES

The **Chairperson** invited Ms Nada Al-Hassan to present the reports that were *open for discussion*.

Socotra Archipelago (Yemen)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.23](#)

Le Secretariat présente le rapport sur l'archipel de Socotra qui a été frappé par deux cyclones dévastateurs en novembre 2015 et qui ont provoqué de nombreux dégâts aux habitations humaines ainsi qu'aux environnements terrestres et marins du bien. Ces deux cyclones ont affecté l'état de conservation de Socotra et l'ont rendu encore plus fragile face aux menaces liées à l'utilisation non durable des ressources et à l'érosion des sols. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial réitère toute sa solidarité envers les habitants de l'île de Socotra à la suite de ces désastres naturels. Le Comité du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN ont été interpellés par des informations apparues dans les articles de médias au sujet de nouveaux projets de développement dans l'île de Socotra, ainsi que par des informations supplémentaires reçues par l'Organisation pour la préservation des villes historiques au Yémen. Ces sources indiquent que des projets de développement sont en cours de planification ou de réalisation pour la construction de villes résidentielles, de ports, d'hôtels et de routes, sans évaluation préalable des impacts sur l'environnement unique de l'archipel de Socotra et de sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. À la suite de ces nouvelles, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a envoyé un courrier à l'État partie, le 13 février 2017, pour vérifier ces informations mais n'a pas reçu de réponse. Une mission de suivi réactif Centre du patrimoine mondial sur l'archipel de Socotra au Yémen est souhaitable dès que la situation sécuritaire le permet.

The **Representative of IUCN** had no additional comments to add.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Liban** demande des clarifications suite aux informations obtenues par le Centre. En même temps que des informations ont été reçues à propos de projets de développement des villes, des ports, des hôtels, une autre information, donné par GOPHSY (l'Organisation générale pour la protection des villes historiques au Yémen) fait lieu de sa préoccupation au sujet d'opérations militaires au sein du bien, or comment peut-il y avoir d'un côté des grands projets de développement touristique, et de l'autre côté, des opérations militaires ?

Le Secretariat reconnaît que GOPHSY a fait état d'opérations militaires ou de la présence d'infrastructures militaires. Malgré qu'il soit difficile de vérifier ces informations, il semble qu'en effet ces projets d'infrastructures militaires et d'exploitations touristiques existent en parallèle. Il remarque ne pas avoir eu de réponse à sa lettre. La gouvernance au Yémen est presque inexistante aujourd'hui, et ces actions se passent sans que le bureau puisse vérifier ou dialoguer avec les parties prenantes responsables.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Portugal** remarque aussi l'implausibilité de l'existence simultanée d'opérations militaires, d'infrastructures touristiques et d'infrastructures pour l'aide humanitaire. Elle insiste sur l'importance d'obtenir des informations viable et de demander à l'État partie des clarifications sur la situation, avec pour but de pouvoir envoyer une mission.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** remarked that the Committee was witnessing another tragedy for a World Heritage site, adding that it wished to demonstrate its solidarity and urged the international community to provide the necessary assistance in such unusual geopolitical circumstances.

La **Délégation du Liban** souligne qu'avant qu'une mission est lieu il faudrait savoir si les conditions de sécurité le permettent car il semble que l'accès à Socotra par Aden est moins compliquée que dans d'autres villes du Yémen. La délégation demande au Centre si il a des informations sur les conditions de sécurité dans la région à Aden ou à Socotra.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to respond to the questions.

Mme Nada Al-Hassan remarque que même avant le conflit il n'était pas possible de se rendre à Sana'a. En revanche, Socotra est accessible par l'intermédiaire du PNUD et le bureau de l'UNESCO à Doha est en contact quotidien avec le PNUD, et ils envisagent de quelle manière ils pourraient accéder à Socotra avec des avions militaires de l'ONU parce qu'il n'est pas question de s'y rendre comme simples passagers. Pour compléter le rapport, le Secrétariat souligne qu'en l'absence de gouvernement la situation n'est pas claire, et espère pouvoir clarifier la situation au plus vite possible.

La **Représentant de l'IUCN** remarque qu'en ce qu'il concerne l'accessibilité de Socotra, l'IUCN suit l'avis sécuritaire des Nations Unies, et donc dès que cet avis est positif, elle pourra joindre une telle mission.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.23 adopted.

ASIA PACIFIC

The Sundarbans (Bangladesh)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11411)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.25](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/11411)

The **Chairperson** invited Turkey to explain the reason in opening the report on the Sundarbans.

The **Delegation of Turkey** proposed to open discussion on the Sundarbans so as to address the inconsistencies found in the analysis and the conclusions of the World Heritage Committee and the IUCN with the report submitted by Bangladesh, specifically on the topics of strategic Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) to ensure adequate freshwater flow into the Sundarbans ecosystem, as well as mitigation possibilities. Firstly, in its report the State Party explained that regular dredging is beneficial for the Sundarbans for improving the freshwater flow into the property by reducing siltation, improving water equality and decreasing salinity in and around the property. The State Party also stated that EIA studies have been conducted by the Mongla Port Authority to dredge the Passur Channel and that all issues of environmental impacts had been considered, whereas the World Heritage Centre/IUCN conclusions regretted that the EIA for the dredging of the Passur River had not been updated as requested by the Committee. Thus, it was necessary to reconcile the two

opposing views on the EIA. Secondly, the State Party agreed to carry out a comprehensive EIA for the South-West region of Bangladesh, including the Sundarbans in accordance with the previous decision of the Committee. However, it was not clear why the World Heritage Centre/IUCN conclusions deny the State Party sufficient time to complete the SEA, as required by the Committee's previous decision and insisted that the State Party take pre-emptive measures by halting all infrastructure development work in the area without seeing the results of the SEA. Thirdly, ensuring freshwater flow into the Sundarbans is a key recommendation of the Reactive Monitoring Mission to sustain the ecosystem of this natural site. The State Party had provided detailed information on how it is currently managing freshwater flow into the property as well as the measures underway to improve the freshwater flow. Given the fact that the entire river system of Bangladesh is dependent on the upper riparian countries for water flow all year around, the State Party needs to be given sufficient time to address this complex issue. Finally, the Reactive Monitoring Mission conclusion is that the Rampal Power Plant has a higher likelihood for impacts on the property arising from air and water pollution, and thus the project should be relocated, while the State Party had provided details on a wide range of mitigation measures. Last, but not least, the delegation wished to commend the efforts by Bangladesh to stop Phase II of the Rampal project and the Orion project, in line with the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. It believed that the constructive comments from them, especially on the management system in the Passur River and the mitigation of certain impacts would further ameliorate the draft proposal. In addition, very fruitful discussions with the State Party, Finland and IUCN had been conducted on this matter.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Liban** soutient la proposition de la Turquie.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that the Sundarbans mangrove forest is a spectacular ecosystem that not only provides habitat for a number of endangered species but also provides invaluable ecosystem services for the people of Bangladesh, while protecting the coast line from climate change induced threats, such as sea level rise and storms. In addition, millions of people rely on the Sundarbans ecosystem for their livelihoods, including fishing. The State of conservation report and many scientific reports demonstrate the threats posed by the proposed coal fire plant, as well as other activities such as river traffic. However, Finland took note of consultations held with the Bangladesh delegation, IUCN and the Secretariat, as well as Turkey and other Committee Members and was thus willing to go along with the consensus, even if it would have preferred the original decision text. Nevertheless, it had some minor suggestions for the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** joined Turkey to commend Bangladesh for taking important steps to address the concerns of this Committee, urging Bangladesh to undertake a strategic EIA for the South-West region of Bangladesh that includes the property and any industrial development where the OUV is at the core.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** urged the State Party not to approve the plans of the power plant, though it welcomed the effort of the State Party to start working on an ecological monitoring system for future consideration and the restoration of its territory. It also welcomed the approval of the strategic plan on oil and gas production. The delegation supported the position by Turkey.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** commended the Advisory Body on its report on the State of conservation of the Sundarbans mangrove ecosystem and for the comprehensive information provided. As a developing country, Indonesia understood that necessary steps should be taken in order to adjust to urban development and it commended the Government of Bangladesh for its efforts in keeping the balance between conservation and urban development. The delegation was of the understanding that Bangladesh had taken several steps recommended by the Advisory Body to maintain the property in its required state for inscription on the World Heritage List. These steps include both technical and cultural

aspects, such as collaborating with India, ensuring any construction work is within an approved distance of the property, restoring ecological integrity, and putting into place independent monitoring mechanisms. Taking into account the intentions of the State Party to protect and conserve the property, it was appropriate to allow the State Party to provide further explanation on the measures taken and be given the floor to do so.

The **Delegation of Portugal** remarked on the tensions between conservation, protection and economic development. Concerning the Sundarbans, the challenge was to strike a balance between social and economic development where the needs of the population have to be factored into any decision, while the protection of the ecosystem was indispensable for sustainable development. In the case of the construction of the Rampal power plant for instance, while acknowledging the potential negative impacts for the Sundarbans World Heritage site, the delegation believed that Bangladesh and its citizens must have adequate access to electricity to meet the needs of a growing population. Furthermore, this project would also provide direct and indirect employment for the communities living along the edge of the Sundarbans. Nevertheless, the delegation urged the State Party to use the best available mitigation measures for oversight in the Rampal power project and to rigorously and independently monitor the environmental impacts of the plant and continuously evaluate the effectiveness of the measures undertaken. The delegation sympathized with the position expressed by Turkey and other colleagues.

The **Delegation of Angola** concurred that this property was one of the cases where a tricky balance had to be struck between economic development and biodiversity conservation, particularly in a developing country where development is needed to alleviate poverty and provide access to energy and employment. The delegation recognized that the State Party had done some tremendous work in addressing some of the issues proposed by the Advisory Bodies. The fact that two projects had been cancelled showed the State Party's willingness to maintain that balance. Nevertheless, the delegation recognized the need for mitigation measures to be implemented, while noting that a strategic EIA would be undertaken, adding that the different aspects affecting the region should also be taken into consideration in environmental and social management plans, and developed and implemented with the monitoring processes. The delegation also aligned with the proposal made by Turkey.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended Bangladesh for the efforts made in retaining the OUV of the property and for implementing the recommendations of the 2016 Reactive Monitoring Mission. The delegation was aware of the unique low-lying geographic position of Bangladesh, which necessitates dredging, and it commended the State Party for measures taken to stop infrastructure development, especially the Rampal power plant. It also noted and supported the observations made by Angola on the conflict that often arises between development and the need for sustainable development in a poor country. It supported the recommendation by Turkey.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** also aligned with the statement by Angola, which was supported by Zimbabwe.

The **Representative of IUCN** was also grateful for the opportunity to speak with the Minister and senior officials present at the session, but also to have been invited to join Members of the Committee in seeking to find a consensus ahead of the debate. The IUCN very much welcomed the States Party's decision to undertake a strategic EIA for the South-West region of Bangladesh that includes the area where this property is located. A key point of principle in terms of the relationship between environmental assessments and development was to avoid preemption in the way developments proceed, which was also assessed by the strategic EIA. Another point of clarification concerned the point first raised by Turkey on dredging in the Passur River. The State Party had stated to IUCN that there was currently no active dredging proposal, while also confirming its commitment that any further dredging would require a specific assessment of impacts on the OUV of the property in addition to the general

assessments. It was thus a commitment that the Committee should welcome. IUCN further noted that the mission to the site in March 2016 concluded that the property currently did not meet the requirements for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, but there were an important number of issues that were mentioned in relation to freshwater flows, including the large-scale developments in the vicinity of the property and the integrated management requirements and issues related to shipping that require urgent implementation to prevent damage to the OUV of this property.

The **Chairperson** invited Bangladesh to speak.

The **Delegation of Bangladesh** thanked the Members of the Committee, IUCN and other delegates for their important and significant observations on how to live in harmony with nature while promoting economic development. It took note of these observations and agreed that Bangladesh would have to work hard to improve the lives of ordinary people, including in the heritage area. It understood that it had to strike a balance and find a pathway between sustainable development and economic development so as to provide energy for the ordinary people of Bangladesh whose lives would be transformed with access to electricity. The delegation reiterated its thanks for the observations, adding that it stood by its commitment to carry out the strategic environmental assessment and introduce any needed mitigation measures to preserve the Sundarbans; a source of pride and the soul of Bangladesh. The delegation looked forward to continuous engagement with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN in its commitment to the Sundarbans as a World Heritage site and its commitment to economic development for the ordinary people of Bangladesh.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that an amendment had been received from Turkey and Finland. Paragraphs 1 and 2 remained changed. The original paragraph 3 was now divided. The first part would become a modified paragraph 3, while the second part would become a new paragraph 4 with a slight modification. The original paragraph 4 would now become paragraph 5 with very slight modifications. Original paragraph 5 would become paragraph 6 with very slight modifications. Paragraph 6 would become paragraph 7. Paragraph 7 would become paragraph 8, which was amended by Finland [in the latter part of the paragraph] and would read, 'requests furthermore the State Party to put in place a management system for shipping to minimize negative impacts on the property, including from associated activities such as dredging'. Original paragraph 8 would become a new paragraph 9. The second part was deleted, but the first part would read, 'Reiterates its request to the State Party to undertake the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) for any future dredging of the Passur River to include an assessment of impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, as requested by the Committee'. Paragraph 9 would become the new paragraph 10, with two options. The first comes from Turkey, which would read, 'Also notes of the mission's concerns about the likely environmental impacts of the Rampal coal-fire power plant on the property and requests furthermore the State Party to ensure that these impacts are comprehensively assessed as part of the SEA and adequate technological measures are put in place to mitigate this impacts'. Finland sought to maintain the original paragraph 9 that would become paragraph 10, which would read, 'and put in place adequate measures to mitigate this impact in order to avoid damage to the outstanding universal value to the property'. The original paragraph 10 would become paragraph 11 with a modification proposed by Turkey, which would read, 'Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2018, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019'.

The **Delegation of Finland** wished to provide a clarification in paragraph 10, adding that although it supported the amendments by Turkey it wished to maintain, 'arising from air and water pollution, a substantial increase in shipping and dredging, and additional removal of

freshwater from an already increasing saline environment'. The delegation added that this would provide more clarity.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–10 were duly adopted.

The **Delegation of Turkey** wished to appreciate the proposal by Finland.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.25 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Representative of the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)** remarked that her organization had worked with the Government of Bangladesh and other local partners for more than 10 years to help ensure the long-term protection of freshwater dolphins by collaborating with local fishing communities, conducting range wide assessment of populations, and working with the State Party to establish new protected areas. The WCS had recently supported the implementation of SMART, a conservation approach and software tool to improve wildlife and law enforcement monitoring within the Sundarbans. The WCS noted that the threats to wildlife, part of the OUV for which the site was inscribed, may be even greater from poaching and unsustainable destructive fishing practices than from some of the development issues discussed. The WCS called for a coordinated and holistic management approach, including effective monitoring and enforcement that address these threats alongside the issues related to development. The WCS recommended that the Government of Bangladesh ensure that Rampal, and other industrial projects in the immediate area, provide sustainable employment for the landless poor living along the edge of the Sundarbans who are engaged currently in illegal or unsustainable resource use practices. It also recommended for consideration the establishment of a trust fund by the financiers of industrial development along the banks of the Passur River to support training for the landless poor to obtain entry-level jobs in developing industries, and to support wildlife enforcement and monitoring patrols in the Sundarbans conducted by the forest department. The WCF looked forward to working in cooperation with the State Party on the conservation of this important site.

Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park (Viet Nam)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.33](#)

The **Chairperson** invited the Republic of Korea to explain the reason in opening the report on Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** asked to open this report as it wished to propose a small amendment to paragraph 5 of the draft decision on the state of conservation of the property. The delegation explained that based on the new additional information provided by the State Party, it understood that Viet Nam had no intention to build a cable car system, either in Son Doong Cave or providing access to it. With this new information the State Party has concerted with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. The delegation thus wished to propose an amendment reflecting this agreement and wished to hear from both the State Party and IUCN, if required.

The World Heritage Centre, confirmed that since the distribution of the working document, the State Party had submitted additional information on 16 June in which it was confirmed that the Quang Binh Province had no intention to build a cable car system in Son Doong Cave.

The **Representative of IUCN** thanked Viet Nam for having provided the additional information and for its clarifications during the session. IUCN confirmed that there was no

intention to go ahead with the cable car project. However, IUCN also confirmed – in conversations with the State Party – that some proponents of cable car projects would undertake some research, even though neither central nor local government approved it. The Reactive Monitoring Mission mentioned in the draft decision was therefore still relevant, and Viet Nam confirmed that it would welcome the mission.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegations of Indonesia, Portugal, the Philippines, Turkey and Cuba** supported the amendment by the Republic of Korea.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment received from the Republic of Korea concerning paragraph 5, which would read, 'Reiterates its concern about proposals to construct a cable car to provide access to the Son Doong cave within the property, and takes note of the confirmation of the State Party that it has no intention to build a cable car system, either in Son Doong Cave, or providing access to it'. The remaining paragraphs remained unchanged.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraphs 1–9 duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.33 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** expressed thanks to the Committee for adopting the decision with the amendment based on its new statement.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to read the list of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the Asia-Pacific region for which the reports were *proposed for adoption without discussion*.

The Secretariat read out the list of reports of natural properties: Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154), South China Karst (China) (N 1248bis), Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083bis), Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338), Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955), Shiretoko (Japan) (N 1193), Chitwan National Park (Nepal) (N 284) and Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590rev).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7B.24, 41 COM 7B.26, 41 COM 7B.27, 41 COM 7B.28, 41 COM 7B.29, 41 COM 7B.30, 41 COM 7B.31 and 41 COM 7B.32 adopted.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Former Chief Scientist of the Australian Institute of Marine Science**, Mr John Veron, spoke about the Great Barrier Reef and how it had been a privilege in his life to have identified and named one fifth of the world's coral reefs species. It had also been a tragedy to realize that no one living today would witness the majesty of coral reefs as he had experienced. In the two years since the Committee last examined the Great Barrier Reef, 49 per cent of its corals have died due to global mass coral bleaching events, which is the most visible evidence of climate change. There is no doubt that in the past two years the OUV of the Great Barrier Reef has been severely diminished. He commended the work of IUCN, UNESCO and this Committee in securing in recent years significant outcomes to build the resilience of the Reef. This year's draft decision should be supported. The World Heritage Centre rightly identified that implementing strong laws in the Reef's catchment that clean up farm water pollution and stop excessive tree clearing was vital. But sadly, the last two years have shown that the impacts of climate change were vastly outpacing local management efforts. Climate change is a global phenomenon and every country must do its fair share to keep the global temperature rise to below 1.5°C. However, Australia was not close to doing its fair share. If all countries made the same level of effort as Australia in reducing emissions, global temperature would rise by 2–4°C by the end of the century. This would kill all reef corals worldwide. Australia also actively supported a proposal to develop one of the world's largest coalmines next to the Great Barrier Reef. To be a true custodian of this global

treasure, Mr Veron urged the Committee to call on Australia to dramatically lift its level of ambition to reduce carbon pollution and to halt support for dirty fossil fuel development.

The **Delegation of Australia** thanked Poland for its excellent hosting of this meeting and to the people of Krakow for their warm hospitality. The Government welcomed the Committee's decision on the Great Barrier Reef, which recognized Australia's significant efforts and investment in implementing Australia's 2050 Plan, as endorsed by the Committee with unanimous acclaim at its 39th session in Bonn in 2015. The assessment by the Advisory Bodies found that the inception of the Plan had been effective and the necessary investment framework was in place. Australia recognized that this was just the beginning, albeit a positive one, and there was much work to be done over which it had direct influence, and chief among them the quality of water entering the Reef from river systems along the Great Barrier Reef coast. Australia strongly recognized that climate change is the single greatest threat facing the Reef, which was impacting in devastating ways as seen with mass coral bleaching event affecting coral reefs the world over. Australia was resolute in its commitment to collective global action on climate change through the Paris Agreement made under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and would seek the opportunity to say more on this subject when the discussion returns under agenda item 7. The delegation assured the Committee that there was no endeavour more important to Australia than safeguarding the Great Barrier Reef, this jewel in the crown of World Heritage.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the next item.

MIXED PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The **Chairperson** noted that no mixed properties in this region had been proposed for discussion. He therefore invited the Secretariat to cite the sole property for which the report is proposed for *adoption without discussion*.

The **Secretariat** cited the report: Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid region (the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) (C/N 99ter).

The **Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.34 adopted.**

The **Chairperson** noted an NGO Observer wishing to speak.

A **Representative of the NGO Ohrid SOS Citizen Initiative** thanked the Reactive Monitoring Mission for its investigation of threats to the Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid region (The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), adding that its recommendations were well considered. Nonetheless, the Representative drew the Committee's attention to two very important aspects: the Studenchtishte wetland and the A3 express highway. The Studenchtishte is the last remaining important wetland on the shores of Lake Ohrid. It not only supports the local people and the world's unique lake ecosystem by filtering water, it also contains the river's biodiversity. Recent plans to urbanize the area have been halted for the moment, but meaningful protection for the entire wetland had still not been designated. Unless recommendations are made, urbanization plans would start at some time in the future. Secondly, although the draft decision 41 COM 7B.34 is right to recommend permanent consultation for subsegments (a) and (e) of the A3 express highway, the NGO strongly urged a total abandonment of the remaining section of the road. The key concern was not only the ecological impact of the road itself, expressed through the destruction and fragmentation of the habitat and alteration of the landscape, but also because of the incremental urbanization that would likely accompany it. Development is often poorly planned in the Ohrid region, and wastewater and solid waste systems were also inadequate. Under the current circumstances, a new built road and further development were unlikely to deliver sustainable outcomes for the OUV of the Ohrid region.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the next item.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The **Chairperson** noted that no mixed properties in this region had been proposed for discussion. He therefore invited the Secretariat to cite the properties for which the report is proposed for *adoption without discussion*.

The Secretariat cited the reports: Blue and John Crow Mountains (Jamaica) (C/N 1356rev) and Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7B.35 and 41 COM 7B.36 adopted.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that 19 SOC reports had been covered during the day, which meant that there were 12 reports remaining.

The Secretariat presented a number of side events for the evening, including the Frontiers of the Roman Empire Thematic Study presented [by ICOMOS], an event, Perspectives and Challenges of Transboundary Cooperation in World Heritage organized by the German Commission for UNESCO, an event organized by the National Heritage Board of Poland and Europa Nostra called, For a Structured Dialogue with Civil Society, and another event organized by the Turkish National Commission and a number of other Turkish authorities and institutions on Kizilirmak Wetland and Bird Sanctuary.

The **Chairperson** remarked that NGOs would be grateful for the delegations' active participation at the meeting 'For a Structured Dialogue with Civil Society on World Heritage'.

[Close of afternoon session]

FOURTH DAY – Thursday 6 July 2017

SEVENTH SESSION

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE [Continuation.]

The **Chairperson** welcomed the Committee and turned to agenda item 7B, inviting Zimbabwe to explain the reason for opening the report on Ngorongoro Conservation Area.

MIXED PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.39](#)

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** explained that the draft decision had some misconceptions with regard to the upgrading of the Lodoare Road. In the past the Committee had given the State Party permission to harden the road because of tourism pressure and the different vehicles on the road, which was the subject of Decision [39 COM 7B.34](#) in Bonn, as well as in Doha and Saint Petersburg [Decision [36 COM 7B.35](#)]. These decisions requested the State Party to look into options for hardening the road in order to address the overuse of the road and the associated negative environmental impacts. The State Party had undertaken the feasibility studies required and meetings had been held with the Advisory Bodies and consultants to discuss the recommendations of the study. The delegation found that the draft decision requesting to put on hold the upgrade of the Southern Bypass was dealing with a matter that was not related to the hardening of the road, adding that these two roads were different. Thus, it proposed a draft amendment to the decision that clarified the two roads and their differences.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to respond.

The World Heritage Centre, explained that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body had been liaising closely with the State Party on the state of conservation to discuss the various conservation and development projects that were planned at the property. The World Heritage Centre even organized a meeting with the Tanzanian Authority and the Advisory Body in February 2017 to specifically discuss the project to upgrade the Loadare Gate to Golini Main Road and the access road to Olduvai museum from gravel to a hardened standard within the property. Other projects under discussion included the re-excavation of the Laetoli footprints, the Laetoli Hominid Footprints Museum and associated facilities to these facilities, and the airport to develop a general management plan for the property. In light of the combined complexity of this project, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies considered that further progress to this project should await the findings and the recommendation of the proposed Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to which both the State Party and the Advisory Body had reached an agreement (in a joint meeting in the last two days) on the time in which that mission could be conducted.

The **Representative of IUCN** confirmed that the Advisory Bodies had had a meeting with the State Party at the present session to discuss this very issue, and IUCN thanked the State

Party for requesting that meeting. As far as the Loadare Gate to Golini Road was concerned, it was understood that the condition of this road was very poor and required an urgent solution, and indeed the Committee at its 36th session had requested the State Party to assess options for hardening this road. Moreover, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre had received an EIA for the upgrading of this road. However, IUCN was concerned that the assessment of impacts on the neighbouring Serengeti National Park World Heritage Site had not yet been undertaken in the form of a comprehensive EIA, and the proposed upgrading of the road may have implications for its use that were currently not fully understood. This included the risk of increasing traffic with associated impacts, such as the risk of increased wildlife mortality in road accidents, and some of these risks were also identified in the EIA that was submitted by the State Party. IUCN therefore advised a mission to look into these concerns more closely. The Advisory Bodies were ready to cooperate with the State Party to ensure that such a mission could be organized quickly.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** also expressed its appreciation for the useful meeting with the State Party. As IUCN already indicated, there had been discussions in the past about the options for hardening the Lodoare to Golini Road. There are in fact two issues. One is the service of the road and the second is how the road is used. In past discussions and recommendations of the Committee, there had been requests to understand the relationship between upgrading the Southern Bypass and the use of the Lodoare-Golini Road. It is this interlinkage that the Advisory Bodies would like to see more clearly set out. If the road is hardened, then clearly there would be an increase in traffic, certainly for tourist traffic, and perhaps for other traffic as well. Thus, the implications of the hardening of the road also needed to be set out and discussed. In the helpful meeting with the State Party, the possibility of an early mission was discussed, as that could facilitate earlier dialogue on these issues. Both IUCN and ICOMOS would be very willing to do all it could to send a mission as quickly as possible.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** asked the Chairperson to allow the State Party to respond.

The **Delegation of Portugal** noted the comments by the representatives of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and took note of the very constructive and useful discussions that had taken place with the State Party. However, it also understood the concern raised by Zimbabwe. The delegation therefore proposed to hear the State Party on this matter, and to have the draft decision projected on the screen so as to clearly see the modifications proposed.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** commended the efforts by the State Party to adhere to the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in their endeavours to protect the property, adding that it was important to recognize its dedication to working out viable solutions to protect its heritage. In addition, providing a Southern Bypass Road could be an alternative to ease traffic pressure within the property. The delegation hoped that the EIA and HIA [heritage impact assessment] could be conducted in a productive manner with regard to archaeological site protection and recovery of the downstream wetlands. The delegation sought from the State Party details of the study and research of the cultural and archaeological attributes and its progress, adding that the State Party should address the issues of the livelihood of the communities and increasing tourism pressure continuously and holistically. It had no doubt of the State Party's dedication to carry on with their continued efforts.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** souhaite également ouvrir la discussion pour permettre à l'État partie de clarifier certains points et plus particulièrement les préoccupations exprimées par les organes consultatifs. La délégation comprend que les organes consultatifs sont disposés à effectuer une mission de terrain afin d'accompagner toujours l'État partie mais souhaite que la coopération se poursuive et appui l'idée de permettre à l'État partie de pouvoir apporter des clarifications pour mieux évaluer les propositions d'amendement qui

seront faites.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** supported Zimbabwe in opening the discussions on this item, and thanked the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for their reports. It also commended the State Party on its efforts, notably those related to achieving zero recorded elephant poaching within the property. The main concerns related to the proposed road improvements and the resulting heavy traffic and increased access for poachers. The delegation encouraged the State Party to invite the Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property. In light of the proposed amendment to the draft decision, indicating additional information and including the submission of a comprehensive ESIA/HIA, Jamaica welcomed hearing directly from the State Party.

The **Delegation of Turkey** also wished to hear from the State Party on the upgrading of the roads as, having heard the general remarks by Zimbabwe, it was convinced of its commitment.

The **Delegation of Peru** agreed that State Party should provide an appropriate explanation.

The **Chairperson** invited United Republic of Tanzania to respond.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** explained that there were clear distinctions between the two roads: the Southern Bypass and the road it wished to upgrade. The upgrading of the Lodoare-Golini Road was an environmental strategy to minimize the existing environmental concerns. This road was almost exclusively used for tourism and there were already limits of use of this road (it is only used 12 hours a day). In addition, the comprehensive engineering was designed to prevent heavy traffic from using this road, so it is not a public road *per se*. Conversely, the Southern Bypass is a public road built by the Government to support the communities living on the western side of the Serengeti. At the moment, transport was complicated as people use a much longer road, so the Government decided to improve this road so that the people living in western Serengeti could easily move from the western Serengeti to central, west and east Tanzania. Thus, the purposes of the two roads were quite different and distinct. The delegation further explained that additional information on the downstream parts had been provided to the Advisory Bodies and it suggested that the Advisory Bodies be asked to explain whether the information they requested was adequate. Regarding the continued use of the current F road, the delegation explained that the impacts were enormous and the consequences of not making a decision now would continue to affect the environment of the property. Thus, it was better that the road is upgraded than to leave it the way it is. The delegation noted that the Advisory Bodies had agreed to come early, adding that it must happen soon as the impacts were enormous.

The **Representative of IUCN** noted the question from the State Party on whether the information submitted on downstream impacts was sufficient, i.e. the downstream impacts affecting the Serengeti National Park. It was noted that the road in question went through Ngorongoro Conservation Area and continued through the Serengeti, so any upgrade of the road would have impacts on the use of the road through the Serengeti. These impacts have not been assessed in the form of a comprehensive HIA but have been assessed as secondary or indirect impacts. IUCN was thus of the view that the impacts on Ngorongoro and Serengeti should be assessed comprehensively and together as direct impacts on both properties rather than indirect impacts on one property resulting from the upgrade of the road through the other property.

On the issue of cultural and archaeological sites, the **Representative of ICOMOS** clarified that if the road is improved there would be slight changes to its alignment, adding that ICOMOS was concerned that – in advance of the work undertaken – there should be a good understanding of the impact on archaeological sites, which would in effect mean providing a survey of the areas affected by the roadworks. At the moment, ICOMOS did not yet have that information. It had lists of known sites but not on the potential impacts of roadworks on the sites.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted amendments by Zimbabwe in three paragraphs. Paragraphs 1–6 remained unchanged. A new paragraph 7 would now read, 'Takes note of the strategy and the ongoing efforts in the construction of the southern Serengeti-Ngorongoro by-pass road to cater for public and commercial transportation'. Paragraph 8 would read, 'Commends the efforts being undertaken by the State Party to currently regulate the passage of heavy commercial vehicles on the Loduare gate to Golini road and further welcomes the steps accomplished so far towards hardening of this road for improvement of visitor experience and conservation purposes in line with Decision 36 COM 7B.35, also acknowledges the submission of comprehensive ESIA/HIA report in this regard, which includes assessments of downstream impacts of opening new borrow pits and restoring wetlands, and of all known cultural/archaeological sites, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines'. A new paragraph 9 would read, 'Also Requests the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property in August 2017, in order to provide advice to the State Party on the conservation of the additional set of footprints discovered at the Laetoli site in 2014, proposed Laetoli Hominid Footprints Museum, and monitor progress on the road upgrade project and proposed tourist developments as well as review progress in balancing conservation, livelihood and development needs'.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Angola** supported the draft decision proposed by Zimbabwe, adding that it was happy the way it had been restructured in terms of the need for additional comprehensive studies and the HIA. It took note of the comments by IUCN in terms of the downstream impacts, and it hoped that these impacts would also be covered in the proposed document.

The Delegations of **Kuwait** and **Turkey** supported the proposal by Zimbabwe.

The **Delegation of Portugal** joined in supporting the amendments. With regard to paragraph 7, the delegation remarked that it took note of the remarks by Tanzania and it hoped that due care would be taken regarding the concerns expressed.

The **Delegation of Peru** understood that the amendments proposed did not prevent the State Party from taking into account the concerns flagged by ICOMOS and IUCN, adding that the new draft decision by Zimbabwe should conceptually deal with the State Party's obligations. With that in mind, the delegation supported the proposed amendments.

Noting the urgency, the **Delegation of Jamaica** hoped that the mission could be facilitated as proposed in August 2017. It too supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Croatia** supported the amended decision, adding that this was a very good example of how things could be solved, which should be similarly applied in further cases.

The **Delegations of Cuba** and the **Republic of Korea** also supported the draft decision.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Bodies to confirm the date of the mission.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** confirmed that it would do its best to organize the mission in August 2017, as requested. With regard to paragraph 7, which 'takes note of the strategy and the ongoing efforts in the construction [...]', the Representative remarked that ICOMOS was not aware of having received a strategy, and suggested that there was perhaps a misunderstanding.

The **Chairperson** invited Tanzania to respond to the comment.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** remarked that in previous decisions, the Advisory Body mixed up the purposes of the Southern bypass and the road it intended to upgrade when it sought to halt the road upgrade. It thus clarified that there was in fact

another road being built in the southern part of Ngorongoro that would help solve the problems, and hence why it wished to upgrade this road. Paragraph 7 therefore recognized that improvement [to the southern Serengeti-Ngorongoro by-pass road] had nothing to do with the road it intended to upgrade.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision paragraph-by-paragraph, with paragraphs 1–12 duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.39 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to cite the mixed properties in the Africa region for which the reports were proposed for adoption without discussion.

The Secretariat read out the list of mixed properties: Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda (Gabon) (C/N 1147rev), and Maloti-Drakensberg Park (Lesotho, South Africa) (C/N 985bis).

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.37 and 41 COM 7B.38 adopted.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE/NORTH AMERICA

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties in Europe and North America that were open for discussion.

Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.42](#)

Le Secretariat présente le rapport qui fait lieu des préoccupations concernant les effets négatifs potentiels sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien de projets de développement de grande ampleur, à savoir : le projet « Club de patinage de Vienne – Hôtel Intercontinental – Salle de concert de Vienne » ; les projets dans le secteur de Karlsplatz, c'est-à-dire d'importantes modifications du Musée de Vienne et du bâtiment Winthertur ; ainsi que le cadre juridique inadéquat de contrôle de la planification et des développements s'appliquant au bien, comme cela a été discuté des deux dernières sessions du Comité en 2015 et 2016. Suite à la réception par le secrétariat du rapport de l'État partie sur l'état de conservation du bien, l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial ont demandé des informations visuelles sur ces projets. Les visualisations soumises par l'État partie ainsi que l'évaluation d'impact sur le patrimoine reçu pour le projet « Club de patinage de Vienne – Hôtel Intercontinental – Salle de concert de Vienne » ont été évaluées par l'organisme consultatif ICOMOS et prises en compte dans l'analyse et les conclusions présentées dans le rapport sur l'état de conservation. Une résolution faite le 5 mai 2017 par le Conseil municipal de Vienne qui spécifiait que les mesures de planification urbaine prises pour l'évaluation du centre-ville dans le futur ne devront pas compromettre l'authenticité du bien, et que les bâtiments de grande hauteur ainsi que les ajouts ne seront pas autorisés dans le 1^{er} district municipal, dit « Innere Stadt », ont aussi été pris en compte. L'État partie a néanmoins spécifié que cette résolution ne s'applique pas à la zone couverte par le plan directeur pour le glacis, zone dans laquelle se situe le projet « Club de patinage de Vienne – Hôtel Intercontinental – Salle de concert de Vienne ». Le Centre du patrimoine mondial continue de recevoir de nombreuses lettres de la société civile qui font part de leurs inquiétudes aux égard des projets de développement qui peuvent avoir un impact sur l'intégrité visuelle du bien Centre historique de Vienne. Le projet de décision présenté pour

examen pour les membres du Comité propose d'inscrire le bien sur la liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that the scale of urban developments, including new high-rise buildings in the Historic Centre of Vienna, which would be allowed under current development controls had reached a critical level threatening the property's authenticity, integrity and OUV. Planning provisions and guidelines adopted by the Vienna City Council, particularly the High-Rise Concept 2014 allowed for a significant increase in the building height and density within the property and its buffer zone. These provisions allowed for developments of a location, form and style that is inconsistent with the historic-built form that would also affect the historic cityscape when observed from distant views. A recently approved development is a watershed moment for the historic city of Vienna, and ultimately the authenticity, integrity and OUV of the property. The Vienna Ice-Skating Club–Intercontinental Hotel–Vienna Konzerthaus development would affect both the close urban context and the more distant vistas towards the Vienna Historic Centre from the Belvedere Gardens, and would further exacerbate accumulated impacts beyond the threshold at which the OUV of this property would be irreversibly affected. The changes made to this development since it was last considered by the Committee were insufficient to comply with the 2015 mission recommendations and the 2016 Committee decision. The minimal reduction of height by only 8.7 metres, i.e. from 75 metres to just 66.3 metres, and the amended footprint of the residential component were negligible compared to the total project height, the number of storeys, and the building volume. The City Council of Vienna had now actually passed the necessary resolution to create the legal basis for this development to proceed. Other current projects may also affect the OUV of the property, including those mentioned by the World Heritage Centre, such as proposed changes to two buildings in the Karlsplatz-area, the Wien Museum and the de Winterthur Building. In addition, there continued to be a fundamental problem with the planning framework for the property. Therefore, to protect the OUV of the property, it was essential and urgent not only to stop the Vienna Ice-Skating Club–Intercontinental Hotel–Vienna Konzerthaus development from being built, but also, and particularly, to change the planning documents and guidelines that enabled this highly inappropriate project to be conceived and developed. At the previous session of the Committee, it was noted that changes to the planning controls were urgent to prevent other inappropriate development proposals. As the World Heritage Centre observed in early May, the Vienna City Council also passed a resolution seeking to limit high-rise development within the property, but this resolution did not cover areas outside the first municipal district, the Innere Stadt, i.e. this resolution did not even cover the full extent of the inscribed property. This resolution did not reverse the existing high-rise approvals and could simply be reversed by another resolution of the City Council at any time. Despite previous indications that the problematic planning controls would be addressed, there had been no substantive action taken to repeal or amend them. These controls present a potential danger to the OUV of the property within the meaning of paragraph 179 (b) of the Operational Guidelines.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

Connaissant bien l'histoire de ce bien, la **Délégation du Liban** souhaite intervenir sur ce dossier. Il a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 2001 où il était défini dans la décision d'inscription des nécessités de contrôle strict des hauteurs et des volumétries autour du bien, de façon à protéger la valeur universelle et exceptionnelle du bien. Un an plus tard le projet Wien-Mitte propose de construire des gratte-ciels et des bâtiments de grande hauteur. Le Comité, conformément à la Convention, a menacé de retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial, du fait qu'il soit clair dans la Convention que lorsque des règles qui définies au moment de l'inscription sont enfreintes, le Comité peut retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Après des négociations, le projet a été abaissé laissant place tout de même à une tour, bien que réduite. Suite à cela, une discussion a eu lieu à l'intérieur du Comité, entre la ville de Vienne et les responsables du patrimoine, concernant un

colloque qui a approuvé le mémorandum de Vienne, le « [Vienna Memorandum](#) » qui a donné des recommandations pour la protection du patrimoine urbain concernant les bâtiments de grande hauteur, ce qui a commencé le processus qui a abouti au HUL [Historic Urban Landscape], c'est-à-dire à l'approbation par la Conférence générale de la recommandation sur les paysages urbains historiques. Le délégué regrette la situation, qui est un retour en arrière, et souligne que le problème ne concerne pas juste le Club de patinage et l'hôtel Intercontinental mais remet en question la conception même de la VUE d'un bien, comment le protéger, comment assurer la protection de son authenticité et de son intégrité. Il insiste à ce que le Comité lance un appel clair au conseil municipal de Vienne que cette situation ne peut pas continuer et qu'il en va de la crédibilité du Comité et de l'UNESCO globalement, et souligne que l'Autriche a les ressources nécessaires, et que le Comité doit envoyer un message clair.

The **Chairperson** thanked Lebanon for this very broad context of Vienna, reminding the Committee of the Vienna Memorandum that served as a certain catalyst to to Historic Urban Landscape ([HUL](#)) recommendation of UNESCO of 2011.

The **Delegation of Finland** recalled that this case had been extensively discussed during the last session of the Committee. The Historic Centre of Vienna has a special place when addressing matters on Historic Urban Landscape, as pointed out by Lebanon, which also comes with a certain amount of responsibility. Despite the State Party's attempt to resolve the situation, the fact remained that problems keep emerging and thus a strong message was needed from the Committee to arrive at a sustainable solution to the situation. Finland supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Portugal** echoed the remarks by Lebanon, adding that it was indeed a very frustrating issue that went far beyond Vienna in that it affected a number of structural and strategic dimensions of the Convention. The delegation regretted that the City Council of Vienna had not addressed the serious concerns that had been clearly identified over the years. Since 2001, the Committee had repeatedly recommended the State Party to undertake the necessary measures to review the height and volume of new developments in the city. Sixteen years have passed and the Committee was still discussing the same issues regardless of the Committee's decisions and its recommendations from the various missions to the property. Not only was there an obvious contempt for this Committee's decisions, as noted in some of the arguments put forward [by the State Party], but they were of little credibility and even quite ridiculous. For example, the stated justification of the height and the volume of the complex of the Vienna Ice-Skating Club, the Hotel and the Konzerthaus as something that would enhance Vienna as a capital of music. Regrettably, because Vienna is and should stay a beautiful city, the delegation agreed with others to inscribe the property on the Danger List in the hope that this would finally help the concerned entities in Austria and the State Party to seriously commit to this issue and address the challenge in an appropriate and effective way.

The **Delegation of Poland** remarked that large investment pressure in Vienna had caused changes in the historic substance and structure of the city in a process that had lasted for years, ever since its inscription on the World Heritage List in 2001. This was recently strengthened by the weakening of special planning rules in this beautiful city. Poland also regretted that the State Party had problems in implementing the decisions of the Reactive Monitoring Mission and Committee decisions. Changes had already taken place in the city structure and those that are were planned in the near future would seriously deteriorate its architectural coherence. The weakening of special planning rules in Vienna posed an even more serious threat to town-planning on the OUV of the site. The delegation hoped that listing on the World Heritage List in Danger would help solve the difficult and complex investment issues of the Historic Centre of Vienna. It stressed that the planned investments and lack of town-planning would visibly affect the OUV and not only the Historic City Centre of Vienna but also probably the wider context of palaces and gardens of Schönbrunn, the second World Heritage site in Vienna. It was hoped that danger listing could help the State

Party develop new tools to guide the development process towards sustainable development. The delegation supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Croatia** supported the draft decision and agreed with Lebanon's remarks. However, it wished to raise the question of terminology and categories of endangered monuments. As noted in earlier cases, sites in danger were, first of all, sites where bombs explode and where people purposely destroy the sites with hammers. The delegation did not feel that this category applied to Vienna nor that the sudden change of skyline considerably endangered the site. The delegation went further to say that Vienna was first endangered when it built the Stephansdom, much oversized for its time. Moreover, it was the decision-makers of the site who were against the stakeholders and the NGOs, who paradoxically elected those same policy-makers. The delegation agreed with the proposed decision but urged the Committee to have a discussion on the terminology used so as to introduce different sub-categories in the future, adding that putting all contexts on the same List made it less effective for those affected by wars for example.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** noted that the State Party's non-compliance with the requests outlined in its decisions from the 40th session concerning the lack of change in existing planning controls was unacceptable and it therefore supported the draft decision in the hope that the State Party takes action as an opportunity to rescue the OUV of the site.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** shared the sentiment already expressed by other delegates, as it was indeed a very unfortunate situation. It noted the many threats to the OUV of the site, as well as the State Party's non-commitment to the decisions of the Committee, including a number of requests from the Advisory Bodies on what should be done. The delegation took note of the decision to place the site on the Danger List, adding that from a technical point of view it wished to know which corrective measures were being put in place and indeed whether they would be implemented. The delegation wondered whether the Danger List was being considered from a procedural point of view, and it agreed with Croatia about the need to present other means in trying to solve such problems. It thus suggested to defer this decision so that the Advisory Bodies could work with the State Party, or without the State Party, in order to determine the corrective measures. If these corrective measures were not implementable, then the Committee should take a decision to de-list the property entirely.

The **Delegation of Peru** supported the draft decision, noting that the Committee Members and Advisory Bodies had already spoken at length about the situation regarding the site's urbanistic or architectural structure and modifications, and real or potential threats to its authenticity. It was further noted that the draft decision was sufficiently clear as to the reasons for putting the site on the Danger List. Nevertheless, the delegation wished to add that the Convention conferred to the Committee its standard-setting task in that it was responsible for implementing the provisions contained in the Convention. This clearly delineated the Committee's scope of work and mandate, and, according to the Convention, the Danger List is comprised of properties that face real or potential threats to their conservation, authenticity or integrity when the actions of the State Party were clearly insufficient to solve those problems. For this reason, the Committee was empowered to adopt the decision to place this site on the Danger List. So, whatever the reasons were for accepting the OUV of a property, the Committee must take responsibility when the management of the State Party had proven insufficient to conserve the property, which was indeed the case here.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** supported the draft decision and expressed the hope that through this very strong message, efforts would be re-doubled to preserve the importance and beauty of the Historic Centre of Vienna.

La **Délégation du Liban** revient sur l'intervention de Croatie sur la différence des sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril si bien que des sites comme Alep est bien différent qu'un comme celui de Vienne, mais pointe que c'est une bonne chose que des sites

aux conditions plus « normale » soit aussi inscrits pour protéger la valeur de ces biens. Elle répond à l'intervention de la Tanzanie sur les bénéfices concrets d'être inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en rappelant qu'en 2002, lorsque le Comité du patrimoine mondial s'est saisi du cas de Vienne et a demandé de façon forte que le projet de Wien-Mitte soit revu, celui-ci a été revu, malgré que le conseil municipal ait déjà approuver du projet, pour assurer qu'il respect d'avantage la valeur universelle du bien. Ainsi, un message fort obligerait la réévaluation de l'ensemble des règles concernant les bâtiments de grande hauteur pour la ville de Vienne, de façon à mieux protéger la valeur universelle du bien.

Noting no further speakers, the **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Bodies to take the floor.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** wished to respond to the comments by Croatia, adding that it was true that there were different circumstances and reasons for adding a property to the List of World Heritage in Danger. Many of the horrendous circumstances that had been discussed earlier in this session relate to ascertained danger under paragraph 179 (a) of the Operational Guidelines. The Operational Guidelines provide the framework in which the Advisory Bodies provide their advice in relation to the subject property, and in this case, its advice was actually under paragraph 179 (b); it is a potential danger and it is specifically caused by the continuing presence and operation of the relevant statutory provisions and guidelines that allow such developments. In relation to the intervention by Tanzania, the Representative explained that firstly the draft decision provided a process for setting out the desired state of conservation and it would need to engage very specifically with matters such as the location, form and style of developments that were allowed, while noting that the existing provisions were not consistent with the OUV of the property. Moreover, it was a position of the Committee last year that there should be engagement between the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the State Party, which had in fact occurred. However, the reality is that only negligible changes had been made to the worst of the approved developments, and the relevant controls and guidelines had not been changed, and hence the draft decision that proposed danger listing under paragraph 179 (b).

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.42 adopted to inscribe the Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Delegation of Austria** stated that efforts had been made to raise awareness on the requirement of World Heritage and to advise the legal and administrative authorities of the Historic Centre of Vienna. As Austria is a Federal Republic, all provisions related to building legislation, urban development and townscape protection fell within sole legal competence of the local authorities. He therefore presented the representative of the Viennese municipality.

The **Representative of the City Government**, Mr Rudolf Zunke, as a citizen of Vienna and site manager spoke of his pride in the Historic Centre of Vienna. He was thus surprised by the draft decision for two reasons. Firstly, the City of Vienna reacted to last year's Committee decision and revised the so-called Ice-Skating project regarding the height of the building and its footprint, both of which were reduced. Secondly, it reacted to the Committee's Decision in Istanbul in 2016, in that the highest political body in Vienna, the Vienna City Council, decided that the entire core and buffer zone would be an exclusion zone for high-rise buildings. This decision was dated 1 June 2017 and was binding at the utmost, highest legal level. Thus, the High-Rise Concept and the Master Plan were overruled. This decision of the highest political body was not sufficiently considered in the draft decision. Mr Zunke therefore appealed to the Committee to rethink and revise this draft decision, adding that Vienna should not be placed on the Danger List. He added that the Viennese were proud of their World Heritage and he was convinced that a common solution could be found that would achieve the balance between development and protection. Placing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger would not help achieve this goal.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers.

The **President of Blue Shield Austria**, Ms Ursula Schweiger-Stenzel, drew the Committee's attention to the fact that on 1 June 2017 the majority of the city parliament decided on the landuse and development plan, allowing it to build a high-rise building in combination with the new construction of the Hotel Intercontinental on the former ground of the ice-skating area in Vienna. They did so in full awareness that this project contravened the World Heritage Convention, which Austria signed in 1992, and in full knowledge that it did not comply with the obligations that the City of Vienna took in 2001 [year of inscription on the World Heritage List] that included the first district zone of World Heritage. As a member of the city government, Ms Schweiger-Stenzel was astonished at the argument brought forward by the senior officer of the city government, adding that the resolution was not worth the paper it was printed on. She appealed to the Committee not to bow to this argument and to stick to its principles because there was more at stake than the World Heritage area in Vienna. There was the credibility of UNESCO and the credibility of World Heritage at stake. For this reason, Vienna should be placed on the Danger List as a warning signal against any violation of World Heritage wherever it is violated.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the decision had been taken.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** wished to respond to the comments made by Croatia, Lebanon and Peru, and the interesting question raised by Croatia of potentially subdividing the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Director remarked that the drafters of the Convention had already foreseen serious and specific dangers to World Heritage in Article 11.4 on the List of World Heritage in Danger. For example, large-scale public or private projects was mentioned alongside armed conflict. The Committee was thus placing sites under such threats under one single list, which is the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** invited Ms Anna Sidorenko, Programme Specialist at the Europe and North America Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to present the next report.

Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.49](#)

Mme Anna Sidorenko rapporte sur l'état de conservation du bien Ensemble historique culturel et naturel des îles Solovetsky (Fédération de Russie) et présente les facteurs menaçant le bien, qui se résument de la manière suivante. La majeure partie du régime hydrologique de l'archipel a été négligée et la pratique traditionnelle de régulation de l'eau a été perdue, conduisant à des modifications dramatiques du paysage. Une importante pression due au développement s'exerce sur l'île principale, sans que l'impact cumulatif général soit apprécié et sans que les cadres de planification nécessaires soient mis en place. Le rapport souligne que des progrès ont été réalisés par l'État partie qui a publié un décret portant à la création d'un groupe de travail pour classer l'archipel et les territoires voisins en tant qu'objet du patrimoine culturel d'importance fédérale, notamment au titre de sites religieux et historiques. Le rapport recommande au Comité de demander à l'État partie d'inviter une mission conjointe de suivi réactif Centre du patrimoine mondial/ICOMOS pour examiner l'état de conservation du bien. Compte tenu de la vulnérabilité de l'environnement de l'archipel, il est également recommandé qu'un représentant de l'UICN participe à la mission. Depuis la publication du rapport, le Centre a reçu, en juin 2017, les informations émanant de l'État partie concernant des plans révisés pour le bâtiment de l'ensemble muséal. L'ensemble de la documentation a été soumis pour examen à l'ICOMOS qui va présenter les résultats de l'évaluation technique des informations reçues de la part de l'État partie.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that the large monastery on the main island of

the Solovetsky archipelago had in recent years been revived as a national pilgrim centre, attracting significant numbers of pilgrims. The landscape around it has been shaped by monastic activities since the 15th century, particularly by monastic groups, and by a complex irrigation system of canals and lakes. Although the development strategy for the Solovetsky archipelago recognized it as a unique site of spiritual, historical, cultural and natural heritage and, although significant efforts had been made to address the recommendations of the last Reactive Monitoring Mission, significant gaps still remain. The islands have three distinct communities: the monastic brethren, pilgrims and other visitors, and the local communities, all with different, and at times competing needs. The management plan did not yet fully reflect the complexity of the overall cultural landscape and there was pressure to upgrade housing and other facilities on the island through the construction of an airport, blocks of flats for residents, a new hospital and a new school. Aspirations are to some extent ahead of the planning tools, as the Master Plan and the Development Plan are not yet aligned. The Management Plan did not take a landscape approach and the proposed new constructions were being considered one-by-one rather than through a coordinated approach to the overall development of the islands. Given the particular sensitivity of this remote archipelago, an urgent issue was to determine the carrying capacity of the islands in terms of their ability to absorb development without compromising their sense of spirituality, remoteness and beauty, as well as their nature conservation interest. One specific conservation issue that remained to be resolved was the proposal for a new museum, for which construction started without the approval of this Committee. Work had been halted and there were plans to reconfigure the structure built so far. Given the sensitivity of its location, which is inter-visible with the main building of the monastery, the recommendation before the Committee was to consider a more appropriate location and design. A Reactive Monitoring Mission was proposed to allow discussion and consideration of all these issues and, in particular, the long-term vision for the archipelago and how its management and planning systems could be made more effective.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** informed the Committee that it had that submitted a small amendment, explaining that since the new revised plan for the Museum Complex of the Solovetsky Islands ensemble, as well its Heritage Impact Assessment for the updated project of the Museum Complex of the OUV recently submitted and confirmed by the World Heritage Centre, it decided not to conclude on this issue at this stage and to submit the recent amendment to paragraph 8 of the draft decision. The delegation further explained that it was expedient to wait for the results of the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, as well as the progress report of the State Party to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2017.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** commended the effort and progress made by the State Party to address the Decision by the Committee, such as the amendment to the Master Plan and the Management Plan with the Arkhangelsk Region developing a roadmap for implementation in 2017 and 2018. The State Party also revised the plan for the Museum building that was submitted to ICOMOS for review, and it was ready to invite a joint Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property. The delegation thus shared the view that more time should be given to the State Party to carry out its conservation commitment, as well as more time for ICOMOS to review the submitted revised plan. With this in mind, it supported the draft amendment proposed by Kazakhstan.

The **Delegation of Finland** commended the State Party on the progress made on the development of the Master Plan. There were, however, plenty of issues that needed to be addressed, namely, the challenges with the monastic irrigation system and several development projects. Interestingly, many of the construction projects were connected to tourism facilities and museum buildings, something this property has in common with the upcoming well-prepared nomination of the Assumption Cathedral of the town-island of Sviyazhsk recommended for inscription. It seemed that the State Party of Russia and

ICOMOS had somewhat different perspectives regarding these museum and tourist development issues. The delegation was of the view that these issues could be resolved through dialogue between the two parties. It encouraged the State Party to invite the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** congratulated and commended the State Party for the work done on a body of issues, even though there were still a lot of challenges and problems that might threaten the property. In the analysis of the Advisory Body, it was noted that the monastic irrigation of the archipelago had been neglected for more than a century. The recommendation now is to see whether the State Party could come up with a well-defined plan to implement the resources needed so that measures are taken. This property was clearly in danger and the Committee was now being informed of those dangers and threats. The delegation suggested that ICOMOS, as advisor to the Committee but also to the State Party, in its role in the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission should work with the State Party on the corrective measures so as to support the site now as it was already in danger. The corrective measures could then be presented to the Committee so that funding opportunities be sought to support the property in line with paragraphs 183–189 of the Operational Guidelines.

The **Delegation of Portugal** carefully noted the concerns raised by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, as well as several delegations. It was also of the understanding that there had been an evolution in terms of some important aspects, for instance, a revised plan for the museum has been submitted and was being discussed with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. The delegation therefore suggested that the State Party be given an opportunity to explain its precise intentions regarding this issue.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that the Solovetsky Islands comprise a group of islands within the Solovetsky archipelago whose extent made conservation and management work more complicated. In this context, Turkey acknowledged the State Party for its response to some of the Committee's decisions. For example, some of the steps taken by the State Party since the last Committee session included the progress made on the Master Plan and the Management Plan, as well as the classification of the archipelago and adjoining territories as cultural heritage objects of federal significance, i.e. religious and historical sites. It was also notable that Heritage Impact Assessments would be undertaken for all major projects. Furthermore, development projects in the Solovetsky Islands and the negative condition of the monastic irrigation system were deemed priority issues that needed to be taken into account in the conservation planning of this site. A more appropriate design and location for the museum building was also required. Concerning the complexity of the site, Turkey believed that the State Party would follow-up on the Committee's recommendations and would continue to enhance the state of conservation of the property.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** also commended the measures taken by the State Party to protect the site, namely, through the Master Plan and the Management Plan. It also further encouraged the State Party to continue its work on the Heritage Impact Assessment for which it had given its assurances. The delegation also welcomed the decision of the Russian Federation to invite a Joint World Heritage/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to the site. All these measures show the readiness and the commitment of the Russian Federation to follow-up on all the recommendations of the Committee. It thus supported Kazakhstan's amendments to the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Croatia** welcomed efforts by the State Party in revitalizing the whole ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands. Aware that it takes time to fulfil the requests of the Committee, it encouraged the State Party to continue in this direction, and it commended the changes, for example, in the project of the museum. It was hoped that the monitoring mission could help in avoiding potential mistakes in the process. It also supported Kazakhstan's amendments to the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Poland** congratulated the State Party for working on its retrospective

statement of OUV that was to be adopted in the present session. It also strongly supported the request to invite a Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property, as there was an urgent need for long-term conservation plan for the whole site. The state of conservation of the hydrological region of the archipelago was not sufficient and the neglected hydrological system may have an irreversible influence on the attributes of the property in a longer perspective. The delegation also recognized the urgent need to better conserve the pilgrimage path and vernacular architecture as part of the site. It thus encouraged the State Party to re-analyse new investments in the archipelago.

La **Délégation du Liban** souhaite entendre le représentant de la Fédération de Russie expliquer l'évolution de leur proposition pour améliorer la situation dans le site de Soletsky.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** constate avec satisfaction les efforts faits par l'État partie pour appliquer et se conformer aux recommandations du Comité, et rejoint les autres délégations pour demander à l'État partie de rendre compte de ses efforts pour appliquer les recommandations du Comité.

The **Chairperson** invited the Russian Federation to respond.

The **Delegation of the Russian Federation** took the opportunity to thank the Polish hosts for their hospitality and excellent organization. Concerning the measures taken by the State Party to meet the concerns and recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, the delegation explained that the museum was needed in order to separate the religious and the museological parts of this complex, which was necessary for normal monastic life. In addition, space was needed to exhibit the large number of articles from the period when the monastery was a prison camp, as described by many authors, including Nobel Laureate, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn. Recently, the delegation submitted to the World Heritage Centre a revised plan for the construction of this museum and its impact assessment on the OUV of the site. In order to meet the ICOMOS recommendations, the goal was to conceal the main part of the museum in the landscape by means of substantially lowering the level of the aboveground part of the building; thereby minimizing the impact to its visual integrity. For this purpose, the already-built first and second floor structures would be dismantled. The delegation informed the Committee that all construction work had now stopped and it was ready to continue its consultations with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS on the implementation of this project, as well as on other substantial issues. It had already invited a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to examine the project. The delegation hoped that the Committee would support and encourage the joint efforts to achieve the best possible practical solutions.

The **Delegation of Cuba** took note of responses from the State Party regarding some of the concerns expressed in the draft decision, as well as the other comments made by Members of the Committee. The delegation believed that the State Party had shown commitment to resolve the problems and therefore it supported the modification to draft decision put forward by Kazakhstan.

The **Delegation of Portugal** also noted the remarks made by the Russian Federation and it commended the State Party for its serious efforts to address the Committee's concerns, including the important matter of the museum construction, and also for the invitation already extended for a Reactive Monitoring Mission. It encouraged all the stakeholders to proceed on this encouraging path and it looked forward to see the draft proposal by Kazakhstan in the new paragraph 8.

The **Delegation of Peru** was also grateful for the updated version of the report and it welcomed the efforts made by the State Party in terms of implementing the recommendations made by the Committee in preserving the ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands heritage. Indeed, this is a property that is not easy to manage with some complex issues for the State Party to resolve, but the State Party had shown that it had the will and commitment, and a very constructive attitude, towards these issues. Following the intervention by the Russian Federation, the delegation wished to focus on the museum

aspect, notably, the need for the museum to actually exist and become a reality. The delegation explained that this was about preserving the linkages between the intangible aspects of this element, such as some of the religious practices carried out at the monastery [and the tangible aspects of the museum]. Indeed, the delegation believed that this could set a good precedent for similar cases. In addition, the will of the Russian Federation to try and restructure the plans of the building for this museum, above all, by looking at the size of the museum so that it did not affect the physical landscape of the islands demonstrated its determination to find a solution. Indeed, the State Party had clearly taken into account ICOMOS' recommendations in reducing the size of the museum by scaling down the construction works. The delegation therefore believed that the State Party's constructive and positive attitude was very compatible with what was needed for this property.

La **Délégation du Liban** soutient les amendements proposés par le Kazakhstan et espère qu'un mémorial à Alexandr Solzhenitsyn puisse un jour être érigé.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended the State Party for its efforts to address the recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies and particularly for scaling down the construction of the main museum. It supported the proposals by Kazakhstan on the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** congratulated the Russian Federation on their continuous consultation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies and for its serious efforts to protect the OUV of the site. It understood the need to celebrate the intangible aspects of the site and it supported the request of the Joint Mission, as well as the amendments made by Kazakhstan.

The **Delegation of Turkey** congratulated the State Party and supported Kazakhstan's proposal.

Après avoir entendu les propos de l'État partie, la **Délégation de la Tunisie** apporte son soutien au projet d'amendement.

With no further comments, The **Chairperson** gave the Russian Federation the floor.

The **Delegation of the Russian Federation** thanked the Committee for its deep understanding of the problems faced in the preservation of the Solovetsky Islands, and for its encouragement in continuing the joint efforts, consultations and exchanges with the Advisory Bodies in order to find the best possible solutions. The delegation stressed however that the problems facing the Solovetsky Islands were not solely reduced to the museum and these concerns were reflected in the draft decision. It was nevertheless ready to consult with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre to adequately address these issues.

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to respond.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** welcomed the collaboration with the State Party that had taken place over the past few months, first at the end of 2016 when new proposals for the Museum Complex were put forward, and again more recently when a second set of different proposals were presented, as well as the proposals and their accompanying documents on HIAs, for review. ICOMOS fully supported the idea of a museum building to house the monastic archives and collections, as well as to present all aspects of the islands to tourists. The issue was the scale of the building, its location and design. However, ICOMOS believed that there was good collaboration with the State Party to take these matters forward. The issue of the museum and other issues identified in the State of conservation report would all be discussed at the Reactive Monitoring Mission for which it was optimistic that the collaboration would produce fruitful results.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Kazakhstan, Tunisia and Cuba. There was a slight modification in paragraph 8. The first part of the paragraph remained unchanged, which read, 'Noting that new revised plans have been submitted for the Museum Complex', but the

second part was modified, and would now read, 'recognizes the efforts taken by State Party to implement the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies on the Museum Complex project and requests the State Party [...]'. The last part remained unchanged, 'to report progress to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2017, for review by the Advisory Bodies'.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–11 were duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.49 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to cite the culture properties located in the Europe and North America region for which the reports were proposed for adoption without discussion.

The Secretariat cited the following: Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569bis), Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784), Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217), Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708), Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066), Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrásy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400bis), Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C 829), Venice and its lagoon (Italy) (C 394), Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape (Turkey) (C 1488), Ephesus (Turkey) (C 1018rev), Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356), Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527bis), Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1215), Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey including Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis), Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 373bis) and The Forth Bridge (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1485).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7B.40, 41 COM 7B.41, 41 COM 7B.43, 41 COM 7B.44, 41 COM 7B.45, 41 COM 7B.46, 41 COM 7B.47, 41 COM 7B.48, 41 COM 7B.50, 41 COM 7B.51, 41 COM 7B.52, 41 COM 7B.53, 41 COM 7B.54, 41 COM 7B.55, 41 COM 7B.56, and 41 COM 7B.57 adopted.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Representative from Earthjustice** (a public interest, environmental law organization in the United States), Ms Jessica Lawrence, spoke on behalf of 22 cultural and conservation organizations, wishing to alert the Committee to a new, urgent threat facing Papahānaumokuākea World Heritage site. It is one of the largest marine protected areas in the world, covering over 300,000 square kilometres of ocean, islands and reefs, northwest of the main Hawaiian archipelago. It has deep significance for native Hawaiians and is home to over 7,000 marine species. When it was added to the World Heritage List in 2010, the Committee noted that threats to the site included exploration and mining, commercial fishing, anchor damage and vessel strikes. Unfortunately, recent actions by President Trump had brought these threats closer to reality. Two month ago [May 2017], President Trump ordered a review of all US national monuments with the intention of weakening or completely removing their protected status. In ordering the review, the President called national monument designations an abusive practice that created barriers to achieving energy independence and otherwise curtail economic growth. With respect to the designation of national marine sanctuaries, including Papahānaumokuākea, he expressed concern for the loss of potential energy and mineral exploration and production. Therefore, removing the site's national monument status would also open up the site to commercial fishing and would devastate the endangered monk seals and many other species. This loss of monument status would remove the very legal protections necessary to preserve the site's OUV. She urged the Committee to put the United States on notice that removing these legal protections could warrant the addition of the site to the List of World Heritage in Danger as early as

2018.

The **Chairperson** remarked that his major task was not to politicize the Committee meeting.

A Representative for the Forum for the Protection of the Values of Gjirokastra (Albania), Mr Kreshnik Merxhani, spoke on behalf of the Forum of Gjirokastra, a group of intellectuals and professionals, among them Prof. Emin Riza Eminarisa, the name behind the nomination files of Gjirokastra and Berat. The Forum fully supported the recommendations of the draft decision and encouraged its adoption. However, it was highly concerned about the continuing loss of cultural monuments in Gjirokastra through the lack of conservation efforts and policy for the conservation and management of the town. The Forum was also concerned with the continuing failure of the State Party to comply with the Decision of the World Heritage Committee, and with entirely insufficient financial and human resources allocated to resolve the city's problems. The Forum asked the Committee to request the State Party to permanently stop the bypass road project, to undertake a comparative study of traffic flows and mobility needs in the town, and to present alternative plans to keep the historical bazaar free of vehicles. These plans should be examined by the Committee and its Advisory Bodies, and request that the State Party rescinds its decision to de-list more than 240 category second monuments and instead develop a plan in consultation with ICOMOS and ICCROM for their restoration, authorizing the Secretariat, in accordance with Article 176 (a) of the Operational Guidelines, to take the necessary actions in consultation with the State Party and stakeholders to present conditions of the property, the dangers to the property, and the adequate restoration of the property.

The **Delegation of Ukraine** was very grateful for the attention that the World Heritage Centre and the Committee was giving to the preservation of the World Heritage properties in Ukraine, and it recognized its responsibility and was making maximum efforts to ensure the appropriate level of conservation. Nevertheless, the Government was facing daily pressure and it was grateful to the World Heritage Centre for not leaving Ukraine to address these issues alone and for providing competent and comprehensive assistance. Since the 40th session, Ukraine had made considerable progress in finalizing the draft management plan for the property [Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra]. Due to the consultative assistance of ICOMOS, the document was significantly improved and completed. Also, Ukraine had revised the boundaries and regimes of the property's buffer zone in order to strengthen the protection of the property. Amendments to the national legislation, concerning the protection of the World Heritage properties and the implementation of the Convention's provisions, were also prepared. It considered that this Committee's Decision was balanced, but was also a challenge for the State Party requiring a lot of effort to implement all the recommendations within the next two years. Nevertheless, Ukraine had already begun to do so, but it still needed the consultative assistance of the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, and Members of the Committee, and it looked forward to their support.

A Representative of NGO Initiative for St. Andrew's Passage (Ukraine), Ms Iryna Nikiforova, wished to inform the Committee that following its Decision, and in cooperation with the City authorities, they succeeded in reducing the height of a building in the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral. She underlined that the most problematic and current issue in the buffer zone of Saint Sophia Cathedral was the construction of a ten-storey building. The building with two-level underground parking had a strong negative impact on the OUV of the property and had destroyed the surrounding architectural ensemble of the buffer zone of Saint Sophia. The NGO deeply regretted that the item was closed for discussion because a recommendation provided by the Committee would change the situation in Saint Sophia and prevent further illegal construction in the buffer zone. The City authorities and the Mayor of Kyiv fully intended to reduce the height of non-conform buildings, but the construction lobby is quite strong in Ukraine. The NGO requested that the Committee make one amendment to the last paragraph of the Decision in changing the terms of future discussion so that it could be revised at the next session of the Committee. It

was noted that this practice had already taken place in Doha (Qatar) in 2014 when an amendment was made to an already adopted decision.

The **Delegation of the United States of America** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak, as well as to Earthjustice and the other NGOs who continue to monitor and work with the delegation on the protection of national parks and national monuments. At the request of the President, as noted, the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce were conducting a review of national monuments, which are established by the US President on federal land under authorities of law. President Trump had asked the Secretaries to provide recommendations on the designation of 27 monuments in the reviews, including whether any of them should be reduced in size. Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument was being reviewed as part of this process. No other World Heritage sites were being reviewed. The reviews are ongoing and no determinations had yet been reached. It was not clear whether any changes would be made to Papahānaumokuākea. The delegation was committed to the Convention and to ongoing and active dialogue with the NGO community on this and on all other monuments.

A **Representative of World Heritage Watch** (Germany), Mr Stephan Dömpke, on behalf of Citizens Initiative Rheinpassagen wished to address the issue of the Upper Middle Rhine Valley. He explained that the site was in danger because of the expansion of the railway lines from Genoa to Rotterdam with traffic noise from railways and vibrations increasing even more. At least 600 trains would be driven daily through the Middle Rhine Valley. The Middle Rhine Bridge would connect two inter-regional transport networks on each side of the Rhine, which experts confirm is classified as a trans-European Road. The traffic volume and noise from the railways and roads must be significantly reduced and the NGO asked for a strategic transport plan to be developed for the Middle Rhine to improve the living conditions for people on the Middle Rhine. For this reason, plans for the construction of a bridge should be abandoned and ferries should become an integral part of the World Heritage site. The Lorelei Plateau was currently under construction. The re-construction of the Lorelei Open Air Theatre was now widely visible in the Rhine Valley and seriously affecting its integrity. Moreover, a huge hotel with 200 beds was already under construction across an area of 28,000 square metres. The further development of the Lorelei Plateau required special care such that all changes must be in harmony with the landscape. For this reason, construction work on the Lorelei Plateau should be halted until a development plan was prepared and it should include guidelines for appropriate building designs and layout for the long-term future of the site.

The **Delegation of Albania** was very appreciative of the report presented by the Secretariat and it also appreciated the efforts of civil society and NGOs towards the better conservation of the World Heritage property of Gjirokastra. Albania has always worked in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and has kept them informed and consulted on all matters regarding better conservation plans and next steps forward. In this regard, the World Heritage Centre had already been informed that the bypass project had been suspended in order to find a better solution for the immense traffic problem in the centre of the city. The other issue raised, concerning the number of monuments of Gjirokastra, was currently being re-categorized, as suggested by the ICOMOS Monitoring Mission of 2012. Furthermore, the Government of Albania was currently raising funds in order to conserve and protect the monuments that were part of this property. A large amount had already been raised for the project of the Old Bazaar, a project for which the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre were consulted.

A **Representative of civil society of Diyarbakır** (Turkey), Mr Ercan Ayboga, noted that Diyarbakır is the biggest city in the Kurdish southeast of Turkey, but that there was much concern because of the ongoing, systematic destruction of the ancient city, which is part of the site. During the armed conflict between autumn 2015 and March 2016, several hundred buildings had been destroyed. However, by far the largest destruction happened afterwards under State control. More than 2,000 buildings were demolished, which is around one third of

the Suriçi Old City. Under the ongoing blockade, the debris had been excavated without any investigation or rescue. The integrity and authenticity of the streets around 180 historic buildings and monuments had experienced serious damage and destruction. Twenty thousand people were displaced. Recently, the construction of new concrete buildings started in the razed area, which are sold for high prices and had thus changed the demography. Since spring 2017, even in the western part of the Old City, forced displacement had begun. In autumn 2016, the site management at the local municipality, which included civil society, had been forcibly usurped by the Turkish Government. There had been absolutely no dialogue with civil society and no transparency. These points had not been reflected in the Decision just adopted. The Committee did not take the same stand as it did for the Historic City of Shakhrisyabz in Uzbekistan. Mr Ayboga spoke of a double standard. Nevertheless, he hoped that the Committee could discuss the reconstruction of Diyarbakir in 2018.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that the Diyarbakır Fortress and the Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape is one of Turkey's World Heritage sites, which was inscribed at the 39th session of the Committee in Bonn in 2015. The Government throughout the process has invested in and supported the preparation of the file, and the development and implementation of management and conservation areas. Unfortunately, Turkey's towns and provinces, especially bordering Syria and Iraq, have been exposed to violent acts of extremism and terrorism launched from adjacent territories by armed terrorist groups like the PKK and Da'esh. PKK is a terrorist organization engaged in violent acts of terror and perpetrates all kinds of organized crime, targeting the civilian population, public interests, government buildings, security installations and economic infrastructures. They are the cause of more than 40,000 civilian deaths and incalculable physical and economic damage in Turkey. More recently, certain parts of the periphery of Diyarbakır Province, including the first buffer zone of the World Heritage site and the Suriçi neighbourhood, were also among the affected areas. The Government of Turkey had therefore been compelled to introduce measures and conduct security operations in order to restore law and order, and to provide security and safety for its citizens. Any person claiming otherwise cannot convince the Committee. Despite violent terrorist attacks, Turkey's security forces maintained utmost diligence and restraint to prevent collateral damage to life and property. The Government has formed a Commission of Inquiry and deployed technical missions, comprising architects, construction and survey engineers, restorers, archaeologists, museum experts, art historians and urban planners in order to assess damage that may have occurred in buildings and monuments in line with legislation on conservation and heritage sites. The authorities, security forces and experts continue to work on restoring order, a return to normalcy, and introducing rehabilitative measures.

MIXED PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no reports of cultural properties for the region of Latin America and the Caribbean, inviting the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present the list of mixed properties for which the reports were proposed for *adoption without discussion*.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** cited the following: Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445), Churches of Chiloé (Chile) (C 971), Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile) (C 959rev), City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2), Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129), Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panama) (C 790bis), Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis) and Fray Bentos Industrial Landscape (Uruguay) (C 1464).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7B.58, 41 COM 7B.59, 41 COM 7B.60, 41 COM 7B.61, 41 COM 7B.62, 41 COM 7B.63, 41 COM 7B.64, and 41 COM 7B.65 adopted.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties located in the Africa Region and *open for discussion*.

Lower Valley of the Omo (Ethiopia)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.68](#)

The **Chairperson** invited Angola to explain the reason in opening the report on Lower Valley of the Omo (Ethiopia).

The **Delegation of Angola** explained that it understood information had been submitted with regards to the Lower Valley of the Omo (Ethiopia), particularly the approved Heritage Impact Assessment report of the Kuraz Sugar project, a request that was made at the Committee's 40th session. It took the opportunity to commend ICOMOS for the work done so far. With regard to the ICOMOS report on this property, it recommended to include the Lower Valley of Omo on the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Lake Turkana National Parks, which was said to be impractical because of the location of the two different inscriptions in two different State Parties and with different OUVs of these properties. There were also different inscribed criterion. The delegation did not like to see a separate analysis between these two properties, one located in Ethiopia, the Lower Valley of Omo, and the Lake Turkana National Parks, which is located in Kenya. This would of course impact the draft decision as it should be clearly directed to the site and the discussion. Hence, it proposed to delete paragraph 6 of the draft decision, which it believed was not applicable to the subject at hand. The delegation was also aware of the recent submissions made by the State Party, including, as indicated, the HIA on the Lower Valley of Omo, updates on Environmental Impact Assessment on the sugar development project (Kuraz), and the provision of a map that shows the property and development project, and also the distance between the two activities, which the Committee appreciated during its 40th session. Angola also submitted an amendment to reflect the current situation, as well as the efforts undertaken by the State Party in addressing the recommendations from the previous Committee sessions. In its view, Angola believed that the Committee should consider the amendment of the draft decision, and in addition it requested that the World Heritage Centre continue to support the efforts made by Ethiopia, and also requested that Ethiopia continues to work with UNESCO to preserve this World Heritage site. The delegation asked that Ethiopia be given an opportunity to provide additional information and to clarify what additional steps were being made to ensure compliance with the recommendations.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat and ICOMOS to respond to the remarks.

The Secretariat confirmed that the World Heritage Centre received on 12 June [2017] a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the Kuraz Sugar Plantation project from the State Party, and on 17 June [2017] it received an update map on the Kuraz project. However, due to the late submission, it was not possible to take this document into account in the SOC report and hence the draft decision. The Secretariat added that the State Party had been liaising closely with UNESCO and ICOMOS on the implementation of the EU-funded project entitled 'Promoting the Contribution of World Heritage for Sustainable Development', and the World Heritage Centre was enforcing capacity for the protection and conservation of the

paleontological sites in Ethiopia. As previously reported to the Committee, this project was particularly important as one of its objectives was to carry out geo-mapping to establish boundaries for the property and its buffer zone, which should be given clear priority in the project implementation and precede any further advancement of the Kuraz project.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** acknowledged the extra material submitted by the State Party on the HIA and the updated map. ICOMOS noted that the Kuraz project is a very large project that would be undertaken over many years and is extremely expensive. In order to fully understand this project, the best possible documentation was needed, which it had been requesting over the years. Although ICOMOS now has an updated map, it was of the view that it would be valuable to have even further details to fully understand how the project would extend towards the property, and particularly the ancillary infrastructure projects that go with it. As far as the HIA was concerned, ICOMOS required this wide dimension in order to evaluate the HIA. A second problem was that an HIA needed to relate to the World Heritage property and to do that there needed to be some boundaries, however, there was an on-going boundary project that had not yet reached a conclusion such that the boundaries of the project had not been clearly delineated and updated. ICOMOS noted the difficulty of this project for the State Party and ICOMOS, but it hoped that further collaboration would help to resolve some of these not-so-straightforward issues.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the proposal by Angola to amend the draft decision, particularly the deletion of paragraph 6, which joined the Lower Omo Valley property with the transboundary World Heritage property shared with Kenya in the Turkana Valley. The delegation explained that it was difficult for the State Party or the Committee to look at impacts at another property that was not under discussion. If the two properties were under discussion, it would be easier to see the connection between the two. It also supported the Advisory Body in urging the State Party to provide the missing information that was required, but also to commend the working relationship that had been established with the Advisory Body and to urge that this continues more frequently, particularly so that the boundary could be established soon.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** requested that the State Party be given an opportunity to speak, as requested by Angola.

The **Delegation of Portugal** shared the position of Zimbabwe and Tanzania, and it supported Angola's proposal.

The **Delegation of Turkey** supported the efforts by the State Party and the recommendations of Angola. It added that Africa is one of the global priorities of UNESCO and thus the Committee should further encourage the African countries with regard to conservation. The delegation thus recommended the follow-up and an updated report on the state of conservation of the property.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** took note of the developments reported, especially the submission of the HIA for the Kuraz project. Though submitted late, it recognized the efforts of the State Party, which should be acknowledged. The delegation appreciated the close engagement of the State Party with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. Thus, it believed that the Committee should look positively at the amendments submitted by Angola, which it considered very reasonable.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** soutient la proposition de donner la parole à l'État partie, souhaitant qu'il adresse les recommandations faites par l'organisation consultative. Elle soutient aussi la distinction des deux biens, et de se concentrer, dans ce projet de décision, sur la basse vallée de l'Omo.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body for their work, adding that although some work had been conducted by the State Party there was still significant work outstanding, including documentation related to the Kuraz Sugar

Development project and its impact on the OUV of the property. As there was an indication of updated and additional information, Jamaica welcomed hearing from the State Party.

The **Delegation of Croatia** noted the good collaboration with ICOMOS and also wished to hear from the State Party. It suggested further cooperation, and also supported Angola's amendment.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** understood that achieving balance between development and conservation was a very difficult task and it commended the efforts of the State Party in this regard. It understood that the State Party had submitted updated information on the Kuraz project and had begun to address the boundaries and to prepare the HIA requested by the 40th Committee. Concerning the the state of conservation, it supported Angola's proposals.

The **Delegation of Finland** commended the State Party for its progress, and encouraged the State Party to continue its dialogue with the Advisory Body.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Ethiopia to respond.

The **Delegation of Ethiopia** expressed gratitude to the people and Government of Poland for the warm welcome and generous hospitality, and thanked the Committee for recognizing its efforts to conserve Simien Mountains National Park, which was a long-awaited and hard-earned outcome for the people and Government of Ethiopia. The delegation thanked the Committee and its partners for its decision and their support. Heritage conservation issues in Africa and the developing world are still very challenging, but the delegation congratulated Côte d'Ivoire for the Committee's decision to remove the Comoé National Park from the List of World Heritage Sites in Danger. The delegation spoke of the vital role of the Convention to build peace, ensure tolerance, and strengthen fraternity among communities. It also appreciated the contribution of heritage for sustainable development. To this end, Ethiopia has been working with UNESCO and relevant partners for which it expressed thanks for their support in preserving its heritage sites. With regard to the state of conservation of the Lower Valley of Omo, it was noted that the draft decision also mentioned the Lake Turkana National Parks of Kenya, which Ethiopia believed should be specific to the Lower Valley of Omo, which is entirely located in Ethiopia. This was in conformity with the Convention that provides the obligation of the State Party to protect and preserve a heritage in which it is located. On that basis, the draft decision should only refer to Lower Valley of Omo. The delegation also requested the Committee to consider the recently submitted revised Heritage Impact Assessment on the Lower Valley of Omo, the EIA on the Kuraz Sugar project that is underway, and the [updated] map that shows the location and distance between the Lower Valley of the Omo and the Kuraz Sugar project. Regarding the original draft decision's reference to a SIA on the Kuraz project, the delegation clarified that Ethiopia was currently revising the EIA on the Kuraz Sugar project. As the subject of the study concerns a particular project, it should not refer to a SEA but an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Taking this into account, paragraph 7 should only make reference to an EIA. The delegation concluded by wishing the Committee fruitful deliberations and thanked Ms Irina Bokova, the outgoing Director-General of UNESCO, for her outstanding leadership, wishing her all the best in her future endeavours.

The **Delegation of Cuba** supported the modifications made to the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** noted the confirmation by the State Party of the revision of the HIA and the EIA, and thus supported the amendment submitted by Angola.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** supported the proposal by Angola.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Angola. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified, and 'Decision 39 COM 7B.48' and '39th session in Bonn' was deleted. Paragraph 3 had two parts, the first part was deleted, and the second part of the

paragraph would read, 'Reiterates its request to the State Party to provide adequate details of the project, including clear and precise information on the scope and location as well as information on the relocation of pastoral communities, in relation to the property as a matter of urgency and by the 1 December 2017, as requested by the Committee at its 38th and 40th sessions, respectively in 2014 and 2016'. Paragraph 4 remained unchanged. Paragraph 5 was modified, which would read, 'Notes the late submission of the HIA of the Kuraz project', and the following part was deleted, followed by 'requests the State Party to liaise with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in its review to ensure that the HIA is compatible with accepted international standards and with ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties, and that the HIA is based on defined property boundaries and on clear and adequate details of the Kuraz project'. Paragraph 6 was deleted entirely. Paragraph 7 was also proposed for deletion. The previous paragraph 8 would now become paragraph 6, which remained unchanged.

The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

Following the intervention of Ethiopia, the **Delegation of Angola** proposed an amendment to paragraph 7 regarding the ongoing Environmental Impact Assessment.

The **Chairperson** proposed to return to the paragraph after adoption of the preceding paragraphs. He pronounced paragraphs 1 and 2 adopted.

For the sake of clarity, the **Delegation of the Philippines** wished to make an amendment in paragraph 3 with a reference to the project in question, 'the Ethiopian Sugar Development Corporation Project (Kuraz Project)'.

The **Chairperson** noted that Angola agreed, which was adopted. Paragraphs 4–6 were adopted.

With regard to paragraph 7, the **Delegation of Angola** wished to retain some of the original paragraph, which would read, 'Also noting the scale of the ongoing Kuraz project, its potential direct and indirect impacts on the property', and add the following, 'reiterates its request to the State Party to finalize and submit the EIA on the Kuraz project'.

The **Rapporteur** clarified that this amendment should be paragraph 6 not 7.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.68 adopted as amended.

Lamu Old Town (Kenya)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.69](#)

The Secretariat noted that in addition to its state of conservation report dated 7 January [2017], the State Party had submitted a number of documents related to the Lamu Port-South Sudan-Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) corridor project on December 2016, January 2017, April 2017 and May 2017. While appreciating the significant number of exchanges with the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body expressed concern that the various documents did not appear to adequately deal with the World Heritage status of the property nor did they refer to the Heritage Impact Assessment carried out in 2014, as requested by the Committee. Moreover, as the 2012 Reactive Monitoring Mission to Lake Turkana National Parks concluded, the LAPSSET project could also impact Lake Turkana. The Secretariat added that it was important that the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the LAPSSET project take into account all the potential impacts in all World Heritage properties. In addition, it should also be noted that on 29 May 2017 the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party on a third party information regarding the proposed coal plant in the vicinity of the property and encouraged the State Party to submit

the related Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessment to the Centre. The State Party promptly acknowledged receipt of the letter and gave assurances of follow-up.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked on the difficulty in assessing the precise impact of the extensive LAPSSET project, as despite numerous requests by the Committee over several sessions for more detailed documentation the information received was inadequate in scope, unambiguous or not related to the potential impacts on the property. Although in Decision [40 COM 7B.12](#) the Committee noted the State Party's assurance that the project would exclude the Lamu Archipelago, this remained unclear, until it was reassured at a meeting with the State Party during the present session that this was still the case. Nevertheless, although there are no direct impacts, there is still potential for adverse *indirect* impacts. The LAPSSET project has many dimensions, including a new port, a new metropolitan district for workers, a possible tourist resort, a coal plant and connections to the coast. Although ICOMOS knows roughly where these sites would be located, there were no precise details and no specific HIAs, apart from an initial one that was undertaken mainly for the port. ICOMOS understood that the tourist resort was a long-term project, but the coal plant had already been approved in principle, although it is subject to a legal challenge by local communities. It also understood that the LAPSSET project was linked to other infrastructure projects that went beyond Kenya, affecting other members of the East African community and related to roads, pipelines and holiday resorts, including the one mentioned near Lake Turkana. The SIA was seen as an opportunity to have an overview of the LAPSSET project, but the details provided so far indicate that it was not offering a strategic view that covered cultural heritage nor did it relate to the existing HIA. In ICOMOS' view this should be augmented. ICOMOS stressed that it wished to be proactive on this project and be able to engage with the State Party on which aspects of this major, economically important project were benign and which have the potential to impact adversely on the property. To do this, it needed sufficiently detailed information to allow assessments to be made and for these assessments to be based on those undertaken by the State Party. In order to make progress, and following very helpful discussions with the State Party at the present Committee, ICOMOS considered that it would be beneficial for the Reactive Monitoring Mission to be undertaken, as recommended in the draft decision, but that in advance of that, a separate meeting be held to discuss technical details of the LAPSSET project and its links to wider infrastructure and other developments across the region.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** souligne la similitude entre le site de Lamu et les autres sites et villes historiques inscrits comme le Centre historique de Vienne (Autriche) et l'Ensemble historique, culturel et naturel des îles Solovetsky (Fédération de Russie), qui font tous face au défi du développement urbain qui a un impact sur la protection et la gestion de ces sites, qui demandent des mesures correctives urgentes. Bien qu'une partie de la documentation est sollicité par le Centre du Patrimoine Mondial, l'ICCROM et l'ICOMOS ai été envoyé tardivement et présente quelques insuffisances, ces organes consultatifs reconnaissent les efforts déployés par le gouvernement du Kenya en mettant à jour le plan de gestion du site, qui inclus le projet LAPSSET, implique la communauté locale, et un protocole a été signé pour la coordination du projet. L'État partie s'engage à mettre à jour ces informations dès que le cycle de réunions avec les parties prenantes est bouclé. L'Angola demande des éclaircissements sur les liens possibles entre le site de Lamu et celui des Parcs nationaux de la Turkana du fait que certains paragraphes mentionnent les deux sites, pourtant le site qui est en train d'être évalué et celui de Lamu. La délégation note le renforcement de la coopération entre l'État Partie et les organes consultatives pour la mise en place de mesures correctives, et encourage cette collaboration afin de réduire les menaces qui pèsent sur le site et maintenir sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. L'Angola a soumis un amendement au projet de décision mais désire tout d'abord donner la parole à L'État partie.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** recognized the strategic and necessary steps that the State Party had taken between 2004 and 2015, which showed its commitment to preserve the

Lamu Old Town, the oldest and best preserved Swahili settlement in East Africa. The concern was that there appeared to be a gap in the timely submission of reports. As to the adequacy of the information provided, the specific action on the SEA and the HIA needed to be undertaken, and the delegation urged the State Party to demonstrate even greater commitment to preserve and safeguard the heritage of the site by undertaking the assessments and completing the necessary reporting to UNESCO. It also strongly urged the State Party to invite a new Reactive Monitoring Mission to the site. Without this necessary assessment, concerning the overall state of conservation of the site, the property was clearly under potential danger in line with paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines. It welcomed hearing from the State Party.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** also supported that the State Party be given the floor to provide clarification. It noted that this site also concerned the issues of sustainable development and site preservation, and it commended the State Party for its efforts made in terms of the restrictions in place to ensure that developments did not affect the Master Plan of the Island of Lamu. However, it waited to hear more from the State Party on the actions undertaken and urged for more close collaboration with the Advisory Bodies.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** noted the complexity of this site, adding that there were issues of the SEA and the State Party's responsibilities.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** recognized that the growth and the decline of seaports presented significant cultural and economic facets in the East African region, and that this finds its most outstanding expression in Lamu Old Town. The delegation encouraged the State Party to provide sufficient evidence that the impact on the site, the surrounding natural environment, including the buffer zone, and on its people and their cultural identity and traditions would be minimal and manageable. The State Party was also encouraged to invite a joint Reactive Monitoring Mission in this regard.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** note qu'il existe des préoccupations quant aux documents présentés par l'État partie et que ceci ne permettent pas à l'organisation consultative d'évaluer l'impact potentiel du projet sur le bien. Elle désire entendre l'État partie sur les demandes qui ont été faite sur l'établissement d'une évaluation d'impact et d'une mission de suivi réactif.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to respond to the questions.

The **Delegation of Kenya** congratulated the Chairperson on his appointment, and thanked the Government of Poland for its warm welcome. Regarding the perceived lack of updates of the feasibility study for the LAPSSET project, the delegation informed the Committee that the planning process and review is an ongoing activity and may take years to be fully realized. It hoped the Committee would appreciate that the development associated with the LAPSSET and the proposed Lamu Metropolis are located outside the Lamu Island and the official buffer zone of the World Heritage site, i.e. at least 30 kilometers away on the Lamu mainland. However, it recognized that some of the new developments might affect some of the Old Town values. For that reason, the Government of Kenya, in 2016 and 2017, appointed several consultants to undertake specific sectoral plans for the LAPSSET project and associated infrastructure. For example, the County Government of Lamu appointed a consultant to undertake an integrated Lamu Metropolitan Area Structure Plan, which is a detailed planning document for the Lamu Metropolis, a component of the LAPSSET project. The LAPSSET Authority has, in addition, appointed an international consultant to complement the Metropolis Master Plan for the Lamu Port and Investment Framework. Kenya would commit to submitting these reports to the World Heritage Centre as soon as they were ready, ensuring that the heritage issues of the Lamu Old Town property would be factored into the planning. Regarding the LAPSSET draft report, Kenya has agreed to invite the Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM for a technical meeting in Nairobi in December 2017 to further discuss the issues. The delegation also spoke about the issue of the Manda Airport expansion (an extension of the runway) from an upgrade to a bitumen surface. The

makeshift structures of the airport terminal were refurbished to permanent structures of the same scale and volume, and in conformity with Lamu-Swahili architecture. Finally, Kenya assured the Committee of the official relationship between the LAPSSET Corridor Development Authority and Kenya National Museums in which cultural and natural heritage were key considerations in the LAPSSET planning and development process.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** remarked on yet another complex situation, but it noted the many efforts put into the project by the State Party for which it should be commended. However, there were some requests that would not be easy to accomplish. For example, the SEA covered from Lamu Island to Lake Turkana National Parks from the North to the South and would thus involve a lot of expertise and money. The issue of the airstrip could also be a source of pollution and noise. Before considering the Danger List, the delegation asked that the the Advisory Bodies, particularly ICOMOS, begin working on the corrective measures with the State Party so as to clearly see what needed to be done and how, before the situation becomes difficult to manage. The delegation felt that a proactive approach, coupled with preventive measures, could prevent a situation where the property is damaged.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Angola, with 11 paragraphs (instead of the original 12 paragraphs). Paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unchanged. In paragraph 3, the last part of paragraph was deleted. Paragraph 4 had an amendment, which would read, 'Notes that the 2011 Feasibility Study and Master Plan for the LAPSSET project are complete as well as, the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) carried out in 2014 and continues to encourage the State Party to exclude the Lamu Archipelago from LAPSSET developments, and acknowledges that whilst the LAPSSET project is ongoing, the details of the LAPSSET project be submitted to the World Heritage Centre when available'. Paragraph 5 remained unchanged. Paragraph 6 was deleted. Paragraph 7 would become paragraph 6. The original paragraph 8 would become paragraph 7 with no modification. Paragraph 9 would become paragraph 8 with no modification. Paragraph 10 would become Paragraph 9 with 'Lake Turkana National Parks' deleted. Paragraph 11 would become paragraph 10 with a modification, which would read, 'Acknowledges the submission of a draft SEA report and asks the State Party to continue enhancing the mitigation measure to address the identified negative impacts of the project in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines'. Paragraph 12 would now become the new paragraph 11 without modification.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** had an issue with paragraph 9, and would return to it at the time.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and Pparagraphs 1–5 were duly adopted.

Referring to paragraph 4, the **Delegation of Finland** wished to change 'when available' to 'as soon as possible', which was the standard language applied in previous decisions.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** felt it was important to add a timeframe in paragraph 4, as this would assist the State Party, and it asked the Advisory Body if it could suggest a feasible timeframe.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that it needed the plans in advance of the Reactive Monitoring Mission and the technical meeting proposed in Nairobi in December [2017].

The **Delegation of Jamaica** reiterated the importance of having a date so that it was clear to the State Party what was required of them.

The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision and pronounced paragraphs 6–11 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.69 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Representative of Save Lamu**, Ms Khadija Famau, remarked that Lamu Old Town was threatened by two mega-projects: the LAPSSET project, and most recently a proposed 150 megawatt coal power plant just 30 kilometers from the Old Town. In 2014, the Committee expressed deep concern about the likely negative impact of the LAPSSET project. Following the latest UNESCO Decision, a Strategic Environmental Assessment was completed. The NGO's review of the assessment report indicated that it did not provide protection or mitigation for the site. The proposed coal power plant would exponentially increase the negative impact on the Lamu site with the majority of the community against the coal project. Ms Famau urged the Committee to seek protection of the Lamu Old Town from avoidable industrial threats and to ask the State Party to reject the coal power plant or at least to provide details on the mitigation measures for every element of the project that threatened the site, and sadly place Lamu Old Town on the Danger List.

Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add2](#)
Decision: [41 COM 7B.71](#)

The **Chairperson** invited Burkina Faso to explain the reason for opening the report on Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal).

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** demande l'ouverture du point relatif au rapport sur l'état de conservation de l'île de Saint-Louis afin de d'apporter un amendement au paragraphe 6 du projet de décision, et ce que les informations fournies dans le rapport puissent être complétées par l'État partie. L'analyse et les conclusions du Comité, de l'ICOMOS et de l'ICCROM reconnaissent les progrès réalisés par l'État partie en termes d'activités de conservation et de disposition à coopérer. Elle note l'approche participative qui a impliqué les acteurs concernés : l'État, les communautés locales et les partenaires privés. Cette approche participative ainsi que les mesures pratiques, administratives et financières prises par l'État partie dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre des recommandations antérieures du Comité, doivent être saluées. La délégation souhaite que les efforts et progrès enregistrés soient reconnus dans le projet de décision et ainsi que l'État membre se sente encouragé et poursuive ses efforts. Elle estime aussi que le délai de soumission du rapport actualisé proposé le 1^{er} février 2018 dans le projet de décision est trop court pour disposer des avancées significatives qui seront communiquées. Pour ces raisons, elle demande l'ouverture du point et souhaite présenter des amendements conjointement avec le Zimbabwe.

Le Secrétariat note que la mission de 2017 a constaté les préoccupations fortes exprimées par le Comité lors de sa 40^e session en 2016 concernant l'état de dégradation, le manque de restauration et d'entretien de plusieurs bâtiments historiques, la gestion participative du bien, l'intégration des mesures réglementaires, le recrutement d'agents assermentés, le mécanisme de suivi et de contrôle des modifications à une nouvelle construction, le diagnostic des bâtiments publics les plus dégradés, la recherche de financements, le renforcement des capacités et la sensibilisation. Il note des améliorations en termes de gestion de la coordination des acteurs par rapport à 2014 : des outils de collaboration ont été mis en place, le comité de sauvegarde a été élargi, le plan d'action et des projets conjoints ont été mis en valeur. Concernant les modalités de contrôle, suivi et protection, les bases pour un système de suivi efficace ont été mises en place, ceci à travers un processus de consultation de toutes les parties prenantes. Il reste à l'État partie de travailler sur l'opérationnalisation en organisant des réunions systématiques et bien qu'un nombre de ces préoccupations soient progressivement mises en œuvre, la situation globale de plusieurs bâtiments classés ou remarquables sont dans un état de conservation contrasté. Certains

cas de dégradation lentes ont été notés, où certains bâtiments identifiés sains en 2005 sont maintenant considéré en mauvais état. Ce sont les raisons pour lesquelles il est important que la dynamique lancée par le gouvernement et les communautés locales soient soutenue afin de contrecarrer les menaces permanentes qui pèsent sur le bien.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted the progress made in creating management structures to begin an inventory and to recruit an architect-urbanist to help the team. ICOMOS fully appreciated the efforts made to engage civil society and the local communities, and it considered that these measures would take time to have an impact, meanwhile the degradation noted by successive missions was not being systematically addressed in a way that turned the property around. Although there were some areas that had been improved, when one took the property as a whole, the indicators showed it moving in a downward trend. What ICOMOS wished to see is an increased mobilization of resources and efforts to target the crucial areas that would reverse the degradation and turn things around in a positive direction. The thrust of the State of conservation report was to suggest ways in which this could be addressed.

Noting the time, the **Chairperson** suggested to open the list of speakers and continue after lunch.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the reasons for opening the discussion, as presented by Burkina Faso. It recognized the efforts of the State Party to put in place and implement the recommendations from the 2014 Reactive Monitoring Mission, which was just two years ago, adding that restoration takes longer than two years. The delegation mostly commended the State Party for its achievements, including the mobilization of local communities and the private sector for the restoration of the property, the establishment of control, monitoring and protection measures through a long consultation process with all the stakeholders, a distinct improvement in the coordination of stakeholders and other collaborators through the International Partners Forum, and also for having local champions to protect the property. It also wished the Committee to take into account that the restoration efforts have begun but would take time to see the results. The analysis of the Advisory Board noted some improvements but more effort still needed to be done. The delegation wished to encourage the State Party to continue in this endeavor and to implement the remaining recommendations with the support of the local community, as well as the international community, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It therefore did not agree with the statement of intention to put the property on the Danger List as this may reflect lack of confidence in and consideration of the State Party.

La **Délégation du Liban** remarque l'importance particulière du site de Saint-Louis du fait qu'il s'agit d'une opération combinée entre le gouvernement, la mairie et surtout la diaspora et ceci est un exemple à suivre dans des cas pareils. Compte tenu de la disponibilité des autorités sénégalaises, le Liban pense le Comité tenus d'accepter l'amendement proposé par le Burkina Faso et le Zimbabwe.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended the work of the State Party in focusing work towards the conservation and preservation of the Island of Saint-Louis, in particular, the measures taken to safeguard the site. It recognized the State Party's commitment to fulfilling the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre that included the development of a communication strategy, the rehabilitation of heritage structures, and a revival of the management structures, which were all indicative of the level of work the State Party was willing to perform. However, the delegation agreed with previous speakers that the State Party would need time to realize the corrective measures proposed. It therefore encouraged the State Party to continue towards fulfilling corrective measures.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** rejoint la position de autres délégations qui ont demandé à ce que cette décision soit revue plutôt positivement étant donné l'effort consenti et réel qui est fait par l'État partie, notamment en ce qui concerne l'amélioration de la gestion, le début de travaux de restauration et l'engagement de la société civile à aider cette entreprise. Un

intérêt particulier est donné au développement des capacités, et toutes ces directions donne le sens d'une considération sérieuse de ce patrimoine. Par conséquent, la délégation rejoint la position du Burkina Faso, qu'une durée de six mois pour remettre le rapport n'est pas suffisante.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were still a number of Members wishing to speak, and suggested returning to the item on Island of Saint-Louis after lunch to continue the discussion.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that there were three side events, which were displayed on the screens, and that there would be no meeting of the Budget Group because it had finished its work. The Organisation for Islamic Cooperation would also meet during lunch.

[Close of morning session]

FOURTH DAY – Thursday 6 July 2017

EIGHTH SESSION

3.00 p.m. – 7.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE [Continuation.]

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal)

The **Chairperson** opened the session to continue the discussion on Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal), inviting Kuwait to take the floor.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** commended the State Party on the progress made and agreed with the amendments by Zimbabwe and Burkina Faso regarding paragraph 6. It was felt that the original text of paragraph 6 could trigger hesitation and discouragement for future restoration plans and could negatively affect the needed mobilization of the three-year rehabilitation programme, which was expected to reach completion by 2020.

La **Délégation du Portugal** souhaite aller dans le sens de l'amendement de la décision proposée par le Burkina Faso qui encourage l'État partie dans ses efforts, d'ailleurs salué par la délégation. Elle souligne que ce processus prend du temps mais est confiante que le Sénégal continuera dans sa coopération avec le Centre et les organes consultatifs pour restaurer l'état du bien Saint-Louis et assumer ses obligations.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** thanked the State Party for providing further information on the state of conservation of the property and appreciated the steps taken to ensure that the Management Plan was carried out with stakeholder coordination in conformity with regulatory authority guidelines and the Advisory Body recommendations. It also noted the State Party's increased efforts to monitor ground conservation with the instalment of an on-site police unit and the creation of a special committee to issue work permits in the core and buffer zones. The Philippines commended the involvement of local communities and private partners in conservation. Since significant progress had been documented, with the State Party taking concrete action to address threats to the property, and that the Committee would continue its review of the various concerns, as reflected in the draft decision, the delegation supported the amendments presented. It encouraged the State Party to ensure that impacts on the site's OUV and previous factors affecting the property were addressed, and that coordination in the management and governance of the property is facilitated.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** welcomed the efforts undertaken by Senegal in the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee at its 40th session. It also commended the strong mobilization of local communities in the management of the property and the involvement of the private sector that had already set up a fund to support the protection of the heritage. Despite the degradation to some of the historical monuments, the delegation noted the strong commitment of Senegal with regard to the 3-year rehabilitation programme. Thus, it was important to encourage rather than discourage the State Party, and in this regard it supported the Burkina Faso's proposal.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** joined Burkina Faso and other Members supporting the proposal. It commended and welcomed all the efforts taken to date to deal with the problems affecting the property. From a technical point of view, the delegation

commended the Advisory Body for the recommendations made on the way forward in paragraph 5 (a–d) of the draft decision that clearly outlined the steps to be taken when a site is in danger in a very clearly elaborated action plan.

The **Delegation of Finland** commended the State Party on the implemented recommendation with regard to the 2014 Reactive Monitoring Mission, and on improvements in the coordination of stakeholders compared to 2014. In addition, the fact that the Tourism Development programme had been able to raise strong support for rehabilitation from the private sector was an important step forward. Nevertheless, the property remained vulnerable. Finland urged the State Party to continue its effort in improving the management and governance of the property.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** commended the efforts of the State Party and welcomed the involvement of civil society and local committees in conservation. It supported the positive amendment by Burkina Faso to give the State Party time to make progress.

The **Chairperson** invited Senegal to take the floor.

La **Délégation du Sénégal** félicite la Pologne pour son organisation et son accueil. Elle témoigne de son excellente collaboration avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial qui l'accompagne dans ses initiatives, de Saint-Louis à Gorée. Elle félicite les experts de cette mission pour la qualité de leur rapport et recommandations qui ont été adoptés à la feuille de route. La délégation informe le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS que l'une de ses recommandations de recadrage et de relance du programme de développement touristique est en train d'être considérée au travers d'une réunion de concertation à Saint-Louis afin de trouver une solution, ce qui est un des effets positifs de cette mission de suivi réactive. La délégation insiste qu'il n'y a pas de divergences notables avec l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Sa préoccupation principale est que l'État partie puisse être entendu et qu'il soit donné confiance dans son engagement et sa détermination à mettre en œuvre toutes les recommandations qui ont été avancées. Le Sénégal s'engage à continuer de mobiliser les communautés et la société civile, notamment le [secteur] privé, pour relever premièrement les questions les plus urgentes comme la sécurisation des bâtiments en ruines, en attendant que le programme mis en place commence sérieusement à partir de la fin de cette année 2017, pour trois ans. L'État partie remercie les délégués qui l'ont appuyé et qui ont soutenu cet amendement. Il leur assure que lors des prochaines sessions il ne sera pas le cas de revenir sur ce qui a, et ce qui n'a pas été fait à Saint-Louis. Le Sénégal, finalement, demande au Comité d'encourager les initiatives privées au Sénégal, de les encourager et de les encadrer, avec l'aide de la communauté internationale, pour faire de Saint-Louis un exemple du partenariat public-privé pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** appreciated the comments from Tanzania on the idea of setting out clear remedial measures when a site has difficulties or has potential threats so that actions to overcome those threats were clear. The Representative alluded to the case of Lamu, but noted that in this case 'corrective measures' could not be applied because they specifically refer to properties on the Danger List, but remedial measures were clearly something that ICOMOS would strongly support.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Burkina Faso and Zimbabwe to amend paragraph 6 by deleting the last part and changing the date, which would read, 'Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by February 2019, and asks that the report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019'.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** remarked that the date in this case would be the 1 December 2018 for the Committee in July 2019.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** reconnaît les efforts faits par l'État partie et l'ouverture d'une coopération avec les organes consultatifs et le Centre, et appuie le point 6 tel qu'amendé.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.71 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to cite the list of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for *adoption without discussion*.

The Secretariat cited the following: Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323bis), Historic Town of Grand-Bassam (Côte d'Ivoire) (C 1322rev), Osun-Osogbo Sacred Grove (Nigeria) (C 1118) and Fossil Hominid Sites of South Africa (South Africa) (C 915bis).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM.7B.66, 41 COM.7B.67, 41 COM.7B.70 and 41 COM.7B.72 adopted.

ARAB STATES

Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.78](#)

The **Chairperson** invited Tunisia to explain the reason in opening the report on Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt).

La **Délégation de la Tunisie remarque** que l'amendement proposé par la Tunisie s'appuie sur l'accord entre l'État partie, l'ICOMOS et le Centre au sujet de la construction du tunnel pour contourner le problème du trafic, devenu de plus en plus intense autour du monument. La délégation félicite la transparence, l'efficacité et la bonne disposition du l'ICOMOS pour superviser techniquement les travaux, et prend note que l'État partie souhaite commencer les travaux au plus tôt possible en accord avec les organisations consultatives.

The **Chairperson** invited Ms Nada Al-Hassan to present the report.

The Secretariat noted that the State of conservation of Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur in Egypt was examined at the 40th session of the Committee in Istanbul, which addressed, in addition to conservation management issues, a project proposed by the State Party to build a tunnel that would extend five kilometres across the whole width of the property at the north of the Giza Pyramids plateau, as agreed in principle at the 40th session of the Committee in Istanbul. In this regard, the State Party sought a viable traffic solution to protect the property, while addressing the growing development pressures in the Cairo megalopolis. Since the inception of this project almost two years ago, the State Party has engaged with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in regular technical exchanges, as well as an ICOMOS Advisory mission, a mission by the Director of the Centre, and a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Advisory Mission in addition to numerous meetings. Throughout the process, the State Party had steadily sought to follow the requirements of the Convention, its Operational Guidelines and the ICOMOS recommendations as thoroughly as possible. The State Party had advanced considerably in addressing the technical requirements recommended by ICOMOS and was keen to start the construction work as soon as the Heritage Impact Assessment was completed to the satisfaction of the Advisory Bodies, possibly before the next Committee session. In this regard, the request by Tunisia to open this item for discussion aims at providing the Committee with a transparent and full review of the technical review process by ICOMOS in order for the State Party to ensure that when ICOMOS receives the final technical reports and the related Heritage Impact Assessment, and when all technical requirements and guarantees were considered satisfactory for ICOMOS, the State Party could implement the project before the next Committee, if deemed appropriate.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** appreciated the dialogue with the State Party during the development of this tunnel project, including through two missions, and that the State Party had accepted the technical approaches suggested by ICOMOS. This revised decision sets out clearly what had been agreed and what the State Party has said it would deliver for review, as well as any additional recommendations by ICOMOS before the tunnel project is approved. ICOMOS therefore supported this revised decision.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

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

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** found it refreshing to see the Advisory Body, the World Heritage Centre and the State Party in agreement and therefore it supported the revised decision proposed by Tunisia.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** welcomed the engagement of the State Party with the joint technical assistance, as well as the consensus. It supported the amendment by Tunisia.

The **Delegation of Portugal** supported the new draft decision presented by Tunisia, and after hearing from ICOMOS, was happy to note the agreement between the Advisory Bodies and the State Party, as remarked upon by Zimbabwe. It therefore agreed with the proposed revision.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** aligned with the comments made by Zimbabwe and Portugal adding that it was a pleasure to see this full agreement between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body. It therefore supported the change.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that this was an example of good practice that the Committee should take account of in future because everyone was working towards a common goal, which is saving heritage, and was one of the very best examples of how to consensually apply a decision.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** appreciated the consultation between the Advisory Body and the State Party. The measures carried out were an outstanding example of how a State Party could work to ensure economic development and still be in line with the conservation of the property. It therefore supported Tunisia's proposal.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** est ravie de de la collaboration entre les organes consultatifs et le pays et appuie le nouveau projet de décision.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** apprécie la qualité de la collaboration entre l'État partie et l'ICOMOS et c'est la raison pour laquelle elle souhaite appuyer le projet d'amendement proposé par la Tunisie.

The **Delegation of Finland** supported the revision, adding that the Committee joined all the stakeholders in agreement this time.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Egypt.

The **Delegation of Egypt** commended the Polish authorities for hosting the meetings and for the excellent organization. It also thanked the Chairperson, the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their valuable support of this important project. The past year had witnessed intense cooperation between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, which had produced miracles. With regard to paragraph 9 [new paragraph 10], it wished to inform the Committee that all illegal activities in the property associated with dumping, waste incineration and sand extraction had completely stopped, and illegally dumped fill material was being removed from the site.

The **Chairperson** was grateful for this important information, and with no further comments, the Chairperson turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Tunisia. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 remained unchanged. The new paragraph 5 would read, 'Also notes the recommendation of the joint

World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Advisory Mission, in advance of developing a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed ring road tunnel, the State Party should develop, as efficiently as possible, three technical reports on traffic management, archaeology and design details, and submit these to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies'. The original paragraph 5 would become paragraph 6, which was modified and would now read, 'Takes note of the submission by the State Party of the requested technical reports on traffic management and design details, and notes furthermore that the State Party is currently working on archaeological remote sensing survey and research of the area potentially impacted by the proposed tunnel', with the last paragraph deleted. Tunisia introduced a new paragraph 7, which would read, 'Requests the State Party to submit an HIA for the proposed tunnel scheme based on the combined technical reports for subsequent review by Advisory Bodies'. A new paragraph 8 would read, 'Also requests that work for the construction of the tunnel should only be progressed once all the requested technical reports and the subsequent HIA have been positively evaluated by the Advisory Bodies and any appropriate mitigation measures and procedure for monitoring have been agreed'. The original paragraph 6 would become paragraph 9, and paragraph 7 would become paragraph 10, and paragraph 8 would become paragraph 11. None of these paragraphs were amended.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–11 were duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.78 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited Ms Nada Al-Hassan to cite the properties in the Arab States for which the reports were proposed for adoption without discussion.

The Secretariat cited the following: Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565), Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193), Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192ter), Ancient Thebes and its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87), Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89), Baptism Site "Bethany Beyond the Jordan" (Al-Maghtas) (Jordan) (C 1446), Petra (Jordan) (C 326), Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093), Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el- Rab) (Lebanon) (C 850), Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299), Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco) (C 444) and Rock Art in the Hail Region of Saudi Arabia (Saudi Arabia) (C 1472).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM.7B.73, 41 COM.7B.74, 41 COM.7B.75 and 41 COM.7B.76, 41 COM.7B.77, 41 COM.7B.79, 41 COM.7B.80, 41 COM.7B.81, 41 COM.7B.82, 41 COM.7B.83, 41 COM.7B.84 and 41 COM.7B.85 adopted.

ASIA-PACIFIC

The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Centre, to present the reports on the State of conservation of the cultural properties open for discussion.

Silk Roads: the Routes Network of Chang'an – Tian-shan Corridor (China / Kazakhstan / Kyrgyzstan)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 7B.88](#)

The Secretariat remarked that while the discussion on the state of conservation of this property was not initially foreseen, developments on-site and the looming threats to the property had prompted an early review by the Committee. In view of the complexity of the serial transnational property, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS proposed to open this property for discussion to highlight issues that arise when threats to one component of a

serial property put the whole property at risk. The Secretariat encouraged all States Parties (China, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan) to address the threats in Kazakhstan. The World Heritage Centre also had de-briefing meetings with representatives of the Permanent Delegations of China and Kazakhstan on this issue. Details on the main conservation issues identified for the property were summarized in the working document. Inscribed in 2014 as the first successful nomination of a large-scale international cooperation effort to address selected Silk Road sites to the World Heritage List, the first State of conservation report for this serial transnational property was presented to the Committee in July 2016. The main issues concerned the component parts located in Kazakhstan, and notably in Talgar archaeological site where the construction of a large road connecting Birlik, Almalyk, Kazstroy, Ryskulov and Ak-Bulak was planned across the site that would destroy yet unexplored archaeological layers. Following the Committee's request at its 40th session, Kazakhstan invited a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to the Kazakh section of the Silk Roads. The mission took place on 31 October to 9 November 2016 and considered the implementation of the recommendations of the ICOMOS Advisory mission and progress achieved with the development of management plans for all component sites in Kazakhstan. In 2016, the Committee requested Kazakhstan to halt any further road construction, as it would run directly across the Talgar component site. However, road construction did not stop until October 2016. Furthermore, recommendations of the March 2016 ICOMOS Advisory Mission concerning the road construction had not been followed, which suggests that there is a great need to strengthen the management structure of the component site and its links with national agencies, the Ministries of Kazakhstan and other States Parties involved in the Silk Roads World Heritage property. The 2016 Reactive Monitoring Mission reviewed the road construction project at the Talgar component site. It recommended that a new road be developed beyond the boundary and buffer zone of the property, that the heavy damage inflicted by the roadwork on the archaeological site be restored, and that the partially constructed bridge over the Talgar River be dismantled as requested by the Committee.

The Secretariat explained that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommended that the Committee express its deep concern that the damage had reached levels that put the site, and thereby the overall property, under threat and that it endorsed the recommendations of the 2016 mission, emphasizing that new options should be developed for the road beyond the border boundary, the component site and its buffer zone. Furthermore, the Committee may wish to request that re-construction work and illegal residential development work at the Talgar site be halted, that the bridge be dismantled, and remedy measures be developed urgently to strengthen the overall legal, planning and management frameworks of the site and its setting. The 2016 mission further noted that considerable threats to the OUV would arise from high-speed roads passing through near other component sites in Kazakhstan. Part of the territories of the archaeological sites and buffer zones of Aktobe and Kulan were already cut off by the Western Europe-Western China highway, and the Kayalyk was under threat from a project to widen the strategic Almaty-Ust-Kamenogorsk road, which would cause significant damage to the site if implemented. For Kostobe, there was a plan to build a two-lane paved road with parking and other tourist facilities in the buffer zone, and in Akyrtas, construction of a new two-lane paved road crossing the site and its buffer zone was progressing at a rapid pace. Overall, significant issues with the legal, management and protection systems in Kazakhstan imply that the state of conservation of these sites now represented potential threats to the integrity of the overall serial transnational property. It was therefore recommended that the Committee further expresses its concern that most of these component sites in Kazakhstan had been impacted in a comparatively short space of time since inscription and, based on the above, the Committee may wish to request Kazakhstan, in close consultation with the States Parties of China and Kyrgyzstan, to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2018 a joint updated report on the state of conservation of the property. The report should include the implementation of the mission recommendations for examination by the Committee at its

next session in 2018 with a view to considering whether insufficient progress had been made with the possible inscription of the property on the Danger List in 2018. Finally, Mr Jeng drew the Committee's attention to the fact that inscribing a serial transnational property on the List of World Heritage in Danger raised an additional question of policy since all component parts in all countries, including those satisfactorily managed and protected, were automatically placed on the Danger List alongside the more problematic components.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** was concerned that development threats were apparent in Kazakhstan in more than one component site of the Silk Roads serial property so soon after inscription; an inscription that was seen as a milestone for bringing together three States Parties to support the nomination, and inscription of the first major corridor of the overall Silk Roads. At the time of inscription, particular attention was given to the international coordination mechanism, which was required by the Operational Guidelines for transnational serial sites. All three State Parties provided assurances that a working relationship was in place. Indeed, a formal agreement between all three participating State Parties was signed in 2012 and a more detailed agreement in 2014 provided for a steering group of Vice-Ministers, experts and government officials from each State Party. In light of the threats that have now emerged, there was concern about the effectiveness of this international coordination mechanism. In terms of specific issues, at the time of inscription, a key essential element not in place was the management plan for all eight component sites in Kazakhstan. The Committee requested that these be produced by 2016 according to a timetable proposed by the State Party. However, this timetable was not realized, and as of today, these plans were still not in place. The lack of management plans, and thus the lack of effective management, seemed to have contributed to decisions taken on the roads. One road was built at the time of inscription, but other roads were planned and were in the course of development. Urban development and re-construction are at variance with the principles of conservation and protection that the State Party committed to at the time of inscription. Furthermore, the Master Plans being developed did not appear to relate to the contribution of the component sites to the OUV of the series. Moreover, since the property was inscribed, there have been no Heritage Impact Assessments undertaken of infrastructure or other development proposals. In order to address the potential threats facing this overall serial property, ICOMOS considered essential that urgent action be taken to strengthen management and protection, to clarify the boundaries, and to develop as soon as possible a more robust planning framework, including the revision of Master Plans that acknowledge the constraints of the property and also introduce the use of Heritage Impact Assessments for all projects, including those planned before the inscription of the property.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted that the Silk Roads is a transnational serial property consisting of component sites in three State Parties, yet the 2017 State of conservation report of the Advisory Body focused solely on the eight component sites in Kazakhstan and mainly highlighted the sluggish response to the recommendations of the March 2016 ICOMOS Advisory Mission to Talgar and the November 2017 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission. The delegation sought to hear from the State Party regarding its sluggish response. The same report also informed the Committee that construction of a major road passing through the Talgar component had now halted and alternative routes were being sought. Necessary resources for revising the management plans of the eight components had been allocated, together with funds for cultural heritage and archaeological studies, detailed maps to clarify site boundaries, and potential tourism assessments. Additionally, a revision of the current cultural heritage law was reportedly underway to be finalized in 2018. These actions demonstrated willingness of the State Party to follow the recommendations of this Committee and the Advisory Body more closely in the near future. As another Silk Road country, Turkey was well aware of the difficulties involved in protecting heritage property in a geography where modern communication and settlement networks occasionally overlap with ancient ones. Additionally, it noted that part of the

pending conservation problems at Talgar stem from initiatives taken before the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List. On the basis of the already observed progress, Turkey proposed an amendment to the draft decision for the State of conservation report on the Silk Roads serial property. It was noted that the amendment kept all the Advisory Body recommendations in an edited format to give space for the expression of ongoing progress.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that the property was inscribed only three years ago and already it was under severe threat from highway construction and urban development affecting almost all of the components in Kazakhstan. The delegation wondered whether the planning of this development really took place over the last few years or whether something was missed at the time the site was evaluated for nomination to the World Heritage List. Moreover, this decision would also affect the two other State Parties, and therefore Finland strongly encouraged the State Party to develop effective coordination with China and Kyrgyzstan for the management of the overall serial property in line with the existing agreements and arrangements.

The **Delegation of Poland** echoed the remarks by Turkey, recognizing that this was an important case regarding the state of conservation and its influence on the whole serial property. It supported the amendment to the draft decision proposed by Turkey, adding that this still new inscription needed more time to implement the recommendations of the Reactive Monitoring Mission focused on OUV maintenance. The inscription of this property on the World Heritage List in Danger after just a few years since inscription could be more destructive than constructive, especially when the urgent needs of the local community to have efficient infrastructure should also be taken into account. It encouraged the State Party to maintain strict control over the development process and to inform the World Heritage Centre about significant investments according to paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines. It also recognized the necessity of closer cooperation among the State Parties in the committee on the serial nomination of the Silk Roads. It also sought additional information from the State Party.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** noted that this was yet another site being put on the Danger List, adding that the experience of Tanzania was that once a site was put on the Danger list it would take some time before the corrective measures could be identified. It also took time to prepare the desired state of conservation for its removal. With regard to paragraphs 183 to 189 of the Operational Guidelines, the delegation asked why these procedures could not be used in some cases when the situation was not urgent so as to identify the corrective measures with the involvement of stakeholders as much as possible before the situation worsened.

The **Delegation of Croatia** agreed in general with the points raised by the Advisory Bodies. However, the Silk Road was essentially a route that lived and needs to live and thus should not be isolated from the needs of everyday life. The delegation added that the Committee's purpose, as decision-makers, was not to isolate such sites as places of 'worship' but to let them live – like the Silk Road – by its full activity, i.e. they should not be seen as 'a museum', as could possibly be interpreted by the requests of the Advisory Bodies. This was a conceptual question that the delegation urged all UNESCO bodies to consider in the near future. Isolation and 'museumfication' was not an ideal that the delegation could accept, as stated by Tunisia, "We also need to let the communities develop and not hold them with too strict rules". The delegation conceded that this concept might allow for some mistakes in the process but it considered it much better than strictly implementing protocols that lead to 'museumfication'. It was noted that the Committee was mostly following the suggestions of the Advisory Bodies rather than asking whether there were other possible options, and asking 'What is best for the monument itself and its use for the community?' The delegation thus encouraged Kazakhstan to continue in this direction.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** recognized that this significant transnational property had linked multiple civilizations for centuries, facilitating far-reaching exchanges in areas such as trade,

religion, cultural practices and the arts. It was therefore worrying that the OUV of the Silk Roads Network was threatened due to a lack of management systems and plans, as well as urban and housing developments, and the possible impacts of unplanned tourism. The delegation however acknowledged the proposed plans by the State Party to positively tackle the current state of conservation, and it would thus wish to hear from the State Party in this regard. Jamaica encouraged the State Party to update its plans to ensure that there was no further damage to the OUV. It supported the amended draft decision by Turkey, Poland, Azerbaijan and Kuwait.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** acquiesce des observations et recommandations fait par ICOMOS, mais souhaite tout de même souligner les actions concrètes entreprises par l'État partie qui a suspendu la nouvelle route traversant le site en octobre 2016 et a alloué des ressources cette année pour la préparation des plans de gestion pour les huit sites et pour l'amélioration du suivi. Les fonds pour les études archéologiques, de patrimoine culturel et pour la préparation de cartes détaillées sont prêts. L'État partie du Kazakhstan a informé que la révision de la loi nationale sur la protection et l'utilisation des objets du patrimoine historique et culturel est prévue pour l'année prochaine. La délégation souhaite encourager ces efforts et croie qu'ils amèneront le pays à répondre positivement aux demandes du Comité.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** remarked that every State Party could sympathize with the fact that protecting and conserving a serial property located in several countries was a very challenging and difficult task. The delegation wished to praise the efforts of the three State Parties collectively in coordinating their actions for the protection of this heritage. However, the best of circumstances and international cooperation did not always comfortably find each other. Nevertheless, the integrated management plan proposed at the time of inscription needed to be used as the baseline with respect to the agreement signed between the State Parties. It found the comments of the Secretariat very pertinent, pointing out the difficulties of inscribing transnational sites on the Danger List, adding that this could be discussed in the overall agenda Item 7.

The **Delegation of Portugal** remarked that it could agree with the revision proposed by Turkey, Poland, Azerbaijan and Kuwait if it addressed the fundamental issues of integration of the property. The delegation sought to hear from Turkey about the rationale in keeping Talgar and deleting the other six properties [in paragraph 4], i.e. was it because the State Party concerned considered that there is inadequate protection of these sites and therefore they did not merit being included at the same level as Talgar? The delegation also looked forward to hearing from Kazakhstan.

The **Delegation of Cuba** agreed with the Members that spoke about the good example of cooperation between the States Parties that was represented in this property, adding that it was already difficult for one country to manage coordination but was even more complex with three countries. For this reason, it congratulated the States Parties concerned for the actions undertaken. Having listened to Croatia, the delegation noted the concern with regard to the ideal of the Convention and its Advisory Bodies, adding that UNESCO needed to evolve for which it needed local communities to conserve living heritage. The delegation surmised that the Convention was the furthest behind in this regard. Other UNESCO Conventions were more up-to-date, which was probably due to the fact that they had been implemented more recently. In 1972, when the Convention came into force, the notion of communities had not yet developed to the extent it has today in other Conventions. The delegation spoke of the need to incorporate this element into the Committee's evaluations and decisions.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** joined the Committee in supporting and proposing the amendments on the draft decision. It was positive that Kazakhstan would take the results of the assessment of the Reactive Monitoring Mission seriously and show commitment towards implementing the recommendations to protect the integrity of the serial transnational site. The delegation called for the State Party to provide additional remarks.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked ICOMOS for the comprehensive report and conclusions based on the Reactive Monitoring Mission. Although it recognized the serious concerns with regard to the site of Talgar in Kazakhstan, it could not accept that these concerns be applied to other sites along this Silk Road property. At the same time, Azerbaijan welcomed the decision of the Government of Kazakhstan to suspend the road project in Talgar, and it called upon the State Party to provide alternative routes without impacting the OUV. It also encouraged the State Party to submit the detailed report on the works on the Talgar, and it also sought to know more from Kazakhstan, together with China and Kyrgyzstan, about the coordinating committee to see how they were coordinating their conservation and protective measures together.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** reconnaît les efforts fait par l'État partie d'adresser les problèmes liés aux biens transfrontaliers, comme à signalé la délégation du Viet Nam. Cela montre une volonté affichée de vouloir répondre aux recommandations et aux critiques de l'ICOMOS. Elle rejoint la proposition faite d'organiser un comité de coordination pour pouvoir résoudre ces problèmes transfrontaliers et demande à l'État partie de clarifier certains points relevés par l'ICOMOS.

In response to Portugal, the **Delegation of Turkey** explained that the other places taken out of paragraph 4 had not been as adversely impacted, as mentioned in the Advisory Body reports. The Talgar component stood alone in this respect. Moreover, the problems related with the other components were already included in the other paragraphs of the amendment.

The **Chairperson** invited Kazakhstan to take the floor.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** remarked that almost ten years ago, three State Parties and a group of international experts worked together to prepare the nomination dossier. In 2014, it was finally inscribed on the World Heritage List. Following the inscription, within a short period of time, many things occurred in the component site of Talgar. Already in autumn 2014, the delegation learned about the plans for the road construction through the World Heritage component site and immediately initiated the introduction of a moratorium. In March 2016, the ICOMOS Advisory Mission visited the property upon the invitation of the State Party and concluded that the proposed road construction would have a negative and irreversible impact on the component site. During the 40th session of the Committee, based on the information of the Ministry of Culture and Sports of Kazakhstan, the existing moratorium was reaffirmed. However, in early October 2016, the local authorities unpredictably began the road construction. Tremendous State efforts were made to halt the road construction, which succeeded only in late October 2016 following the on-site visit by the Deputy Prime Minister of Kazakhstan. The Reactive Monitoring Mission took place in November 2016, however the mission report of over 160 pages was conveyed to the State Party only in late May 2017. The delegation truly appreciated the support by the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and the experts who visited the site during the missions. However, as the report of the Reactive Monitoring Mission had only been received recently, time was needed to verify the facts and present official clarifications, particularly with respect to the other component sites of the property in Kazakhstan. Moreover, the Master Plans mentioned in the Reactive Monitoring Mission report only partially reflected the existing problem. The core of the negative process, as reported by the National World Heritage Committee to the Parliament of Kazakhstan, lay in the lack of effective inner legislation mechanisms. In this respect, the Kazakhstan National Commission for UNESCO initiated the preparation and integration in national legislation the specific regulations relative to the World Heritage sites in Kazakhstan. This document was already prepared by National World Heritage Committee experts with financial support by the UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office and sent to the Ministry of Culture, as the government body responsible for the State's culture policy. The Minister of Culture in turn started developing a new law of protection and use of the World Heritage site that should be officially approved by Parliament and the President in 2018. Other potential threats were well defined in the Reactive Monitoring Mission report and would be under the control of the Ministry of Culture. The delegation also

concentrated on the coordination processes between the three countries by intensifying the cooperation through the existing Coordinating Committee on the World Heritage serial nomination of the Silk Roads and its Secretariat based at ICOMOS International Conservation Center in Xi'an (China). With regard to the issue of protection of the Silk Road properties, the delegation assured the Committee that Kazakhstan would work in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Ministry of Culture and Sports to fulfil all the recommendations of this and previous Committees, as well as recommendations of the Advisory Body.

The **Delegation of China** noted that Kazakhstan was taking serious measures to mitigate the impact of the project on the OUV of the property and it commended its efforts. China wished to strengthen the communication with Kazakhstan within the framework of the Intercontinental Collaboration Committee. Should Kazakhstan need help, China would be able to provide its best possible technical assistance, including the development of World Heritage management plans, the establishment of a monitoring system, conservation interventions of the sites, and the presentation of the OUVs in order to better protect the shared World Heritage site.

Responding to the question from Turkey as to why this Reactive Monitoring Mission was solely to the Kazakh section of the Silk Roads, **the Secretariat** explained that this was a decision by the Committee in 2016 because of the emerging issue of Talgar, and also because of the unfinished management plans for the eight component sites in Kazakhstan. Secondly, regarding the late submission of the mission report, Mr Jing explained that a member of the mission team, an ICOMOS expert, had become unexpectedly ill. The State Party had been informed in early January 2017 that the mission report would be late, and in fact the mission report was sent on 16 May [2017]. In addition, one of the issues indicated in the working document, also in one of the paragraphs of the draft decision, related to the boundaries of the component site in Kazakhstan because the mission found discrepancies in the boundaries of the component part, which was considered a crucial issue in terms of protection and management.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** welcomed the new initiatives recommended by Kazakhstan and the remedial measures they proposed to put in place, adding that it was not just Talgar that needed remedial measures and hoped that this fact could be reflected in the draft decision. With regard to paragraph 12 in the draft decision, which called for greater cooperation through the existing Coordinating Committee of the World Heritage Serial Nomination of the Silk Road, it was clarified that this committee referred to the wider committee of all State Parties involved in the Silk Roads project. A more specific committee was actually set up at the time of inscription for the three State Parties for this particular corridor of the Silk Roads. Thus, it would be more appropriate to recognize only the smaller committee of the three State Parties under paragraph 12.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** remarked that the important point on serial nominations in relation to danger listing, brought up by the Republic of Korea, could be discussed under agenda item 7. It was noted that an expert meeting had already taken place in 2008 on this issue. A great number of very complex serial nominations had been inscribed since, so it was an emerging issue. The other point on communities, mentioned by Cuba, was also an extremely important point and there had been great progress since 2005 with a chapter on Partners in the Protection of World Heritage included in the Operational Guidelines, while the sustainable development policy adopted by the Committee would present another new opportunity.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** sought clarification on the question relative to paragraphs 183–189 of the Operational Guidelines in cases where a property was not in an emergency that required it to be placed on the Danger List, and which offered guidance before taking such a decision.

The Secretariat noted that in line with paragraph 183 and 184 of the Operational Guidelines,

the corrective measures needed to be put forward in order to propose a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In the case of Talgar, particularly the road construction at this archaeological site, it was said to pose a threat to both the integrity and the OUV of the entire property. For that reason, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies proposed in the last paragraph of the draft decision that if insufficient progress had not been made by the State Party in addressing the issue, the site should be put on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2018.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Turkey, Poland Azerbaijan and Kuwait. Only paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 (out of 13) remain unchanged. The proposal in paragraph 4 was to delete the four other sites, which would now read, 'Expresses its deep concern that the component site of Talgar has been impacted so adversely in comparatively short amount of time since the time of inscription that its state of conservation is now a potential threat to the integrity of the overall serial transnational property'. Paragraph 5 was slightly modified. Paragraph 6 had the first part deleted, and would now read, 'Requests the State Party of Kazakhstan to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2017 a detailed report on reconstruction work at the Talgar component site, both planned and undertaken, for review by the Advisory Bodies'. Paragraph 7 was also modified with the deletion of the second part, which would read, 'Notes that the Talgar site has been affected by rural residential development in Buffer Zone, and further requests that this be halted and strict control over this process be assured'. The first part of paragraph 8 was also deleted and would read, 'Also expresses its concern that local paved roads are planned or under construction at Akyrtas; and deeply regrets that the World Heritage Centre was not informed about this project beforehand, which goes against Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines'. Paragraph 9 was also modified, which would read, 'Further expresses its deep concern about the adverse impacts of urban development on the perception of the sites in relation to the Silk Roads and their settings, and requests the State Party of Kazakhstan to strengthen the legal mechanism to control environmental impacts of urban growth over the component sites as a matter of priority'. Paragraph 10 was also modified, which would read, 'Requests moreover the State Party of Kazakhstan to ensure that all sites benefit from highest national protection in their boundaries and Buffer Zones as it was submitted at the time of inscription'. Paragraph 11 had a slight addition, which would read, 'Reiterates its request that Management Plans for all eight component sites of the serial property in Kazakhstan and their landscape settings be revised taking into consideration the results of the Reactive Monitoring mission assessment as a matter of priority and be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2018 at the latest, along with the update on progress by December 2017'. Paragraph 12 was also modified, and the new paragraph would read, 'Requests in addition the State Parties of China, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan to develop effective coordination for the management of the overall serial property through the existing Coordination Committee on the World Heritage Committee Serial Nomination of the Silk Road and its Secretariat based at ICOMOS International Conservation Center-Xi'an'. Paragraph 13 was also modified with the second part deleted, and would now read, 'Finally requests the State Party of Kazakhstan, in close consultation with the State Parties of China and Kyrgyzstan, to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2018, a joint updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018'.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–9 were duly adopted.

Having spoken to the Kazakh delegation, the **Delegation of Portugal** wished to retain some of the original paragraph 10, which would read, 'Requests moreover the State Party of Kazakhstan to clarify the boundaries of the component sites' with the remainder of the paragraph unchanged.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.88 adopted as amended.

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.95](#)

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the next report proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that at the present meeting, a de-briefing meeting was held with the Ambassador and Permanent Delegation of Nepal to UNESCO. He recalled that the Committee had reviewed the State of conservation of the property in 2016 at its 40th session when it identified crucial conservation issues resulting from the aftermath of the 2015 earthquakes. On the basis of an updated report on the State of conservation of the property and the implementation of the recommendations of the previous Reactive Monitoring Mission, the Committee decided to consider the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the absence of significant progress. The State Party submitted on 1 February 2017 a State of conservation report that highlighted its response following the disaster, as indicated in the working document. A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring Mission visited the property from 20–25 March 2017. The mission report provided more detailed assessments of the damage to all seven monument zones and raised a number of important concerns, notably regarding the state of the work carried out, as badly damaged structures were inadequately supported and many of their labouring structures and the ancillary buildings had been demolished. The mission regretted that the work undertaken so far had not been based on the systematic assessment and mapping of the damage and that no centralized database had been established to list the extent of the damaged elements. The mission noted that recommendations formulated by the 2016 Reactive Monitoring Mission had not been fully implemented, notably concerning the preparation of recovery Master Plans for each of the seven monument zones, and the review and update of the integrated Management Plan; these documents had not been submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies. The mission also noted the significant impact of the demolition of traditional houses affected by the earthquakes and their replacement with concrete-framed structures. This points to the fact that threats were a result of the earthquakes, but also from some of the work undertaken during the subsequent recovery process that added to the erosion of the properties' integrity and authenticity. While the State Party's efforts were undoubtedly laudable, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS/ICCROM considered that the scale and scope of the disaster exceeded by far the capacities and resources of the Nepali Department of Archaeology. The lack of investigation into the ground condition, the absence of a recovery plan and a clear understanding of the property's OUV led to uncontrolled reconstructions of poor quality, resulting in considerable loss of significant fabric. Research into traditional building techniques and operations over time remain inadequate and many of the contractors appointed were not sufficiently experienced in historical building conservation. In view of the State Party's report and the outcomes of the latest Reactive Monitoring Mission, it was clear that the property was currently facing actual and potential threats to its OUV in accordance with paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines. To safeguard the property, the recovery process needed to be quickened and made more effective, and the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggested that inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger would facilitate a greater input, collaboration and coordination of support from the international community to adequately safeguard the property. It should be noted that the response to many threats faced by the property should be linked to social and economic development so that the recovery process could generate wider community benefits. In that regard, the inscription of the property on the

Danfer List would enable a greater mobilization of the international community and its extensive network of experts and resources, as a means of assisting the State Party in the task of recovering the property and its OUV. Finally, it was noted that the preliminary work had already been done with the State Party to discuss the technical, planning, legal and the management measures necessary to recover the attributes of the OUV, which could contribute to the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted that since the earthquake in 2015, there had been two Reactive Monitoring missions. The first assessed the overall impact of the earthquake and discussed initial post-disaster approaches with the State Party. The second in March 2017 undertook a much more detailed assessment of the destruction wrought by the earthquake in all seven monument zones of the property in considering the recovery work undertaken since 2015, and to discuss how the overall recovery work is being organized and the capacity and organization of resources. The outcomes of the mission were clear. Comparatively little recovery work had been undertaken and many structures remained inadequately protected. Some of the work done had not been supported by the systematic assessment of damage or analysis of traditional methods of construction, and much restoration was unfortunately of poor quality, as the contractors appointed were simply lacking in appropriate experience. Furthermore, little progress had been made to address the urgent issues of housing for local communities. Although the State Party was strongly committed to addressing the severe and extensive impacts of the earthquake, the scale and scope of the destruction was such that responses needed to be at a much higher level and with greater capacity in resources than was currently available. Without a more strategic and coordinated response that was adequately underpinned by documentation and assessment, there was a real danger that the restoration and rebuilding work would erode rather than strengthen the attributes of OUV which, given the very high profile of this property, would be unfortunate. In order to benefit from the collaboration and support of the international community and to shift the recovery operations to a higher and more effective level that can address not only the monuments but the needs and requirements of local communities, ICOMOS supported the recommendation to include this property in the World Heritage List in Danger. ICOMOS explained that this was not because the State Party was not doing its utmost, but rather as a means of assisting the State Party to develop a strategic and coordinated response supported by adequate advice for the recovery of Kathmandu that supports the OUV and reinvigorates the city for its inhabitants.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** appreciated the efforts and commitment of the Nepali authorities in the recovery of the property after the catastrophic earthquake in 2015. It believed that the delay in fulfilling the Committee's decisions was related to the amount of work and capacity that was needed as well as time rather than any failure by the State Party. The delegation was somewhat confused by the divergence between the State Party's report and the mission report of 2017 on the aspects of the recovery Master Plan, the coordination among the stakeholders, the systematic assessment and mapping of damage, and the State Party's efforts to ensure the quality of conservation works. The State Party should be given the opportunity to remark on this matter. It was noted that the works were carried out in line with the six-year recovery Master Plan, which was already delivered to the Secretariat. This plan, like any other policy plan, could be subject to further revision upon further need or change in the situation. Considering the concerns regarding the low quality of the recovery works that were apparently adding more damage to the integrity and authenticity of the property, the State Party also gave assurances on the quality of the recovery works both in terms of material and techniques. Any decision for inscription of the property on the Danger List would be tantamount to undermining the efforts and capacity of the State Party. The delegation believed that the Nepali Government has the capacity of doing its best with further international support. It was also underlined that danger listing could only contribute to the recovery works and safeguarding of the property as long as the international community

provided generous support to the Nepali authorities, but it was not the only option to gain international support. The delegation was therefore of the view that the draft decision did not acknowledge the efforts of the State Party and should thus be reformulated in order to give the State Party more time to implement their plans before taking any decision on danger listing.

La **Délégation du Liban** remarque que les images de Katmandou cette année, en 2016 et à Bonn, rappellent celles vues ces derniers jours sur Damas, Alep, les villes syriennes et du Yémen, pointe du doigt sur le problème de déchainement de violence aussi bien humaine que naturelle. Ainsi les dégradations constatées ne sont pas la faute de gouvernement respectif, ni même des organismes et personnes chargés du suivi de ces biens, par exemple, les spécialistes de la réhabilitation ou des antiquités. Ce sont réellement des phénomènes graves : d'un côté, une violence politique due aux hommes et, de l'autre côté, une violence de la nature. La délégation ne comprend pas les hésitations ou de dire de ne pas inscrire des sites sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elle questionne l'utilité de donner du temps avant l'inscription de ces sites sur la Liste du bien mondial en péril compte tenu que les capacités des gouvernements à interagir sont grandement amoindries. Une mobilisation internationale est nécessaire pour ces sites, ainsi que d'autres qui présentent des situations similaires. La délégation reconnaît qu'une inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril permet d'une part de reconnaître le drame et son importance, et d'autre part de mobiliser la communauté mondiale pour aider le gouvernement du Népal dans ces travaux.

The **Delegation of Finland** noted that already at its 39th session in Bonn, the Committee decided to act in favour of the State Party's wish and not inscribe Kathmandu Valley on the List of the World Heritage in Danger, even though danger listing serves as a tool for the State Party to receive as much international support as possible. Last year ICOMOS raised such concerns in addition to Finland, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Indonesia, Poland and Lebanon. However, once again the Committee decided to grant an additional year to the State Party to resolve the situation. Moreover, there was a strong commitment by the State Party demonstrated by the considerable amount of work undertaken to recover the property. The fact remained that the recovery process now needs to be quickened and made more effective, and greater input, collaboration and coordination from the international community would help achieve this. This reasoning helps justify inscribing the property on the Danger List.

The **Delegation of Cuba** acknowledged the efforts made by the Government of Nepal faced with such a complex situation as a developing country faced with a natural disaster. The delegation remarked that it was concerned that States use the World Heritage in Danger List as a way of obtaining financing when it should not be seen as a kind of financing tool. The delegation added that UNESCO had a strategy for dealing with situations of conflict and natural disaster with a fund dedicated to such situations. It would thus be good practice to link the situation to the strategy that was actually in place for such ends. Moreover, mobilizing funds and extrabudgetary resources should not be linked to the property being placed on the World Heritage in Danger List. Indeed, a meeting on the strategy on conflict and natural disasters would take place in November [2017].

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** remarked on the notable progress in the rehabilitation and restoration of the heritage sites that were destroyed by the earthquake in 2015 despite the limited capacity of the Department of Archaeology of Nepal. Given the sheer magnitude and scale of the rehabilitation works to be done, the State Party must be commended for having crafted their recovery Master Plan for the property. This plan has since been submitted to the Advisory Bodies. Further, the State Party was currently implementing various components of the recovery Master Plan, some of which was being conducted through partnership arrangements with various organizations in Nepal, as well as international experts who had been contracted to support them. The delegation further remarked that the municipal authorities were undertaking post-earthquake conservation, reconstruction, renovation and

rehabilitation. It understood that this may compromise the OUV and therefore it was necessary that the State Party work in close liaison with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. It also reinforced the remarks by Cuba that being on the Danger List should not be the only way of obtaining support. The delegation wished to ask the World Heritage Centre to find ways of mobilizing support once a recovery plan is in place in which the Advisory Bodies also have input. It should be possible to get and mobilize international support for Nepal. It hoped that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies could explore this further. The delegation did not support placing the property on the Danger List as it was already in danger from earthquakes.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** commended Advisory Body on its report and for its hard work. It also commended Nepal for its eagerness and commitment to preserving the state of conservation of the Kathmandu Valley. The delegation understood that it must be an arduous path to keep the property in its required state, in particular after the earthquake in 2015 that nearly destroyed the site. It also understood the difficulty faced by the State Party in realizing a quick recovery of the monuments, as Indonesia also suffered from an earthquake that hit Indonesia's World Heritage site in 2006. The delegation therefore believed that it was appropriate to allow the State Party to explain the problem and the progress made regarding the corrective measure taken.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** acknowledged the massive scale of destruction to Kathmandu Valley due to the earthquake in 2015 and it recognized the commitment of the State Party to do all it could to address the threats and challenges identified. It also called upon the international community to bolster support for Nepal for its reconstruction and rehabilitation. Nevertheless, it wished to reiterate its view that the Danger List should not be seen as a sanction that State Parties must avoid at all costs. The delegation spoke from experience when one of its properties on the Danger List was able to galvanize national and international support to address threats to the property and improve management. Through concerted efforts, the property was eventually removed from the World Heritage List in Danger by the Committee, as was the case for the sites in Côte d'Ivoire and Ethiopia witnessed earlier in this session and which the Committee celebrated as success stories of conservation. The delegation noted that the Committee had taken similar decisions over the last two years to postpone consideration of danger listing for this property, adding that the Committee could not always push difficult decisions to a later date, especially when sufficient time had already been granted to the State Party and no significant progress had been documented. It also asked ICOMOS whether another Reactive Monitoring Mission would have added value or affect its recommendations, as proposed in the amendment submitted.

The **Delegation of Poland** expressed sympathy for the difficult situation faced by the site and the people of Kathmandu. It understood that the process of rehabilitation in general takes time, which was why it would like to give the State Party an opportunity to continue the process of rehabilitation, adding that it appreciated its involvement in this process so far. Nevertheless, there was a need to develop a systematic approach for serious action in such properties, which was why it encouraged the State Party to plan a long-term holistic rehabilitation in cooperation with the international expert community.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** commended the strong commitment of the Government of Nepal for its response to the 2015 earthquake. It took note of the report of the 2015 and 2017 Reactive Monitoring missions that there was a lack of coordination, management mechanisms and quick coordination among national authorities. But at the same time, it also take note of the State Party's report of 2017 that many of the issues and recommendations of the Advisory Bodies had been addressed and it therefore wished to commend Nepal again for this effort. The delegation encouraged Nepal to continue its restoration process using appropriate methods and materials, as well as detailed documentation to guarantee that conservation and restoration would not harm the OUV of the property. Given that the recovery plan would take time before showing significant progress, it would be reasonable to give more time for the Government to fulfil their conservation commitment, and it therefore

supported the proposed amendment.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** saluted the efforts of Nepal for its work to recover from the traumatic earthquake. It respected the Advisory Body's analysis on the need to establish a coherent and integrated recovery plan together with detailed restoration plans for the individual monuments. The delegation highlighted the positive impacts and to utilize the Danger List in a more constructive manner. As was seen in the materials presented in the Orientation Session, Danger Listing could also be an opportunity to shore up support and more attention. The delegation sincerely hoped that this mechanism could be used in a more proactive manner. However, it respected the wish of the State Party to refrain from being included in the Danger List, which could possibly adversely affect the sentiments of the people on the ground who were working so hard for the difficult recovery. Therefore, it supported the revised amendment for this item to be examined once more at the next session.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** recognized the work done and urged the State Party to engage with the Reactive Monitoring Mission to develop a more systematic and scientific approach to conservation. It wished to join the proposal by Turkey.

The **Delegation of Portugal** referred to the remarks by Lebanon that natural disasters were indeed terrible events with unlimited capacity for the destruction of lives and properties that are nobody's fault. The Committee had also been recalled by Finland about the best way to effectively respond to the challenges posed by the devastating earthquake of April 2015. The Committee had also heard the arguments of the State Party and read the recommendation of the two joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring missions to the property since the earthquake. Portugal commended the courageous efforts of the authorities of Nepal. Nevertheless, the detailed results of the mission undertaken in March 2017 quite clearly highlighted the various substantial challenges the property was facing, namely, the deterioration of its architectural and town-planning coherence and the consequences of some recovery work that appeared to be affecting the integrity and authenticity of the property. Facing this reality, and despite the many efforts of the State Party, the delegation believed there was an urgent need for a coordinated approach to lead to a more effective and swift recovery process of the property. The Convention has the adequate tools to provide the best possible answer to these challenges, and ICOMOS was also ready to help. Indeed, the Committee should do more to better mobilize the international community and its extensive network of experts and resources. It agreed with Cuba and Zimbabwe that the Danger List should not be a means of accessing funds but rather a way of better mobilizing the international community and to better coordinate efforts. In addition, inclusion on the Danger List was by no means a form of punishment on a State Party.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended the State Party for its commitment to restore sections of the site impacted by the 2015 earthquake. It noted that a significant amount of work had been done towards the monuments impacted, but the process and methods were of concern. Therefore, Jamaica concurred with the draft decision, adding that the decision could facilitate a clear plan of restoration with the involvement of the international community.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** remarque comment le pays a subi une catastrophe naturelle et son patrimoine a été en partie dévasté, mais note aussi les efforts réalisés par l'État partie de réhabiliter son patrimoine. La délégation insiste sur le fait que, autant elle fait confiance à l'organe consultatif par rapport à la mission et à son rapport, autant elle est obligée de prendre en compte la réponse de l'État partie. Ce dernier considère que seulement 17 % de l'ensemble des monuments ont été touchés. Même si de nombreuses mesures sont positives, notamment au début de travaux avec un plan de gestion révisé et un programme de renforcement des capacités, il reste des problèmes à propos du respect des lieux. La délégation propose au Comité de ne pas prendre de mesures qui seraient considérées comme une punition pour l'État partie, ce qui découragerait des efforts vers l'application des mesures, et encourage donc l'État partie à poursuivre ses efforts en suivant le conseil de

l'ICOMOS et les mesures correctives qu'il lui communiqueront.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** supported the interventions made by previous speakers, adding that it was understandable that the preservation of OUV of cultural heritage of more than four centuries could be challenging in the use of materials. Tanzania recognized that the State Party had made efforts to look for materials that were easily available in the country and compatible with existing material in order to preserve the value. The State Party also informed the Committee that it would complete the recovery of more than 35 monuments within a year. Furthermore, conservation works for several other monuments were also underway in coordination with stakeholders, including the local communities. In this regard, the delegation appealed to the Committee to give the State Party the opportunity to work further on the post-earthquake conservation and rehabilitation of the damaged heritage sites. Tanzania further urged the World Heritage Centre to mobilize all possible support to complement the efforts undertaken.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Nepal.

The Delegation of Nepal remarked that it was consistently working for the conservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation of all damaged cultural heritage following the devastating earthquake of 2015. The report circulated to all the Members of the Committee outlined the conservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation works that were ongoing. Nepal welcomed two joint Reactive Monitoring missions since the earthquake. Feedback from them had been very useful in streamlining and furthering its work. It was noted that the report of the joint Reactive Monitoring Mission to Kathmandu in March 2017 was received less than two weeks ago, which did not allow the Government time to furnish a detailed response to the points raised by the report. In addition, it did agree on many of the issues reported. Most of the issues raised were either already being addressed or contained in the Government plan. The Government thus needed more time to consult with all the stakeholders before responding to the report. Nevertheless, some of the major achievements made during the last two years included an adopted six-year Recovery Master Plan for the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage property and a cultural heritage management system that had already begun recording all heritage in the Kathmandu Valley. The Department of Archaeology was now well equipped with more than one hundred engineers, architects and other support staff, and it had conducted a series of technical trainings to various individuals. These training activities were carried out in close coordination with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, ICCROM and the UNESCO Office in Kathmandu. It was noted that the Procurement Act in Nepal governs all governmental procurements. Nevertheless, following the comments of the joint Reactive Monitoring missions, the Department of Archaeology had been working to develop a tender system that would allow only those contractors who meet eligibility criteria of maintaining OUV to be short-listed. Contrary to one of the points raised in the report, all stakeholders were now coordinating and cooperating well and working together to reinstate and reconstruct the damage to their original shape and form. Nepal was fully confident in progressing forward with increased momentum so that the invaluable heritage of Kathmandu Valley would be reinstated to its pre-quake state. Nepal already completed the conservation and rehabilitation of 15 monuments within two years in coordination with the local bodies and communities and with international support. The remaining works on monuments were under progress. Nepal enjoys an excellent relationship with UNESCO, its Office in Kathmandu and the World Heritage Centre, and it valued the experts committed to making progress. It looked forward to further cooperation in mobilizing international resources and experts. Nepal had successfully completed democratic local elections very recently, which paves the way for effective local participation that would further expedite the process of conservation, reconstruction and the rehabilitation of cultural heritage. In view of the achievements so far, along with its efforts and commitment to the cause, the Government of Nepal requested the Committee's understanding and consideration to not place Kathmandu Valley on the Danger List and thus allow Nepal to move forward with its conservation and reconstruction activities with the support of UNESCO and the international community, as per its Recovery Master

Plan.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS to respond.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** wished to respond to the question posed by the Philippines as to whether another Reactive Monitoring Mission would be valuable, as this was envisaged in the amended draft decision to ascertain the progress made by the State Party in implementing the six-year plan and to give its guidance. It was noted that this was the exact remit of the Reactive Monitoring Mission that took place in March [2017], and the very long report set out just that. Thus, another Reactive Monitoring Mission that sets out to do the same thing would not be very effective. In ICOMOS' view, other guidance was needed to review or supplement the recovery plan to address some of the concerns of the Reactive Monitoring mission of March 2017. ICOMOS fully appreciated the work done by the State Party, but nevertheless the Reactive Monitoring Mission did express some specific concerns about certain aspects of the activities, and it considered that these could be addressed but not through a Reactive Monitoring Mission, as it could not really help in undertaking the recommendations and actions, which is what was needed. ICOMOS therefore suggested a different format of working, perhaps an Advisory Mission or another mechanism, which would be more appropriate than another Reactive Monitoring Mission.

The **Delegation of Turkey** understood the number of misgivings of certain Members and the rationale behind them. However, there were four properties that, after having been inscribed on the Danger List, had not benefitted from the World Heritage Fund nor any extra-budgetary resources. In addition, there were other four properties that had been funded only by extrabudgetary resources and no amount was provided by the World Heritage Fund. This goes at least in some way to show that inscription on the Danger List did not really guarantee the assistance that States need. Based on this understanding, if a State Party sincerely desired more time, and in the meantime showed a verifiable commitment to improving the property, as in the case of Nepal, the delegation believed that it made more sense to grant additional time.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Turkey. Paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unchanged. Paragraph 3 had a slight addition, which would read, 'and the six-year plan for the recovery of the monuments damaged by earthquake'. Paragraph 4 remained unchanged. Paragraph 5 had a slight modification and deletion of the second part. Paragraph 6 had a slight modification. Paragraph 7 remained unchanged. Paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 had been deleted, and a new proposal was made for paragraph 8, which read, 'Requests the State Party to fully commit to use appropriate methods and material in recovery work'. A new paragraph 9 would read, 'Reiterates its request that the State Party integrate the Recovery Master Plan within overall social-economic revitalization programme for urban communities, encourage residents and local businesses to engage in the recovery process and ensure that it delivers wide-range social and economic benefits'. The original paragraph 11 would become paragraph 10 with no change. A new paragraph 11 would read, 'Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Committee/World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to ascertain the progress accomplished by the State Party in implementation of six-year Recovery Master Plan and to give guidance on reviewing it'. Paragraph 12 had an addition, which would read in full, 'Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2018, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018, with a view to consider, in absence of significant progress, the possibility of inscription of the property on the World Heritage in Danger'.

The **Delegation of Portugal** took note of the statement by Nepal, adding that although the placing of a property on the Danger List should not be viewed as some form of punishment it hoped that the decision would indeed constitute an additional incentive to Nepal to engage in

addressing the concerns related to the reconstruction and recovery of the property. It was hoped that significant progress in this matter would be registered at the Committee's next session in 2018. Thus, the delegation could go along with the proposed changes by Turkey. However, paragraph 11, as suggested by ICOMOS, should refer to an Advisory Mission and not a Reactive Mission.

The **Chairperson** thanked Portugal for its essential support, noting approval from Turkey.

La **Délégation du Liban** peut accepter ce type de chose, mais demande s'il est nécessaire dans le paragraphe 12 de répéter « afin de considérer, en l'absence de progrès significatifs l'inscription éventuelle du bien sur la liste du patrimoine en péril » puisque ce passage est inscrit chaque année mais que jamais il n'est mis en place, et cela qui risque d'affecter l'image du Comité.

The **Delegation of Cuba** concurred with the remarks, adding that the part in paragraph 12, where the Committee considers its possible inclusion in the World Heritage in Danger List, was somehow conditioning the final outcome, adding that it was not appropriate for this type of draft decision.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–11 were duly adopted. Paragraph 12 took into account the remarks by Lebanon and Cuba, and agreed by Turkey, and was duly adopted.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** did not want to block consensus but wanted to put on record that it would prefer to retain the deleted part [of paragraph 12], adding that if the situation stayed the same then everything under the Danger List could just be deleted.

The **Delegation of Cuba** took the opportunity to say that the language of some of the decisions should be modified, adding that the World Heritage Committee was the only Committee that did not show its full appreciation of the actions taken by States Parties, especially as recognizing their efforts more positively would create better cooperation. Indeed, very strong language had been used in the past against States Parties and the delegation believed that the language should fall in line with other Committees within UNESCO.

The **Chairperson** declared **Decision 41 COM 7B.95 adopted as amended.**

Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7B.96](#)

The **Chairperson** invited **Ms Junhi Han**, Programme Specialist at the Asia-Pacific Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to present the next report.

Ms Junhi Han remarked that a de-briefing meeting was organized with the Ambassador and the Permanent Delegation of Pakistan to UNESCO prior to the current session of the Committee. It was recalled that the Committee had reviewed the State of conservation of the property in 2016, expressing serious concern about the development of the Orange Line Metro project. It furthermore requested the State Party to prepare a Visual Impact Study of the project to be presented to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies before pursuing the works of the Orange Line Metro associated with the Shalamar Gardens. The Committee also requested the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission at its earliest convenience, the result of which would serve the basis for further examination at the 41st session of the Committee with a view to considering whether there was a potential danger to the OUV of the property for possible inscription on the Danger List. However, the World Heritage Centre received neither the Visual Impact Study nor the invitation to the requested Reactive Monitoring mission. The State Party

informed the Secretariat that the invitation for a Reactive Monitoring Mission would go ahead as soon as the Supreme Court released its final verdict on the Orange Line Metro, and the Visual Impact Study would also be submitted upon finalization. In this regard, it was considered of vital importance to have a comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment of the Orange Line Metro project in line with the ICOMOS guidelines. However, it was important to note that although the Orange Line Metro construction work stopped within a radius of 61 metres (following the decision of the Lahore High Court based on the Antiquities Act 1975 that restricts construction within 200 feet of a protected site), the construction progressed beyond this 61-metre radius limit. Hence, by the time of the preparation of the working document, it had reached 130 metres to the west of Shalamar Gardens' southern elevation and 345 metres east of the entrance to the property. If these two east-west sections are joined by an elevated track, the horizontal distance of the proposed elevated viaduct deck would be 70.8 metres from the southwest corner and 24 metres from the southeast corner, respectively. The vertical distance from the bottom of the proposed viaduct deck is 12 metres from the road level and 8.25 metres from the last remaining hydraulic work associated with Shalamar Gardens. Consequently, the Committee should take into consideration: (i) the impacts of the ongoing construction work on the setting and integrity of the gardens; (ii) the absence of a comprehensive management mechanism that could control and monitor urban encroachment, as well as the related development project in the vicinity of the project; and (iii) the absence of any mitigation measure proposed by the State Party. Thus, the Committee might wish to consider inscription of the property on the Danger List in accordance with Paragraph 179 (b) of the Operational Guidelines.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted that although the work on the Orange Elevated Metro Line work was stopped by the High Court in August 2016 within 61 metres of the Shalamar Gardens, it was because of its status as a heritage site along with ten other buildings, some relating to Shah Jahan along the start of the Mughal Road from Lahore Fort to Delhi, and not for its inscription as a World Heritage property. So far, the World Heritage status of the Shalamar Gardens did not appear to have been taken into account in planning the Orange Line Network. No Heritage Impact Assessment had been carried out nor had the requested Visual Impact Assessment been undertaken such that the potential impact on the OUV of the property had not been formally defined. It was thus unclear on what basis the project did not impact adversely on the property nor on what basis the Government of Punjab issued a Non-objection Certificate. It could only be presumed that the purely physical impact was considered. From the information provided on the ongoing construction, it was clear that the height and bulk of those parts of the elevated line constructed either side of the Shalamar Gardens already adversely impacted on the setting of the Gardens, and that this impact would be increased greatly if the two parts of the line were subsequently joined. The Punjab Government appealed against the verdict of the High Court and the appeal decision is awaited. Although ICOMOS fully supported the principle of a mass-transit system delivered through a metro line, it was impossible to consider any appropriate mitigation measures without adequate impact assessments. It was clear that further work on the line should be halted in order to undertake necessary impact assessments and to consider all possible mitigation measures, including moving the alignment of the section near the Shalamar Gardens, i.e. the Royal Gardens constructed by Shah Jahan and inscribed in 1981 as an outstanding example of Mughal artistic expression at the apogee of its development. The Gardens are part of a serial property with the Lahore Fort, which are linked by the Mughal Trunk Road. Thus, the importance of the Shalamar Gardens did not just lie within its walls, and the relationship with the road and its setting were therefore of crucial importance. ICOMOS considered that the threats to these Gardens from the Orange Line Metro should be acknowledged and every possible measure explored to mitigate or reverse them.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** believed that Pakistan had exerted its efforts to keep a balance between infrastructure development imperatives and the conservation of the Fort and

Shalamar Gardens. The Government of Pakistan reassured the delegation that the Orange Line would not damage the Shalamar Gardens in any way and it seemed that extra care had been undertaken in the project's design as well as in its construction and engineering plans to ensure the protection and conservation of the property. For instance, in order to protect the property and its integrity, the alignment plan was given special attention by creating a maximum possible distance of 135 feet (41.1 meters) from the train track to the main entrance of the Shalamar Gardens. The SOC report was also discussed at the 40th session when the Committee requested an updated version by 1 February 2017, as well as a Visual Impact Study of the Metro project and an invitation for a Reactive Monitoring Mission to Lahore. It was noted that a detailed SOC report had already been submitted to the World Heritage Centre. The Visual Impact Study, which was one of the main requests of the Committee in 2016, was at the final stage of completion and would soon be delivered to the World Heritage Centre. Inviting the Reactive Monitoring Mission to Lahore had been delayed due to legal reasons, as the issue of heritage sites located along the Orange Line Project, including Shalamar, was currently *sub judice* before the Supreme Court of Pakistan. As soon as the Court rendered its judgement the Reactive Monitoring Mission would be invited to visit, and it was understood that the Court's decision would be taken within one month. It was also reported by the Advisory Bodies that the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) submitted in 2016 was not compatible with either international standards or ICOMOS guidelines. However, the delegation had examined the HIA and it appeared to include every technical aspect necessary, and therefore it welcomed ICOMOS' explanation on which aspect specifically was considered insufficient. The delegation recommended that the Secretariat share the HIA reports in the database of properties on its website to allow the Committee to examine those reports together with the Advisory Bodies. In conclusion, it believed the State Party was close to finalizing the implementation of previous decisions, and a decision should not be taken on danger listing before a Reactive Monitoring Mission. It was thus in favour of giving Pakistan more time to fully implement the decision taken in Istanbul in 2016.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** expressed its gratitude to the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and all the relevant institutions for their hard work on this site on Lahore, noting that the World Heritage site consisted of two parts: the Fort of Lahore and the Shalamar Gardens with a distance of 7 km between them. However, expected threats would only take place in one part of the site as the construction of the metro line was close to the Shalamar Gardens. The delegation explained the context of the situation, noting that Lahore is the second biggest city in Pakistan with a population of over 10 million. The road in front of the main gate of Shalamar Gardens is one of the city's main artery roads. Hundreds of traditional quarters and private houses are located around the Shalamar Gardens, including public institutions and agencies. The urban fabric of the roads along the Shalamar Gardens was constructed alongside the history of the city, with and after the Shalamar Gardens. It was thus an urban living heritage and the soul of the City. No work had been carried out within the 6.1 metre perimeter of the property since January 2016. The alignment of the Orange Line project had already been altered to attain its maximum possible distance from the property, with the Metro Line redesigned and moved 41 metres from the main gate of the Shalamar Gardens. The new redesigned project would have no adverse impacts on the site. The detailed State of conservation report submitted to the World Heritage Centre outlined all the protective measures undertaken by the State Party. The Archaeology Department of the Government of Punjab had put in place a comprehensive management mechanism of the Antiquities Act 1975, accepted by UNESCO in 2006. The Visual Impact Assessment report was in its final stages of completion and would soon be presented to the World Heritage Centre. The State Party was going to invite a Reactive Monitoring Mission as soon as the Supreme Court announced its decision in the case of the Orange Line Metro Train project. Against this background, the delegation believed that it was incorrect to prejudge the state of conservation of the property until the outcome of the Reactive Monitoring Mission. Azerbaijan was thus in favour of giving additional time to the State Party, and it did not support the decision to inscribe the property on the Danger List.

The **Delegation of Finland** noted that during its last session in 2016, the Committee gave the State Party additional time to continue the dialogue with ICOMOS to reach a satisfactory solution to the situation. The Committee requested the State Party to invite the Reactive Monitoring Mission and undertake a Visual Impact Study. Unfortunately, neither had been carried out before this present session. As a result of useful discussions with the delegation of Pakistan, it was found that the Visual Impact Study was in the process of finalization and would be submitted to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible. The preparation of such a study had taken longer than the State Party had wished. The Reactive Monitoring Mission had not taken place owing to a case pending in the Supreme Court. Finland still believed that the Visual Impact Study was the most critical document in this case, without which the Committee could not assess the impact of the project. Even though the construction project had not yet entered the buffer zone, it had proceeded to a point where mitigation measures would be difficult to undertake if the Visual Impact Study indicated that the project would affect the OUV of the site.

La **Délégation du Koweït** félicite le Pakistan pour ses efforts afin de sauvegarder le fort de Lahore et les jardins de Shalimar et sa mise en place d'un équilibre équitable entre l'importance du site et de sa préservation en fonction de bases précises d'une côté et du développement de la ville de Lahore d'un autre côté. Elle soutient la demande d'inscription du Pakistan pour continuer d'inscrire ce site sur la liste du patrimoine en péril ainsi que la proposition d'annuler le métro dans la ville dans certaines directions, celle de donner au Pakistan plus de temps pour mettre en œuvre les recommandations du Comité, et celle de poursuivre le dialogue constructif entre le Pakistan et le Secrétariat générale du Centre du patrimoine mondial et le Conseil consultatif.

The **Delegation of Cuba** also supported the comments made by the Committee Members, adding that indeed it should wait to see how things advanced. For example, in some countries one year could be considered a long time, and for developing countries it might perhaps be less, which added to the complication. The delegation felt that it was important to hear from the State Party to note exactly the situation in terms of the Supreme Court hearing, but also to take note of the Visual Impact of this project, for which the Committee required the Reactive Monitoring Mission report to make an evaluation. The delegation sought to hear from the State Party on the progress made.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** apprécie l'effort de l'État partie pour réduire l'impact de la ligne de métro sur le patrimoine avec sa décision d'éloigner la ligne orange du métro de 41 mètres du jardin de Shalimar, c'est-à-dire la déplacer à l'extérieur d'une zone tampon. Elle montre son soutien aux décisions difficiles faites par l'État partie compte tenu du fait que c'est un pays en voie de développement, qui doit veiller à protéger le patrimoine en même temps de faire face à la pression d'assurer un service de transport public indispensable pour sa population, très dense à Lahore. La délégation est confiante qu'une mission de suivi réactif sera invitée après le verdict de la cour suprême sur la ligne de métro orange, et estime donc raisonnable que le Comité attende le rapport de cette mission avant de décider de mettre ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. En même temps, nous encourageons le Pakistan à coopérer étroitement avec les organes consultatifs et le Centre du patrimoine mondial.

La **Délégation du Liban** soutient le projet d'amendement et souhaite entendre l'État partie.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** was totally convinced that the State Party was taking the necessary precautionary measures to make sure that the project did not impact on the site, but it also took note of the analysis made by ICOMOS. However, since this matter had been taken to court, the delegation advised that after the court ruling the State Party invite the Reactive Monitoring Mission to make an assessment, the outcome of which would determine whether the site should be placed on the Danger List or not.

The **Delegation of Portugal** noted once again the difficult issue faced by the Committee, as recalled by Finland, of the tension between World Heritage conservation versus economic

and social development needs, and the significant and sustainable balance that needed to be found between these two very real and tangible responsibilities. It appeared evident that the passage of the elevated track of the Orange Metro Line would have an impact on the property if the project went ahead as planned in the immediate vicinity of the Shalamar Gardens. That impact could and should be minimized by the largest extent possible so that the OUV of the property is not irremediably affected. Nevertheless, the State Party had to provide a comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment in line with ICOMOS guidelines, and that such an assessment should go beyond the vibration impact. It was understood that an appeal to the Supreme Court had been lodged by the Punjab Government against the ruling by the Lahore High Court to stop the work near the property, and that a decision may be imminent. The delegation fully respected these institutional and judicial processes, which were part of democratic life. However, it regretted that the Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property, as requested by the Committee at its last session as a matter of urgency, had not yet been possible, as this would have helped the Committee make a fuller evaluation of the situation on the ground and take a decision. The delegation thus looked forward to Pakistan's statement as well as Turkey's revised version of the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** remarked that the Committee had been assured that the technical studies, such as the vibration analysis and Environmental Impact Assessment, prior to the initiation of the Orange Line project indicated that this project would not have any adverse impact on the setting and appearance of the property. None of the OUV bearing attributes such as the gardens, structures and decorative elements would be directly or indirectly impacted by the Orange Line alignment. There was no negative visual impact on the property, as the garden was designed as a wall enclosure with high surrounding walls defining the closed and restricted space, which would not be impacted by the Orange Line. Another important issue was that the Committee would make its decision based solely on the analysis of a detailed official report, in this case, the report of a Reactive Monitoring Mission, a Visual Impact Assessment and the response of the State Party. On that basis, the delegation considered it necessary to retain the request to the State Party to invite a joint Reactive Monitoring Mission as soon as possible. It supported the amendment by Turkey.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended the State Party for its clear commitment to ensuring the integrity and authenticity of this distinctive site. While not discounting the obvious gaps in the reporting to UNESCO, including the non-submission of a Visual Impact Study, and paying keen attention to the potential negative impact to the Shalamar Gardens with respect to the proposed Orange Line track, the delegation noted that arguably the major issue at hand concerned how to strike a balance between heritage preservation and infrastructure development that would facilitate social and economic advancement. It appeared that Pakistan sought to address both matters, as the welfare of its people was also a major consideration as was its commitment to preserve the Shalamar Gardens for the peoples of the world. With this in mind, and based on careful examination of the reports, the delegation was of the view that the State Party should be afforded the opportunity to provide an updated State of conservation report that responded to the many concerns raised by the Advisory Body. This would allow the State Party to implement the actions needed. The Reactive Monitoring Mission should also be undertaken as a matter of urgency. If the State Party was unable to provide the information in the short term, then the possibility of inclusion onto the Danger List may need to be contemplated in the 42nd session of the Committee. The delegation added its voice to the call for sustained communication and public education programmes that would send a message that the Danger List was not a blight to sites or countries.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** commended the Advisory Body on its report on the State of conservation of the Fort and Shalamar Gardens, and took note of the report by the Advisory Body. It understood that Pakistan was now constructing the Orange Line Metro in close proximity to the property. However, it received information from the State Party that, in order to protect the integrity of the property, the Government of Pakistan had created the maximum

possible distance from the main entrance of Shalamar Gardens, and that it was still waiting for a decision from the Supreme Court. The delegation understood that necessary steps should be taken to adjust to urban development, and that providing the appropriate infrastructure for public transportation was one of the most important. Hence, it trusted that this work would be in line with efforts to preserve the property. In addition, the delegation stressed that close monitoring needed to be undertaken so that any negative impacts could be mitigated as soon as possible. It was thus appropriate to allow the State Party to provide further explanations on the measures taken.

The **Delegation of Poland** expressed support for the proposal by Turkey.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** recalled that the Orange Line development project was taking place outside the boundary of the property. It recognized and appreciated the persistent efforts by Pakistan since the last Committee discussion to conserve the property. However, Korea also believed that the Visual Impact Study of the Orange Metro Line was important to determine the impact of the proposed development to reach a constructive decision, together with the Reactive Monitoring mission, as requested by the Committee in its last session. The delegation understood that certain steps within the domestic arena could take more time than originally anticipated, especially with the legal issues involved. It therefore suggested that the State Party be given more time to prepare the necessary information. It also wished to hear from the State Party.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** note que, depuis la 40^e session, même si les rapports des organisations consultatives laissent percevoir que certaines mesures collectives n'ont pas été totalement prises, elle constate tout de même que l'État partie a fourni des efforts qui attendent encore d'être rendus publics. De ce fait, le Burkina Faso rejoint certains autres intervenants sur son désir de donner plus de temps à l'État partie pour produire davantage de résultats, surtout quand il s'agit d'un processus de gestion aussi complexe que celui-ci. La délégation soutient la proposition de donner la parole à l'État partie pour qu'il puisse donner des précisions sur ses intentions concernant ces points.

The **Chairperson** invited Pakistan to take the floor.

The **Delegation of Pakistan** spoke of its resolute and unwavering commitment to conservation and the protection of heritage. Firstly, the State of conservation report of the Shalamar Gardens was submitted in time. Secondly, the Reactive Monitoring Mission was invited to the Gardens to review the protective arrangements, but was unable to do so far because of the pending issue at the Supreme Court. Legal propriety compelled the State Party to wait for the court's decision before inviting the mission. In its letter of 8 March 2017, Pakistan conveyed to the World Heritage Centre that the mission would be invited immediately after the court's decision, which was expected within the next 15 days. The State Party stood by that commitment. Thirdly, with regard to the Visual Impact Study, an international consultant was engaged in line with local government laws to carry out the study that was presently close to completion. The delegation added that to ensure the standard of rigour of international scrutiny, plus its own local procurement laws, the procedure had been rather lengthy. In its letter dated 29 May 2017, the State Party had intimated to the World Heritage Centre that the study would be submitted as soon as finalized, which it hoped would be at the end of next month [August 2017]. It was noted that the project consultants considered all possible alignment options in front of the Shalamar Gardens. In view of the State Party's resolve to protect and conserve the authenticity, integrity and OUV of the property, the consultants were instructed to make necessary adjustments accordingly, and to ensure that the design and alignment [of the metro] did not adversely affect the property in any way. This necessitated acquiring additional land and relocating many families. At the present stage of development any further change in the alignment was not possible owing to technical and social reasons, as it would entail massive displacement of the local population. The balance between the need for economic development and the protection of the OUV of the property had been carefully maintained.

The State Party reiterated its strong commitment to protecting its heritage and was thus slightly dismayed with the unjustified and harsh draft decision without the visit of the mission, which would have been an opportunity to consult the State Party and bring evidence. It was further noted that the studies conducted so far had covered a period of ten years starting in 2007, and none had indicated any negative impact on the property, and whatever little impact was indicated, all mitigation plans would be followed meticulously.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** referred to the question by Turkey on why the impact assessment was considered unsatisfactory, noting that it did not assess any alternatives, it assumed that the development would be happening and it did not consider all the impacts, particularly the visual impact. Where it did suggest impacts, it did not draw any particular conclusions. The assessment was thorough in one respect but overall it did not meet the requirements of a Heritage Impact Assessment in giving a conclusion on the impact on OUV that assessed all the direct and indirect impacts that might be possible, or look at mitigation measures such as alternatives.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Turkey. Paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unchanged. Paragraphs 3, 4, 5 were deleted. A new paragraph 3, would read, 'Notes that the Reactive Monitoring mission will be invited immediately after the decision of Honourable Supreme Court of Pakistan is announced'. Paragraph 6 was also deleted and the new paragraph [now paragraph 4] would read, 'Also notes that the State Party is undertaking measures to control and monitor urban encroachments and stresses upon the need to expedite the process as far as possible and requests the State Party to further improve the collaboration with related national and local authorities in implementation of the Management Plan'. Paragraphs 7 and 8 were deleted. Paragraph 9 [now paragraph] 5, was partly deleted, with a new first part, which would read, 'Requests the State Party [...]', with part (a) deleted, and (b) partly deleted. A new part (a) would read, 'to urgently complete and share with the World Heritage Centre the Visual Impact Study, as decided by World Heritage Committee at its 40th session, as soon as possible'. Part (c) was also deleted and replaced with a new part (b), which would read, 'to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to the property immediately after the announcement of the decision of the Honourable Supreme Court of Pakistan to examine the Orange Line Metro Train project and to discuss the same with relevant Government authorities and to review the management and protection arrangements of the property'. Original paragraph 10 became paragraph 6. Paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 [which were paragraphs 11, 12, 13] remained unchanged.

The **Delegation of Turkey** thanked ICOMOS for its concrete and brief explanation with regard to the question on the Heritage Impact Assessment analysis. In order to have a fruitful assessment of the draft decision, the delegation explained that it had examined the file submitted by the State Party and that the Heritage Impact Assessment did in fact have in-depth explanations with regard to the attributes of the property, as well as the levels affected and influenced by the proposed projects. Regarding the Visual Impact Assessment, which was another study conducted by the State Party at the same time, the delegation believed that some alternatives were discussed and mitigations were highlighted within the reports. It therefore had different views to ICOMOS. Moreover, the HIA had been conducted by recognized international experts familiar with UNESCO guidelines, and the Committee should thus appreciate its high value.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that the amendment had been deleted quite heavily and thus wished to hear ICOMOS' view on the proposed amendment and whether it recommended that certain deleted parts should be retained for practical reasons.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to review the amendments, noting that many of the parts deleted were 'taking note of' or 'regrets' or 'expresses concern at'. Thus, the parts that remained were the actions. Thus, ICOMOS did not object should the Committee decide to take out the commentary, as what remained were

the actual requests in relation to the mission and the Visual Impact Study, which were the key issues.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraphs 1–4 adopted.

The **Delegation of Finland** wished to add a date in paragraph 5, as pointed out by Jamaica in a previous decision, which would read, ‘at the latest by the 1 December 2017’.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7B.96 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Representative of the Lahore Conservation Society**, Ms Imrana Tiwana, an architect, urbanist and heritage specialist spoke of her honour to represent the vibrant and dynamic civil society of Pakistan through the Lahore Conservation Society, a network of highly specialized professionals and experts, including conservationists, architects, engineers, transport and urban planners, economists, environmentalists and historians who have worked for 28 years to save the soul of the Fort House India Road Heritage City of Lahore. The Society fully endorsed UNESCO’s draft decision both in letter and spirit, and urged the Committee to immediately adopt it. Nevertheless, it was deeply disappointed with the proceedings. The 27.1 km Orange Train project is a national disaster costing 3 billion dollars, serving less than 2 per cent of the population, violating all laws and posing an irreversible and permanent threat that compromised the authenticity, integrity and the OUV of the site. She explained that there had been no compliance to Decision 40.COM 7B.43. The Orange Line passes within 200 feet of the buffer zone and the alignment had not served any purpose. It was noted that the hydraulic works were part of the heritage site. The piers of the train were 3.2 meters away from the hydraulic works and the highly visible viaduct would be directly above the heritage site itself. She asked how this could be accepted with integrity, and that it was a severe violation of the law. The HIA was not in line with international standards and the reports were flawed, misrepresentative and professionally incompetent. No alternative solutions were proposed, as recommended by UNESCO. The State Party had neither invited nor given visas to the joint Reactive Monitoring Mission and, most importantly, the court case has no bearing on the visit of the Mission. It is not *sub judice*, they are mutually exclusive, as confirmed by legal counsel. It was thus important to recognize these facts when upholding the highest ideals of preserving heritage. The NGO had recommended that all work be stopped and that the Committee inscribe the property on the World Heritage List in Danger. She concluded by saying that the work carried out in the Committee had a higher purpose and it was time to take responsibility to uphold the ideals of the Convention and to protect shared World Heritage, collective memory and identity.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to cite the cultural properties in the Asia-Pacific region for which the reports were proposed for *adoption without discussion*:

The Secretariat cited the following: The Great Wall (China) (C 438), Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110), Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea) (C 1278rev), Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241bis), Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the Subak System as a Manifestation of the Tri Hita Karana Philosophy (Indonesia) (C 1194rev), Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115), Susa (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1455), Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People’s Democratic Republic) (C 481), Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143), Historic City of Ayutthaya (Thailand) (C 576) and Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602bis).

The Chairperson declared Decisions 41 COM 7B.86, 41 COM 7B.87, 41 COM 7B.89, 41 COM 7B.90, 41 COM 7B.91, 41 COM 7B.92, 41 COM 7B.93, 41 COM 7B.94, 41 COM 7B.97, 41 COM 7B.98 and 41 COM 7B.99 adopted.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments

A **Representative of the International Union of Architects (UIA), Ms In-Souk Cho**, an architect from Korea, spoke of the UIA as an organization of 1,300,000 architects worldwide. Reading a statement on the behalf of the UIA she noted that the reporting on the State of conservation of World Heritage properties indicated that there were growing threats to urban heritage through unsustainable development and weak management. With social transformations of cities, there was an urgent need to address these issues and review the role of contemporary architecture in historic areas, as indicated in the 2005 Viet Nam Memorandum and the 2011 UNESCO recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. The UIA Work Programme Heritage was committed to encouraging and appreciating the contribution that architecture made in safeguarding World Heritage. It called on the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to join and engage the architectural profession to achieve these goals.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that there were still some unfinished items, adding that arrangements had been with the interpreters to stay on.

ITEM 7A: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER [Continuation.]

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A](http://whc.17/41.COM/7A)

Decision: 41.COM/7A.16

The **Chairperson** invited Burkina Faso to explain the reason in opening the report on Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal).

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** demande l'ouverture pour discussion du point 40 COM 7 à 16, parc national du Niokolo-Koba, afin de permettre à l'État partie d'exprimer ses positions sur des points mentionnés par l'UICN. Le parc a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril à cause du braconnage, du pâturage du bétail et du projet de construction du barrage de Sambangalou. D'autres facteurs affectant le bien ont été identifiés dans les rapports précédents de l'organisation consultative, dont l'exploitation minière potentielle. L'État partie reconnaît avoir accordé une concession minière à un projet aurifère, mais cette exploitation ne se situe pas à l'intérieur du parc national du Niokolo-Koba ni dans sa zone tampon. Suivant les dispositions nationales réglementaires en matière d'environnement, la société Toro Gold a commandité une étude d'impact environnemental et social qui a été validée. La société a demandé à une organisation non gouvernementale un projet de protection intensifiée qui couvrira la zone sud-est du parc jouxtant le projet aurifère. Cela témoigne de l'engagement de l'État partie à prendre toutes les précautions pour éviter tout impact sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. La possibilité de l'État partie de pouvoir disposer de ses ressources peut lui être reconnue pourvu que l'exploitation de ses ressources n'impacte pas la vue du bien inscrit. Sur ce point le Burkina Faso estime qu'il s'agit là d'une conciliation entre les exigences du développement et la protection des biens du patrimoine. La délégation pense qu'une réflexion plus large mériterait d'être poussée en vue d'orientations claires et d'un consensus référentiel qui ne soient pas sujettes à des interprétations divergentes. De plus, concernant le projet de construction du barrage du Sambangalou, elle souligne que l'État partie a indiqué qu'aucune activité ne serait conduite sans au préalable une étude d'impact environnemental et social et propose que le Comité lui accorde ce crédit. Elle salue aussi les actions conduites en matière de lutte contre le braconnage et le renforcement des capacités du personnel en charge de la gestion du site et

estime que ces mesures soient prises en compte à l'égard des amendements au projet de décision ; amendements qui ont fait l'objet d'échanges et de consensus avec l'UICN et le Centre.

Le Secrétariat note que suite aux recommandations de la mission de suivi réactif de 2015, une assistance internationale a été accordée à l'État partie pour soutenir la réactualisation du plan de gestion du bien, et considère la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives comme une priorité. **Le Secrétariat** insiste sur l'importance d'un suivi et de l'étude d'impact environnemental et social du projet de concession minière, afin de tenir compte des préoccupations du Comité et des impacts négatifs potentiels sur la valeur exceptionnelle universelle du bien, peut être par l'identification d'un emplacement alternatif au projet. L'absence de mesures d'atténuation pour la perte d'habitat en dehors du bien, et le fait que le plan de gestion est adaptatif, c'est-à-dire évalué et atténué les impacts directs en fonction de l'avance du projet, sont aussi cause d'interpellation. Pour ces raisons, le Secrétariat recommande au Comité de demander à l'État partie de prioriser la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** souhaite que l'État partie puisse intervenir pour apporter des précisions complémentaires.

La **Délégation du Sénégal** précise qu'ils se sont entendus avec l'UICN lors d'une réunion et qu'il n'est donc pas nécessaire de revenir sur toutes les explications. Elle propose de passer directement à l'examen de la décision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Burkina Faso. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remained unchanged. Paragraph 4 had a slight addition, which would now read, 'Also welcomes the intensified protection project prepared, discussed and implemented following a Memorandum of Understanding concluded between National Parks Directorate, Petowal Mining Company and the NGO Panthera, covering the southeastern part of the property adjacent to the mining concession in Mako'. Paragraph 5 had a slightly modification, in which 'revised' was deleted and replaced with 'monitor and implemented'. Paragraph 6 remained unchanged. Paragraph 7 was deleted and a new paragraph 7 would read, 'Considering that the exploitation of the mine is effective, requests the State Party to take all necessary measures to ensure that this exploitation has no negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property to enable the implementation of all corrective measures adopted by the Committee in its Decision 39 COM 7A.13'. Paragraphs 8–13 remained unchanged.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** propose des corrections au niveau du paragraphe 5. Elle souhaite que la phrase s'arrête après 'préoccupation', c'est-à-dire se lise : « Rappelant également sa préoccupation quant aux impacts potentiels du projet aurifère à Mako qui pourraient exacerber les problèmes existants, tels que le braconnage, l'orpaillage illégal et la fragmentation de l'habitat, ainsi que sa demande à l'État partie de suivre et mettre en œuvre l'étude d'impact environnemental et social du projet afin de tenir compte de cette préoccupation ». Elle souhaite le passage « et afin d'identifier une conception et un emplacement alternatif du projet qui n'aurait pas d'impact négatif sur la valeur exceptionnelle du bien » soit retiré parce que l'exploitation minière est une réalité effective et ne pense donc pas que ce passage n'ait de sens. Elle souhaite aussi que la phrase « Regrette qu'une concession minière ait été accordée au projet aurifère à Mako pour la période 2016-2027 » devienne un paragraphe distinct, c'est-à-dire un nouveau 6.

Le **Représentant de l'UICN** remercie le Sénégal pour le dialogue mené et reconnaît que la totalité de la décision en français est tel qu'elle a été discutée, mais il souhaite apporter un changement à la version anglaise due à une erreur de traduction. Au paragraphe 8 : « que l'exploitation de la mine effective », en anglais serait plutôt « *underway* ».

The **Chairperson** proceeded to adoption, and paragraphs 1–14 were duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.16 adopted as amended to retain Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.17](#)

The Secretariat reported that the State Party submitted its State of conservation report for the Selous Game Reserve on 6 February 2017., which recalled the findings of the ICUN Reactive Monitoring Mission held in February 2017 to which IUCN would report. It was important to note that over the last three years, the State Party had demonstrated political will to halt poaching in the property, as requested by the Committee. The National Authority had developed an emergency action plan and a draft desired State of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger that provided for a comprehensive framework to guide conservation efforts. The State Party should be encouraged to submit the finalized DSOCR and the corrective measures for the Committee's endorsement as soon as it becomes available. It was important to note that on 5 July [2017], the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre and IUCN of the Tanzanian Government's intention to implement the construction of the Stiegler Gorge Power project.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended the State Party for the enormous progress realized so far in implementing the Committee decisions associated with this danger listing in 2014, especially the substantive anti-poaching measures undertaken in collaboration with a range of conservation partners that had already reversed the trend in elephant poaching. Zimbabwe also took note of the recent visit of this property by the IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission in February 2017, the report of which generally confirmed that there was an encouraging range of implemented or planned measures towards safeguarding the OUV of this vast property in accordance with previous Committee decisions. The delegation noted however a few points in the draft decision that warranted a discussion. Firstly, the draft decision urged the State Party to permanently abandon the planned development that was at a conceptual stage. Given the ongoing debate within the Committee on conservation and sustainable development, it was felt that this was a rather strong pre-emptive and premature position. Secondly, it was also proposed that the State Party prepare a strategy plan for mitigating the impact of livestock intrusion in the property. The delegation was aware that Tanzania had a comprehensive GMP [General Management Plan] in place, which was due for review, and that it would present clear approaches on dealing with the scale of the problem that was not considered severe. Therefore, the preparation of an additional study to this effect would be an obvious duplication of efforts. The delegation requested that the State Party be given a chance to clarify, adding that amendments had been submitted to reflect these observations.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that [in a personal capacity] he had visited the Selous Game Reserve a few years ago and confirmed the magnificence of the property. Finland also fully appreciated and supported the need for countries to pursue sustainable development. However, as decided in agenda item 5C concerning sustainable development, the balance between environmental, social and economic sustainability should be achieved while fully respecting and protecting the OUV of World Heritage properties. The delegation was concerned that the proposed Stiegler's Gorge Hydropower project in the heart of the property would indeed jeopardize the OUV of the site. The Committee had also previously raised concern over development projects within Selous, for example, in its Decisions [36 COM 7B.5](#) and [36 COM 8B.43](#). In addition, in 2012, the State Party had expressed its commitment not to proceed with projects that threatened the OUV of the site. Therefore, Finland encouraged Tanzania not to proceed with the Stiegler's Gorge Hydropower project. Construction of dams with large reservoirs within the boundaries of World Heritage properties was incompatible with their World Heritage status, as decided by this Committee in 2016 in its Decision [40 COM.7](#) in paragraph 17. Instead, Finland encouraged Tanzania to consider more sustainable

energy power solutions that would not damage the OUV while ensuring that Selous ecosystem services remained a key asset for local communities in the future. The delegation commended the State Party for its continuous efforts to address the poaching within the property. However, the situation for the critically endangered black rhino was still alarming and there was a need to further strengthen the efforts to protect this species.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** explained that its commitment to undertake the Stiegler's Gorge Hydroelectric development project within the Selous Game Reserve had been on the agenda since independence in the 1960s. The property was therefore inscribed in the World Heritage List with this agenda on the table. At the time of the inscription in 1982, IUCN considered that the Stiegler's Gorge project was of no serious environmental concern given the vast size of the property. It was noted that the Selous Game Reserve covered a vast 50,000 square kilometres, while the project would only cover 3 per cent of this area. The delegation further explained that Tanzania had recently made a firm decision towards industrial transformation to significantly increase energy demand. Given the current available power generation options, it was imperative to reconsider Stiegler's Gorge as a power source. At full capacity, the implementation of this project was expected to boost the total power production for the country by about 144 per cent. Thus, it was decided to develop the Stiegler's Gorge power source to its full potential to address the widening gap in power demand. Upon completion, the project would benefit the majority of the community who live without electricity and would serve the escalated industrial demand for power. Tanzania was of the opinion that if well planned, executed and monitored, such projects as power dams would not necessarily adversely impair conservation. In fact, by using the best available technological options, planning and monitoring tools, such projects could generate national wealth and improve the livelihoods and social well-being of the local community without adversely jeopardizing the very environmental base that generated such benefits. The delegation found it important to mention that despite the no-option conception for hydropower projects within or adjacent World Heritage properties, in reality, demand for such projects continue to exist as they address basic social and economic needs. Moreover, constructive consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies had already occurred and an official submission of this proposal had been made.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Zimbabwe Paragraphs 1–6 remained unchanged. Paragraph 7 had a modification, which would read, 'conduct a comprehensive ESIA/HIA for this project and submit to the World Heritage Centre for review in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines'. Paragraph 8 and 9 remained unchanged. Paragraph 10 was deleted. Paragraph 11 became 10, and paragraph 12 became 11.

The **Delegation of Finland** had an amendment in paragraph 2 related to Committee Decisions, which would read, 'Recalling Decisions 40 COM 7 and 7A.47 [...] as well as 36 COM 7B.5 and 36 COM 8B.43 adopted at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012)'. In paragraph 7, Finland accepted the deletion of 'permanently abandon the project', but given the severity of the situation wished to give the State Party a chance to reconsider. So instead of Zimbabwe's amendment, it wished to introduce, 'Requests the State Party to consider alternative options to the Stiegler's Gorge Hydropower project in the national Power System Master Plan'.

The **Delegation of Turkey** had an amendment in paragraph 7, which would read, 'before deciding to proceed with the construction of the project', which would be added after 'the project'.

The Delegation of **Angola** supported the amendments proposed by Turkey and Finland.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** could go along with the amendments by Turkey and Finland, adding that Tanzania had already mentioned that it would look into alternative power sources.

The Delegation of Finland agreed with the amendment by Turkey.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraphs 1–11 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.17 adopted as amended to retain Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Representative of the Legal and Human Rights Centre in Dar es Salaam** (Tanzania), thanked the Chairperson for recognizing the multiple representative voices of civil society. The statement was made on behalf of the Legal and Human Rights Centre, an organization whose mission is to empower the people of Tanzania so as to promote, reinforce and safeguard human rights and good governance. When the Committee approved the boundary modification of the Selous Game Reserve World Heritage site in 2012, a number of recommendations were made and conditions accepted. Five years later, most of these had not been implemented. The project for which the way was paved by this Decision is a uranium mine, a nuclear installation. Uranium mines and their waste would disseminate a variety of long-lived radioactive elements in perpetuity into the environment. None of the uranium operations in Africa, and only very few in the world, have ever been rehabilitated. Thus, there was a high risk that the Mkuju River Uranium Mine would contaminate the Selous Game Reserve and the Rufiji River system and irreversibly put at risk the OUV of the World Heritage site. The Organization called upon the Committee to take steps to reintegrate the excluded mining area into the World Heritage site to achieve effective protection in the future.

A **Representative of WWF** spoke of how he was representing 450,000 global citizens from over 150 countries who have shown support to the Selous Game Reserve World Heritage site. He commended Tanzania on their leadership on anti-poaching activities to initiate the recovery of the Selous elephant population. However, he cautioned the number of oil and gas concessions that had been issued for Selous, as well as other industrial scale activities planned in the Reserve. Elephants and wildlife need spaces to live and their Selous home is threatened by a large-scale infrastructure project. If these developments go ahead, WWF fears for the survival of the Selous World Heritage site. Protecting the OUV of the Reserve is key, but research suggests keeping Selous intact benefits people and the economy by providing stable livelihoods for 200,000 Tanzanian citizens downstream in areas with high poverty. This issue is not an issue isolated to Tanzania. Nearly half of all World Heritage sites are seeing ongoing pressure from large-scale and potentially harmful industrialization despite the clear economic and social value these properties provide locally, nationally and globally. He encouraged the Committee to be consistent in protecting the future capacity of all these sites to continue providing OUV to all humanity.

The Secretariat announced that there were two evening side events, which were projected onto the screen.

[Close of afternoon/evening session]

FIFTH DAY – Friday 7 July 2017

NINTH SESSION

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 8A: TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES SUBMITTED AS OF 15 APRIL 2017

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/8A](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8A](#)

The **Chairperson** opened the session, inviting the Director to make an announcement.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that due to transport delays, Arabic interpretation was not foreseen for the day's session.

The **Chairperson** remarked that one of the greatest challenges facing the Committee was involvement in politics and national interests that undermine our actions, and it was the Committee's task to overcome these threats. The Chairperson explained that the events over the last two days gave the impression that certain issues were not being tackled with much needed objectivity but had become hostage to political challenges. Such developments during the deliberations would put at risk the successful implementation of the noble purpose and objectives of the World Heritage Committee, therefore he called upon Members of the Committee and State Observers to maintain the necessary serenity and goodwill indispensable to bring about a satisfactory outcome of this 41st session. The Chairperson then turned to agenda item 8A on the Tentative Lists and to the draft decision 41 COM 8A, inviting the Secretariat to briefly present the working document.

The Secretariat explained that document 41 COM/8A presented the Tentative List of all State Parties submitted as of 15 April 2017 in conformity with the Operational Guidelines. In particular, Annex 1 presented the overall situation relative to the Tentative List. Annex 2 presented all the new Tentative Lists or additions to existing Tentative Lists, which had been submitted by States Parties since the Committee took note at its last session. Annex 3 presented a List of all properties submitted on Tentative Lists or received from the States Parties in alphabetical and regional order. As of 15 April 2017, of the 193 States Parties that had ratified the Convention at that date, 182 States Parties had submitted Tentative Lists in accordance with the requirements specified in the Operational Guidelines. Eleven States Parties had not submitted any Tentative Lists. All the nominations submitted for examination at this present session were included on the Tentative Lists of the State Parties concerned. Since the preparation of document 8A for the 40th session of the Committee in 2016 up until 15 of April [2017], 26 State Parties had submitted new Tentative Lists or modified existing Lists. The number of new properties added to existing Tentative Lists is 82, which brought the total of sites currently on the Tentative Lists up to 1,710.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8A adopted.

ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/8B](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/8B.Add](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/8B.Add.2.Rev](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add.2](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/8B2.Add](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B3](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B4](#)

[Point or order by Lebanon]

La **Délégation du Liban**, par un point d'ordre demande des clarifications quant à une modification par le Secrétariat du projet de décision 41.COM 8B.1 relatif à la Vieille ville d'Hébron/AI-Khalil présenté par la Palestine. La version originale du projet de décision a été mis en ligne le 30 juin 2017, or le 4 juillet, juste après l'ouverture de la session, le Secrétariat a mis en ligne une nouvelle version du projet de décision contrairement aux les règles et usages qui ont toujours été suivis par le Comité. La délégation remarque que lorsque de nouvelles informations parviennent au Secrétariat ou aux Organes consultatifs, il est d'usage que ces derniers se réunissent avec l'État partie avant de publier un amendement sur papier bleu ensuite présenté au Comité, mais le projet de décision d'origine reste inchangé. Elle donne l'exemple du site 'Parcs nationaux Chapada dos Veadeiros et Emas' au Brésil, qui a été examiné le 5 juillet. Dans le cas du projet de décision 41.COM 8B.1 relatif à la Vieille ville d'Hébron/AI-Khalil, il est clair que ni le secrétariat ni les organes consultatifs n'ont reçu d'informations nouvelles et que les propositions d'amendement n'ont pas été discutées avec l'État partie. Ce type de pratique, qui contredit les règles et procédures du Comité, ne devrait pas être accepté, au risque d'ouvrir la voie à toutes les dérives possibles, les États parties étant mis devant le fait accompli de projets de décision manipulés et modifiés à la dernière minute sans aucune consultation. Compte tenu du fait que certains projets de décision nécessitent des décisions au niveau des plus hautes autorités, des modifications de dernière minute par le Secrétariat n'est pas admissible. Le Liban demande, par principe, au secrétariat de rectifier l'erreur et de revenir au projet initial tel qu'il a été distribué le 30 juin.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture**, Mr Francesco Bandarin, confirmed the observations by Lebanon that the Secretariat had decided to include a new version of the text. He explained that the evaluation by ICOMOS was unusual in that no final recommendation was made. Therefore the Secretariat decided to provide the Committee with a very succinct summary of the main conclusions by ICOMOS. Normally, ICOMOS would issue a recommendation, i.e. to inscribe, not inscribe, a referral or a deferral. In this case, ICOMOS did not provided this important conclusion. As the Committee did not have all the elements to be informed of ICOMOS' main conclusion, it was believed that the addition of the three paragraphs, summarizing the main conclusions, would help in the debate.

La **Délégation du Liban** trouve la réponse de M. Bandarin inacceptable. Elle souligne que le Comité est ouvert à l'évaluation d'ICOMOS mais que ce n'est pas au Secrétariat de décider ce qu'il peut être modifié après coup. De nouveau, c'est un problème de principe, et si cette dérive passe, ce sont toutes les règles du Comité qui sont questionnés.

The **Delegation of Cuba** added that the Committee should go back to the original wording of the draft decision where, prior to any modifications by the Secretariat, States Parties had already decided on their respective positions based on the original document. Any new

information should be presented by ICOMOS, not the Secretariat.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** appuie la position du Liban pour revenir à la version initiale originale de ce projet de décision.

The **Delegation of Poland** noted the confusion and suggested postponing this item for later discussion and return to the original text. The Committee could vote or even conduct a secret vote.

La **Délégation du Liban** insiste qu'il ne s'agit pas ici d'une discussion mais d'un problème de principe qui s'applique à l'ensemble du point 8B et demande sincèrement s'il est acceptable que le Secrétariat modifie les projets de décisions distribué à l'avance aux États parties sans avoir concerté le Comité ou l'État partie en question.

The **Chairperson** noted that the item was not yet open, and that Lebanon wished to return to the original version, asked the Committee whether it was acceptable.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** wished for the Committee to agree that the Secretariat did not have the right to manipulate a proposed draft decision at the last minute. Once a decision was sent to the State Parties, the Secretariat could not change it, unless there was a genuine explanation and in discussion with the State Party concerned. In the case of new information, it should be presented on [the specific blue form] for that purpose. This was a question of principle.

The **Chairperson** understood that this was an issue of principle.

The **Delegation of Cuba** clarified that the Committee was not asking asking for a vote, noting that Poland seemed to want to move ahead with a secret ballot on the decision, which was not yet open and thus premature. The delegation simply requested to return to the original wording, as the Committee could not fall into the trap of making these kinds of procedural mistakes, and thus a return to the original wording would ensure that this did not reoccur.

La **Délégation du Koweït** soutient la proposition du Liban par principe et n'accepte pas que le Secrétariat change la décision.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the position of Lebanon and Cuba in that the Secretariat could not change a decision midway, which was setting a very bad precedent and was not allowed.

The **Delegation of Peru** noted that it was clear that the situation did not concern Hebron but was rather a question of substance, adding that the point of order raised drew the Committee's attention to a procedural anomaly, i.e. the presentation of a document that ran counter to the usual Rules of Procedure. The delegation was sure that the Secretariat acted in good faith when it applied this unusual procedure.

Noting the confusion, the **Delegation of Poland** asked the Secretariat to explain the procedures concerning this issue, and the original document on which the discussion would be based.

The **Delegation of Turkey** also supported returning to the original texts, as instructions [from the capitals] were based on the original document.

The **Delegation of Croatia** sought clarification, as some Members were referring to the terms 'decision' and 'recommendation' when neither formed the basis of discussion.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** supported the proposal to keep to the original text.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that it was still under a point of order and that the item had not yet been opened. However, in view of the sensitivity of this particular item, he asked the Legal Adviser to comment.

The **Legal Adviser** was not sure that there was a question requiring legal advice, adding that

the Rules of Procedure were silent on this matter. Moreover, the original decision had no text in the decision paragraph, and the subsequent amended second version of the decision also had no decision text. The Rules were silent as to what should be done in a case like this, or whether there was in fact any breach of the Rules. The matter therefore needed to be decided by the Secretariat and by the Committee as to the way to handle this matter.

La **Délégation du Liban** donne raison au Conseiller juridique, mais insiste que lorsqu'un projet de décision est envoyé aux États membres, peu importe le sujet, toutes décisions doit être faites en amont et que si le Secrétariat souhaite faire des modifications elles doivent être faites au moment de l'élaboration du projet de décision, avant d'être envoyé aux États parties. Cela ouvre la route aux dérives et remet en cause tout le fonctionnement du Comité.

The **Delegation of Peru** reiterated that it was a procedural problem in that the Secretariat had taken the initiative [to change the draft decision] even though it was not in its prerogative to do so, and it was now up to the Committee to correct it.

The **Chairperson** understood that there was a general wish to follow the procedures and to return to the previous version dated 30 June [2017], which would be announced at the time of opening the item. He also apologized for the procedural error.

The **Delegation of Cuba** concurred with the Chairperson's understanding, adding that this showed the importance of the Committee's procedures. It remarked on the overall reform of procedures in UNESCO as a whole and that such ambiguities needed to be eliminated, which would also clarify the process to streamline and fine-tune the workings of this Committee and prevent these kinds of problems from recurring.

The **Delegation of Poland** noted the discrepancy in the Committee and requested the Secretariat to deliver the original text to the Committee.

La **Délégation du Liban** souhaite que le Comité prenne une décision de principe avant de close le point 8B et d'ouvrir 9B.1 qui serait que le Secrétariat ne puisse pas modifier un projet de déclaration à la dernière minute, qu'une fois qu'il est envoyé aux États parties le seul moyen de le modifier est avec un papier bleu, et cela pour tout sites et projets de déclaration.

The **Chairperson** remarked that this was the added value of the 41st session. He then turned to the nominations of properties to the World Heritage List and recalled the relevant working documents concerning the nominations and the evaluations of the Advisory Bodies, namely, ICOMOS and IUCN. He further recalled that document INF.8B.3 presented the list of all complete nominations received by 1 February 2017, which would not be discussed at the present session, as they were foreseen for examination at the Committee's next session in 2018. Document [INF.8B.4](#) presented the factual errors identified by States Parties in the Advisory Body evaluations, which would be read out by The Secretariat.

The Secretariat noted that in accordance with Paragraph 150 and Annex 12 of the Operational Guidelines, the notification of factual errors, as submitted by the concerned State Parties and reviewed by the relevant Advisory Body, were presented in the language in which they were submitted. It is important to recall that Annex 12 of the Operational Guidelines is the official format of submission of factual errors identified in the Advisory Body's evaluation, and only identifications received by the statutory deadline and submitted in the appropriate form had been made available and included in document INF.8B.4. The comments by the Advisory Bodies were in the right-side column and indicate whether the information submitted is a factual error or not. In 2017, the Secretariat received 24 factual errors concerning the following nominations to be examined at this session. The nominations submitted by: i) Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Italy, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Ukraine – the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe; ii) Benin, Burkina Faso – W-Arly-Pendjari Complex; iii) Ghana – Mole National Park; iv) Mongolia, Russian Federation – Landscapes of Dauria; v) Mexico – Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: ordinary habitat of Mesoamerica; vi) Angola – Historical Centre of Mbanza Kongo;

vii) Azerbaijan – Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan’s Palace; viii) China – Kulangsu: a historic international settlement; ix) Denmark – Kujataa – a subarctic farming landscape in Greenland; x) Eritrea – Asmara: Africa’s Modernist City; xi) Georgia – Gelati Monastery; xii) Germany – Caves with the oldest Ice Age art; xiii) Germany – The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau; xiv) Germany – Naumburg Cathedral and the High Medieval Cultural Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut; xv) India – Historic City of Ahmadabad; xvi) Iran (Islamic Republic of) – Historic City of Yazd; xvii) Japan – Sacred island of Okinoshima and Associated Sites in the Munakata Region; xviii) Jordan – As-Salt Eclectic Architecture (1865-1925), Origins and Evolution of an Architectural Language in the Levant; xix) Poland – Tamowskie Góry Lead-Silver-Zinc Mine and its Underground Water Management System; xx) South Africa – †Khomani Cultural Landscape; xxi) Turkey – Aphrodisias; xxii) United Arab Emirates – Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants’ Harbour; and xxiii) United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland – The English Lake District. In addition, the minor boundary modifications submitted by the Netherlands, the Defence Line of Amsterdam, would be discussed. Before the presentation of the nominations, the Secretariat would announce the related factual error notification received, and whether it had an impact on the proposed statement of OUV.

With no objections, the **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to present the withdrawals.

The Secretariat noted that six nominations had been withdrawn. Four had been withdrawn prior to the publication of document 8.B, while two nominations were withdrawn just prior to the present session and after the publication of document 8.B. The six withdrawn nominations were: i) Bahrain – Dilmun Burial Mounds; ii) Germany – Luther sites in Central Germany; iii) Ghana – Mole National Park; iv) Italy – Sila National Park; v) Republic of Korea – Hanyangdoseong, the Seoul City Wall; and vi) Republic of Moldova – Orheiul Vechi Archaeological Landscape. Following these withdrawals, the Committee would not have 33 nominations to examine. Among them, six were natural sites, one mixed site, and 26 cultural sites.

The **Chairperson** took the opportunity to recall the two essential procedures concerning nominations. Firstly, the Committee was requested to examine the recommendations and draft decisions presented in the relevant documents, and, in accordance with paragraph 153 of the Operational Guidelines, take its decisions in the following four categories: i) to **inscribe** a property on the World Heritage List (paragraph 154 of the Operational Guidelines); ii) **not to inscribe** on the World Heritage List (paragraph 158 of the Operational Guidelines); iii) to **refer** back a nomination to the State Party for additional information (paragraph 159 of the Operational Guidelines); and iv) to **defer** a nomination for more-in-depth assessment or study, or a substantial revision by the State Party (paragraph 160 of the Operational Guidelines). It was noted that nominations referred back to the State Party for additional information may be resubmitted to the Committee at its subsequent session for examination. Should the Committee decide to defer a nomination, an in-depth assessment or study, or a substantial revision of the nomination file by the State Party would be required. Secondly, on the specific issue of submission of additional information on nominations, the Chairperson recalled paragraph 148 point h), as well as the nomination timetable of paragraph 168 of the Operational Guidelines, which establishes that the evaluations and presentations of the Advisory Bodies should not take into account or include any information submitted by the State Party after 28 February in the year in which the nomination is considered. The Chairperson then proceeded with the examination of nominations, beginning with a nomination proposed on an emergency basis, followed by nominations of natural properties, then mixed properties, followed by cultural properties. ICOMOS and IUCN would also be called upon to make their presentations on the specific nominations.

I. NOMINATIONS TO BE PROCESSED ON AN EMERGENCY BASIS

Hebron/Al-Khalil Old Town (Palestine)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add.2](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.1](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the first nomination on an emergency basis, inviting ICOMOS to present draft decision 41 COM 8B.1 on Hebron/Al-Khalil Old Town.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted that the nomination was submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 30 January 2017 to be evaluated under normal evaluation procedures, and transmitted to ICOMOS on 16 March 2017. On 9 March 2017, the State Party wrote to the World Heritage Centre to request that the evaluation be changed from normal to emergency procedures, as set out in paragraphs 161 and 162 of the Operational Guidelines. On 22 March 2017, ICOMOS wrote to the State Party to request supplementary information on the specific condition that led to the request. The State Party replied on 22 April 2017. ICOMOS attempted to undertake a field visit to the property; it persisted in trying to arrange the necessary travel until early June when it became apparent that the visit was regrettably not feasible. The use of high-quality local limestones characterized the rebuilding of Hebron Al Khalil Old Town during the Mamluk period. The focal point of the town was Al-Ibrahimi Mosque/The Tomb of Patriarchs whose buildings lie within monolithic walls built in the 1st century B.C. to protect the tombs of the patriarch Abraham/Ibrahim and his family. This came to be revered as a pilgrim site for three monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, part of a triangle of holy sites with Jerusalem and Bethlehem. Hebron Town dates back at least to the 1st century A.D. and probably much earlier. Nearby, on Tel Rumeida, are extensive remains of urban settlements, some more than 3,000 years old, that have provided evidence for a 4th century A.D. Christian Pilgrim centre. The surrounding hills formed a sort of natural fortress for the Mamluk town and separated its well-watered fertile valleys from the desert beyond. The town was sited at the crossroads of trade routes for caravans travelling between southern Palestine, Sinai, Eastern Jordan and the north of the Arabian Peninsula. Although the subsequent Ottoman Period heralded an extension of the town to the surrounding areas and brought numerous architectural additions, particularly the raising of the roof level of houses to provide more upper stories, the overall Mamluk morphology of the town is seen to have persisted with its hierarchy of areas, quarters based on ethnic, religious or professional groupings, and houses with groups of rooms organized according to a tree-shaped system. What survives today reflects the impact of military actions in 1834, two earthquakes in 1837 and 1927, the demolition of quarters around the Al-Ibrahimi Mosque/The Tomb of Patriarchs in 1965 to enlarge the piazza, and since 1967, the impact of settlers (there are two Israeli settlements in the property), further destruction of buildings and the development of new urban areas in the periphery of the town. In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, this is a *site*. The nominated town encompasses the continuous urban fabric which goes back to the Mamluk and early Ottoman periods. The buffer zone encompasses the foothills around the nominated zone, including one of the three areas of the Mamluk period. A hierarchy of streets connected the three main areas of the town, with some of the main streets being covered with vaulting through which openings provided light and ventilation. The system of main arteries and auxiliary roads determines a network of public and semi-public spaces that define the limits of the residential quarters. There are different types of houses constructed with local yellow limestone, among them the fortification houses which created a defence mechanism using houses tightly packed together along the outer perimeter of the town, forming a continuous façade with openings kept to a minimum. The residential buildings of

the late Ottoman period are built in a symmetrical compact manner and contain several floors. The eclectic decorative façades are the façades of European influence. The Al-Ibrahimi Mosque/The Tomb of Patriarchs is the most important monument of the town. Elements of the current buildings date back to long before the Mamluk period. This enclosure of massive, finely dressed stone blocks still frames the Mosque, and within it are structures that reflect later periods. The great covered prayer hall was constructed in the 12th century out of the remains of the Crusaders' 11th century Romanesque church which in turn arose from the ruins of a 7th century mosque. Since 1994, the complex has been divided into two separate parts with restricted access.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** reported that the State Party had set out the following emergency threats as a reason for requesting an Emergency Inscription: i) ten UNESCO Executive Board decisions had not been fulfilled; ii) protest letters addressed to the Director-General about continuous violations in Al-Khalil/Hebron had not had any effect; iii) alarming details of violations including vandalism, property damage and other attacks that impact on the authenticity and integrity of the property; iv) the continuity and accumulation of these violations impact on the integrity, authenticity and distinctive character of the property; and v) some violations have irreversible negative impacts on the integrity, authenticity and distinctive character of the property. What is clear is that the threats and violations are systematic and longstanding. They have a significant impact on the lives of ordinary citizens, resulting in the gradual de-population of the Old Town (although this is to a degree now being reversed). Over time, these could be seen to threaten the resilience and sustainability of urban life, and the conservation of the property. Owing to the unfeasibility of a field visit, ICOMOS had been unable to fully evaluate whether the property unquestionably justified some criteria, conditions of authenticity and integrity, and management requirements or whether recent incidents had drastically increased the levels of threats to a degree that the situation may be considered an emergency for which immediate action by the Committee is needed. Under these circumstances, ICOMOS recommended that a field visit to Hebron/Al Khalil Old Town be carried out as soon as possible to assess these issues. ICOMOS was ready to offer advice and support in developing what is considered to be a strong potential for OUV to be demonstrated for an enlarged property that includes Tell Rumeida, the three areas of the Old Town, and other sites with religious associations.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the draft decision of 30 June, as proposed by the Secretariat, had received an amendment by Kuwait, Lebanon and Tunisia.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** thanked ICOMOS for its effort to prepare an evaluation for the property in such a short time despite the fact that ICOMOS was unable to undertake a field mission to Hebron/Al Khalil as the necessary permission was not granted by the Israeli authorities, which was deeply regrettable. As stated in the ICOMOS evaluation report, it was clear that the lack of a field visit meant that ICOMOS was unable to fully evaluate whether the property unquestionably justified some OUV criteria, as well as the conditions of integrity and authenticity. However, ICOMOS' report suggested that the nominated property had strong potential to demonstrate OUV, which may also be developed for an enlarged property that would include sites currently proposed in the buffer zone. The delegation [speaking on a personal note as an architect and architecture historian] remarked that the sites suggested by ICOMOS were separated from the Old City limits located outside the rampart houses and scattered around the nominated property, and any enlarged nomination should be a serial type nomination. Operational Guidelines state that any component part of a serial nomination should contribute to the overall OUV of the whole series and that each component of the series should justify each of the criteria proposed for inscription. This would be very difficult to justify for a revised enlarged nomination as suggested by ICOMOS. As for the Shiekh Ali Al-Bakka neighbourhood, for example, it is located outside the city core in the middle of a modern urban development, affecting considerably its integrity and authenticity, and a component to the series would considerably weaken its OUV. As for the Tell Rumeida archaeological site, this site stands on the other side of the valley, south of the historic city

core and was destroyed several times during history and totally abandoned since the early Christian period. The question was how could such an archaeological component relate to the historic city core that developed since the 9th century around the [Al] Haram Al-Ibrahimi Mosque of the Patriarchs/Tombs of the Patriarchs and housed a multicultural community that came from a myriad of different places, ethnicity and backgrounds: Jews, Christians, Muslims, Arabs, Kurds, Turkis, and so on, and which is still a living city today. How could such a component relate to a unique urban structure that has preserved the morphology and residential typologies dating back to the Mamluk era in a manner that cannot be found in any of the historic cities in the same geo-cultural region? As an element of an enlarged series, Tell Rumeida Archaeological Site would not justify either criterion (ii), an outstanding example of a multi-cultural community that came to share the same traditions and values, or criterion (iv), an outstanding example of an urban structure that has remarkably preserved the historic fabric dating back to the 12th century. As for criterion (vi,) the World Heritage List, as well as Tentative Lists, comprise a large number of properties associated with religions, beliefs and spirituality, but what is unique in Hebron/Al Khalil was not only that it is one of the holiest sites for the three monotheistic religions, but more particularly that its significance is the same for the three religions, embodied in the Haram Al-Ibrahimi Tombs of the Patriarchs structure around which the whole city developed as a holy city.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** further explained that in Jerusalem, for example, Jews, Christians and Muslims value different religious heritage, each community being the gardian of its own shrines and holy places, and Al Haram Al-Ibrahimi/Tombs of Patriarchs is a common sacred site for all believers, a place where Jews, Christians and Muslims can pray together. This unique situation carries a universal message that would be weakened if we would follow ICOMOS' suggestion to include components outside the nominated property that have separate spiritual significance for Jews, Christians and Muslims. True, there are such components scattered around Hebron City core, like, for example, Tell Rumeida Archaeological Site, the Russian Monastery of the Saint Trinity or the Mosque of Sheikh Ali al-Bakka, but all these components have minor spiritual significance compared to Al Haram Al-Ibrahimi/Tombs of the Patriarch, and none of them carries a common spiritual message for the three religions. The delegation proposed keeping the message as strong as it is now that recognized the uniqueness of Hebron/Al Khalil compared to other properties of religious significance, a city organized around a single holy site where the believers of the three monotheistic religions share the same place of worship. It was also noted that it is a combination of the three criteria that gives to the nominated property its OUV. Finally, ICOMOS' report recognized that the property was subject to direct threats and systematic violations that affect the resilience and sustainability of urban life and the conservation of the property. Everyone who has been to Hebron knows that the situation is similar to apartheid. However, in the absence of a field visit, ICOMOS refrained from proposing any recommendation to the Committee for the first time in the history of the Convention. Although the necessary permissions for such a visit were not granted, the Committee could not postpone its decision. Given that ten UNESCO Executive Board decisions regarding the site were not fulfilled, given that continuous violations impact on the integrity and authenticity of the property, given also that such violations if continued might have irreversible impact on the OUV of the property, given all this, the Committee should take its responsibilities according to Article 11 of the Convention and inscribe Hebron/Al Khalil Old City on the World Heritage List in Danger. The ambitious project launched by Hebron Rehabilitation Committees in the early 1990s was still being pursued despite all the difficulties. This project was awarded the Agha Khan Award in 1998 and the UN World Habitat Award in 2013. Thus the inscription of Hebron/Al Khalil on the World Heritage List would be an incentive to transform a place of confrontation and violence into a space for 21st century understanding.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** signale que depuis la création du Centre du patrimoine mondial, jamais un projet de résolution a été présenté sans un paragraphe opérationnel, c'est à dire un projet de décision. C'est une première étonnante pour le Centre du patrimoine mondial et témoigne du refus répété de l'Israël d'autoriser l'expert de l'ICOMOS à accéder

au site candidat pour inscription, Hébron/Al-Khalil. La délégation tunisienne à relever qu'à cinq reprises la Palestine s'est préparée à accueillir l'expert de l'ICOMOS, mais que cela a été empêché. La Tunisie insiste à ce que le Comité ne porte pas les conséquences de ces entraves contre la Palestine mais y voit plutôt une occasion d'insister sur l'urgence d'inscrire la Vieille ville d'Hébron sur la Liste.

The **Delegation of Poland** noted the sensitivity of the issue and proposed to go directly to secret voting on this decision.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that Poland was incorrect [in its interpretation] as the Committee could not move to a secret ballot as it had not yet exhausted the debate on this item. It noted two key issues: the process of analysing the urgency of the nomination, and the evaluation of the nomination itself. The delegation felt clearly that, given the remarks from the previous speakers on the non-compliance with the Executive Board Decisions and the reports of violence and vandalism in particular, there was a valid threat to the integrity of the site that needed to be taken into consideration when considering emergency procedures. In addition, the delegation believed that this particular property was on the back of Members' minds because it had been unable to include it in the World Heritage List in the past owing to the very difficult situation on the ground.

The **Chairperson** reminded Poland that, according to the Rules of Procedure, at least two State Parties needed to request a secret ballot.

The **Delegation of Poland** reiterated that it had asked for a secret vote to avoid the very sensitive inter-religious subject.

The **Delegation of Turkey** concurred with the remarks by Lebanon in believing that Hebron/Al Khalil Old Town had all the unique features to merit inscription on an emergency basis. It therefore supported the decision to inscribe Hebron/Al Khalil Old Town, a city of immense historical and religious importance, on the World Heritage List in Danger.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** propose un vote à main levée.

La **Délégation du Koweït** soutient la demande de la Tunisie pour un vote à main levée.

The **Delegation of Cuba** also supported a vote by a show of hands.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** supported the proposal for a secret ballot vote.

The **Delegation of Croatia** supported a secret ballot vote, according to the Rules of Procedure.

The **Chairperson** remarked that voting had been declared but the question was the form of voting.

The **Delegation of Poland** noted that in a case of three Committee members in favour by secret vote, then it should be so decided.

The **Chairperson** noted a point of order by Lebanon.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** remarked that if a majority was sought then the Chairperson could ask the Committee Members to express their opinion on the manner of the vote, or the opinion of the Legal Adviser could be sought. The delegation was in favour of an open vote.

The **Chairperson** did not wish to ask every Member and would proceed according to the Rules.

The **Delegation of Cuba** noted that the request for a secret ballot came about in the middle of the discussion and not at the appropriate time with two delegations requesting a vote by a show of hands. If the request for a secret ballot vote had come out at the end of the discussion the outcome would have been different. Thus, the procedure should be respected.

The **Legal Adviser** noted that the room had agreed to a closure of debate [confirmed by the

Chairperson]. It was also noted that three Members requested a vote by secret ballot and three Members requested a vote by show of hands. The provisions in the Rules of Procedure were clear: Rule 41 states that voting shall normally be by a show of hands. Rule 41 provides that a decision should be voted on by secret ballot when two or more Members so request. In the case where two or more Members have requested a vote by secret ballot, the vote will need to be by secret ballot.

The **Chairperson** understood that the Committee would proceed with a secret ballot and requested the Secretariat to present the Rule and the majority required for adoption of the motion.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** wished to ask the Legal Adviser about those Members wishing to have an open vote and whether the Rules specifically ignores their will.

The **Legal Adviser** replied that the applicable Rule was very clear. Rule 41, entitled 'Secret ballot', provides that 'A decision shall be voted on by secret ballot whenever two or more States members shall so request or if the Chairperson so decides'.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to confirm the secret ballot.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted a point of order.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** asked to clarify the subject of the vote.

The **Chairperson** noted that the vote would be based on the draft decision of 30 June.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the question (the subject of the vote) would be projected on the screen. The Secretariat prepared the voting box, and the Chairperson would need to appoint two tellers.

The **Legal Adviser** confirmed that the subject of the vote should be made clear to the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** noted a draft proposal from Lebanon, Kuwait and Tunisia. The original draft decision had four paragraphs. The delegations proposed to add in the first part of paragraph 4, 'Acknowledging that in its evaluation report of the nomination, ICOMOS states that "the necessary permissions were not forthcoming for travelling to the Hebron H2 zone, which is under Israeli military control, and within which lies the nomination property" and that in view [...]', with the rest of the paragraph unchanged. A new paragraph 5 would read, 'Regrets that Israel, the Occupying Power, did not give the necessary permission to ICOMOS to undertake a Field Visit to the site in order to evaluate the Outstanding Universal Value, the condition of integrity, the authenticity and management requirements of the property'. Paragraph 6 would read, 'Considers that the nominated property unquestionably justifies criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi) as well as conditions of integrity and authenticity'. Paragraph 7 would read, 'Also considers that the property is faced with serious threats which could have deleterious effects on its inherent characteristics and for which an immediate action by the World Heritage Committee is needed'. Paragraph 8, would read, 'Inscribes Hebron/AI Khalil Old Town on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi). Finally, paragraph 9 would read, 'Also inscribes Hebron/AI Khalil Old Town on the World Heritage List in Danger'.

The **Chairperson** sought to nominate the tellers among the three proposed delegations: Philippines, Angola and the Republic of Korea.

The **Delegations of the Philippines** and **Angola** supported the proposal.

The **Chairperson** did not therefore approach the Republic of Korea, and the two tellers were pronounced as the Philippines and Angola.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** asked that the question be projected onto the screen. The voting papers were distributed to the Members of the Committee, and it was requested that nobody should come to the podium during the voting procedure.

[The Delegation of Israel approaches the podium]

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that this was a secret ballot and no delegation should be present at the podium during the procedure.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reiterated that this was a secret vote under Rule 37, which states, 'Decisions of the Committee on matters covered by the provisions of the Convention shall be taken by a majority of two-thirds of its members present and voting'. It could thus be agreed that an inscription on the World Heritage List is a provision under the Convention.

The **Chairperson** stated that it was a matter of majority required.

La **Délégation du Liban** remarque qu'il en va de l'honneur du Comité de demander aux Observateurs de quitter le podium et demande au Président de demander à la sécurité d'intervenir.

[The Delegation of Israel approaches the podium]

The **Chairperson** urged the Committee to continue its session.

The **Secretariat** noted that the envelopes and voting papers had been distributed, and she called the Members of the Committee, by english alphabetical order, to the podium to cast their vote.

The **Chairperson** announced the results:

- Required majority: 10
- 21 Committee Members present and voting
- 12 Yes – 3 No – 6 Abstentions

The **Chairperson** expressed gratitude to the tellers, Mr Vladimir Russo from Angola and Ms Donna Celeste Feliciano-Gatmaytan from the Philippines.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.1 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** remarked that the triumph was not about one religion over another but a triumph for humankind, history, peace, tolerance and unity, and against the violation, oppression, aggression and the terror of war and weapons. This was a vital message to the world that Jews, Christians and Muslims could co-exist and meet in one place.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

The **Delegation of Israel** welcomed the Mayor of Hebron, remarking that he had killed six Israelis in 1980 in a terror attack and was now elected to the Head of Hebron's Municipal Council. He spoke as a Jew and a human-being, calling the incident three days ago as one of UNESCO's most dishonourable moments. He recalled the moment of silence commemorating the Holocaust that was immediately followed by Cuba's initiative for a moment of silence in memory of Palestinian victims, for which Israel was reprimanded by the Palestinian representative for refusing to stand. The delegate did not regret his decision, as no-one had any right to preach for refusing to take part in a cynical political charade that had nothing to do with human dignity and everything to do with a deep contempt for humanity. Firstly, the request for a moment of silence was timed deliberately. Cuba stooped low in creating a parallel between the victims of the Holocaust and the victims of a violent political confrontation. The Holocaust stood alone in its atrocities, its cruelty, and in its systematic and industrial human butchery. It is like nothing else nor should it ever be repeated. Never again. As a representative of the Jewish nation, the delegate would not give in to this distortion of the Holocaust. Furthermore, the Palestinian Authority viewed these terrorists as heroes such as Fatah, Hamas, ISIS, Al Qaida, Addressing the Cuban representative, the delegate spoke of how she had not stood in silence in memory of the millions murdered in the Holocaust, claiming a political act. Addressing the delegation of Palestine, the delegate spoke of being the first to stand in memory of even one child lost and in memory of innocents whose lives were taken, Palestinians and Israelis alike. In the Jewish tradition, every soul is an entire

world. The delegation appreciated the gesture of the Palestinian Ambassador and others who chose to stand in a moment of silence for the Holocaust. This was a human stand for hope despite political games. Addressing the Ambassador of Germany, the delegation asked how it could have shown such contempt of the memory of the Holocaust. Did Germany really see no difference between the victims of the Holocaust and the Palestinian murderers and terrorists.

La **Délégation de la Palestine** s'excuse de l'épisode qui a eu lieu, qui montre ce que les palestiniens subissent à longueur de journée. Elle commence par remercier les États membres qui ont voté en faveur de l'inscription d'Hébron sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et remercier tous les États qui lui ont donné leur solidarité et compréhension ; qui on fait comprendre que même s'ils n'accédaient pas au vote, ils comprenaient qu'il s'agisse là d'une question qui relève de la justice et de l'humanité. Elle remercie aussi ses Ministère du tourisme et des antiquités et le Ministère des affaires étrangères pour leur travail sur l'aboutissement de ce projet de décision. Plus particulièrement, la délégation remercie Mr Mounir Anastas pour son travail sur ce dossier pendant quatre ans mais qui n'a pas pu être présent due à des raisons de santé. Elle insiste sur le fait la Palestine n'a pas inscrit une religion sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ; les religions se portent dans le cœur. La Palestine, en tant qu'État souverain, même s'il est occupé, a exercé son droit à inscrire sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial une ville qui se trouve sur son territoire, ce qui devrait être une évidence banale sur le fait que les peuples sont maîtres de leur propre territoire et qu'à ce titre ils disposent du droit de les inscrire et d'en disposer. La délégation finit par rappeler que la Palestine est une terre plurielle et qu'il s'agisse de la seule terre au monde qui soit simultanément sacrée par trois religions. Il y a en Palestine une tradition de pluralité vieille de plusieurs siècles, qui est faite de force, d'empathie, de solidarité, et du sentiment et qui se base non pas dans l'appartenance à telle ou telle religion mais sur la reconnaissance de cette terre sainte dont elles sont les dépositaires, peu importe que l'on soit juifs, chrétiens, musulmans ou même agnostiques. À ce titre, la délégation insiste que cette mosquée sera ouverte pour tous les croyants qui viennent exercer leur rituel, élever leurs prières et pratiquer leur foi. Elle remercie de nouveau le Comité pour ce moment historique. La Palestine conclu avec des remerciements du fond du cœur pour ce moment historique pour son peuple.

La **Délégation du Liban** se sent obligé d'intervenir compte tenu des propos qui ont été dits. Le délégué raconte [sur une note personnelle] que depuis sa petite jeunesse les valeurs du rejet du nazisme, du racisme et de l'antisémitisme lui ont été inculquées. Son père a fondé la première ligue antinazi et antifasciste au Liban et en Syrie dès 1936 et pendant l'époque du mandat français, sa famille hébergeait des juifs français qui avaient fui le régime de Vichy. Pour ces activités, son père a été emprisonné par les autorités vichystes et la revue qu'il publiait a été interdite de publication. Cela ne l'a pas empêché de se solidariser avec la tragédie du peuple palestinien chassé de ses terres. Bien au contraire, cette solidarité s'inscrit dans la continuité de son engagement en faveur des valeurs d'humanisme et d'universalisme. Le délégué insiste sur le fait qu'il ne puisse accepter les accusations qui ont été portées contre ceux qui ont proposé et appuyé l'inscription du site d'Hébron/Al-Khalil sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial de l'humanité, ce site qui devrait être l'occasion de la rencontre entre les hommes de bonne volonté, plutôt que le lieu de pratiques inadmissibles qui contredisent toutes les valeurs de l'UNESCO.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** thanked the World Heritage Centre and Saudi Arabia for the interpretation in Arabic. The delegation began by thanking those who voted in favour of the decision, even those who abstained. Hebron is considered to be a part of a State based on its people, and the Decision did not concern religion; it spoke of co-existence. The delegation thanked the people of Cuba who did not deserve humiliation and whose people hold values based on humanism.

The **Delegation of Cuba** thanked the Chairperson for his patience and willingness to resolve the issue, adding that it was not surprised by this sort of situation having witnessed it in other

fora. It also wished to thank the Committee for the Decision, which was in keeping with the very mandate of the Committee, i.e. the protection of heritage, which recognized the links between the three monotheistic religions of this site. Not wishing to refer to the earlier insults, the delegation spoke of Cuba as a free and sovereign country with a large Jewish community who actively participate in the social and political life of the country. The delegation believed in human dignity and the value of life as a fundamental principle, and had thus also participated in a minute's silence for the victims of the Holocaust. The delegation concluded by thanking the Chairperson for the way the session was managed, the proceedings of which should not be tolerated in this type of forum.

The **Delegation of Canada** was disappointed by the continual politicization of the work of the Committee, as evidenced by the Decision taken on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls earlier this week and the Decision just taken to include the Old Town of Hebron/AI Khalil on the List of the World Heritage in Danger. Canada took issue with the Decision as it failed to take into account the independent Advisory Body's findings that were plainly outlined in the draft decision prepared by the Secretariat. These repeated decisions not only hurt in this scope, but they did not advance prospects for the comprehensive, just and lasting peace to which all aspire for the sake of all Israelis and Palestinians.

The **Delegation of United States of America** spoke of the Decision to inscribe Hebron/AI Khalil Old Town on an emergency basis as divisive, confusing and impossible to justify. This site was not under any real or immediate threat. Indeed, the only urgency was the need to express political anger. Had the Committee shown patience, this inscription might have represented at some time in the future an example of the Convention acting as the international community's best and most important tool for cultural dialogue, mutual understanding and peace. Instead, the politically motivated Decision only further stained UNESCO's reputation and further divided this House.

The **Delegation of Germany** remarked that everybody who knows German policy knows that the behaviour of the German Ambassador in this room three days ago cannot be misinterpreted.

A **Representative from the Simon Wiesenthal Center** (NGO), on behalf of its 400,000 members worldwide, spoke of its respect for the Committee's work, adding that it had called upon the Committee in the past for the protection of Auschwitz when a discotheque was opened within its protected zone. Unfortunately, to paraphrase the German strategist von Clausewitz, that diplomacy is war by other means. Since the Palestinian entry to UNESCO in November 2011, the Committee had seen heritage as war by other means, from 2012 [and the inscription of] the Church of the Nativity, to 2014 [and the inscription of] Battir, the site of the Bar Kokbha Jewish revolt against the Roman occupation in 132 CE to the Western Wall and the Temple Mount of Solomon. At this meeting, on soil soaked with Jewish blood, to witness the ravages on Jewish affinity, to Jerusalem and now to the Cave of the Patriarchs in Hebron could only be matched by the temerity of an amalgam between six million Jews shot and gassed in Auschwitz-Birkenau and the support to Palestinians in a moment of silence. To stand in silence in succession for both is a form of Holocaust revisionism, casting Israelis as Nazis violates the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance and the European Parliament's working definition of anti-Semitism with its signatory countries represented here. He added that no other people or religion had been so maligned in the Committee, adding that he would have been the first to protest had the victim been of Islamic heritage. The Judeo-Christian heritage was continually under attack in this chamber, and the Committee should be saved from further fast-tracked demands based on spurious claims to emergency, while other States wait years to inscribe their heritage. The Committee must return to its pristine integrity for the acknowledgment, protection and preservation of heritage in an atmosphere of peaceful dialogue, to redeem and improve World Heritage in mutual respect for the narrative of the other.

The **Delegation of Australia** regretted the decisive Decision and the damaging way in which it was reached, adding that this was not only harmful to Israeli and Palestinian relations but obviously also damaged the Committee and UNESCO. The delegation was concerned that heavily politicized and unbalanced language in these resolutions continue to alter the status quo of Islamic, Jewish and Christian holy sites and were not consistent with the effort to preserve the OUV of these sites. Australia did not support these resolutions that target Israel in a multilateral forum and it did not think that this would bring the parties closer to a negotiated settlement. The delegation was focused on supporting initiatives that reflect and maintain progress towards a negotiated settlement so that Israel and a future Palestine may exist side-by-side in peace and security. These sorts of decisions did not advance that agenda and furthermore failed to recognize the advice of the Advisory Bodies. The delegation encouraged all sides to refrain from further provocative actions and statements that undermined prospects of peace and the interests of the Organization.

The **General Director of the Hebron Rehabilitation Committee** (NGO) spoke of his pride of the Decision taken by UNESCO and the Committee, which proved that they were there to shoulder responsibility and protect and preserve international cultural heritage. He wished to respond to the remarks by the Israeli Ambassador to remind the Committee that tens of thousands of Palestinians were being killed by Israelis, not to mention the 29 people killed in the Hebron Massacre at the Ibrahimi Mosque. Hebron is a 6,000 year old city that comprises Ayyubid, Mamluk and Ottoman buildings, and the Ibrahimi Mosque is 2,000 years old. The Director assured the Committee that the Hebron Rehabilitation Committee of the Hebron Municipality was working to protect and preserve the cultural heritage in Hebron Old City, and in particular, the Ibrahimi Mosque, which had been under renovation for 20 years. Both sides of the Ibrahimi Mosque were being preserved and renovated: the Muslim and the occupied side. He added that inscription on the World Heritage List would help to protect the monument from mainly occupation attacks and violations despite the difficulties. The Director concluded by thanking all those who had voted in favour of listing Hebron on the World Heritage List.

II. NOMINATIONS

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

The Extension of W National Park of Niger (Niger) to become the W-Arly- Pendjari Complex (Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.3](#)

The **Chairperson** moved to the next item, inviting the Secretariat and IUCN to present the trans-border extension of the W National Park of Niger by Benin and Burkina Faso to become W-Arly-Pendjari Complex, Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger.

The **Secretariat** reported that a factual error letter for this nomination on the W-Arly Pendjari Complex had been received, as outlined in document [INF 8B.4](#). This submission affected the proposed statement of OUV that had been taken into account in the Secretariat's version.

Le **Représentant de l'UICN** présente le rapport concernant ce site et indique que l'UICN recommande que le Comité approuve l'extension du parc national du W du Niger, pour devenir le Complexe du W-Arly-Pendjari au Bénin, au Burkina Faso et au Niger sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial au titre des critères (ix) et (x).

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that this comes 25 years after the first component of this complex had been inscribed on the World Heritage List, adding that it was great to have these State Parties complete all the requirements in terms of management and integration on this important gap in the area located in the transition zone between African savannahs and the Sudanese region, especially considering the size of the property that is close to two million hectares. The delegation congratulated the three countries for inscribing this World Heritage, and especially Benin and Burkina Faso for being the first to do so. It supported the draft decision.

La **Délégation du Portugal** félicite le Bénin et le Burkina Faso pour cette extension du parc national WAP au Niger. Du point de vue naturel cette extension est très importante et ce continuum de systèmes terrestre et aquatique dans la savane d'Afrique de l'Ouest améliore davantage la capacité de gestion, à savoir l'habitat des espèces migratrices, et contribue à l'obtention de meilleurs résultats de conservation. Le Portugal encourage les États parties dans le renforcement de leurs efforts transfrontaliers pour une gestion conjointe de la région de manière à aussi pouvoir faire face aux menaces qui pèsent encore sur la faune dans un cadre international.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** accueille avec satisfaction le projet de décision 41.COM/B8.3 et estime qu'une telle décision est une preuve de reconnaissances des efforts fournis dans la sauvegarde de la biodiversité au profit de l'humanité entière. Par conséquent, elle félicite les États parties du Bénin, du Burkina Faso et également du Niger pour l'inscription du complexe WAP sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Cependant, elle souhaite partager avec les membres du Comité les difficultés auxquelles les États parties du Bénin et du Burkina Faso font face dans la mise en œuvre accélérée de la recommandation n° 5 figurant sur le projet de décision, relative à la soumission d'une carte avec une échelle de 1/50 000 d'ici le 1^{er} décembre 2017. En effet, le fond de la carte existante au niveau de l'Institut géographique national au Bénin et de l'Institut géographique du Burkina Faso date de la période l'Afrique occidentale francophone des années 50. Toutefois, toutes les tentatives engagées pour contourner ces difficultés se sont avérées infructueuses. La préoccupation des États parties à produire ladite carte avec les informations requises a conduit les États concernés à demander la réalisation d'une nouvelle carte par ces deux institutions compétentes au niveau national. En plus du coût élevé du défi, 1 276 969 euros, il y a besoin d'un délai minimum de six mois pour produire ladite carte. Malgré ces difficultés, les États parties concernés ont pris l'option de mobiliser les ressources nécessaires pour réaliser ladite carte. Les dispositions sont donc en cours et c'est la raison pour laquelle ils souhaitent repousser la réalisation du point 5 des recommandations au 1^{er} décembre 2019.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that the nomination excellently represented the Convention and the global strategy for a representative balanced and credible World Heritage with three countries working closely together to improve the integrity of the property and enhancing ecological connectivity of important ecosystems in West Africa. Moreover, it could further celebrate as this was both Burkina Faso and Benin's first natural World Heritage site. Finland was delighted to approve this extension and conveyed sincere congratulations to all three State Parties.

The **Delegation of Tanzania** joined Turkey and Angola to fully subscribe the proposed extension of this important property, and commended all three State Parties for the commendable effort to add value to African natural World Heritage conservation in general. It also supported the proposal by Angola on paragraph 5 of the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** congratulated the three State Parties for the work done on the extension of this Complex. It believed that the extension, and also the collaboration between the three countries, would in fact ensure greater protection and conservation of the area and improve the integrity of this site. Zimbabwe supported the amendment proposed by Angola for the extension, and also supported the draft decision in terms of inscription of this

property.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** congratulated the States Parties on providing the Committee with a great example of transnational cooperation for the protection of natural heritage of outstanding universal value. It admired the progressive approach to protection and the management plan adopted for the site and the complex buffer zone system. It was a great pleasure studying the extension dossier and was in fact a learning exercise, adding that the Africa region continued to provide outstanding examples of commitment towards heritage protection.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** apprécie la coopération de ces trois pays africains et félicite les États parties pour leurs efforts, en particulier le Bénin, et soutient le projet d'extension du bien en prenant en compte l'amendement de l'Angola.

The **Delegation of Poland** remarked that the Pendjari Complex is the largest and most important continuum of terrestrial, semi-aquatic and aquatic ecosystems in West Africa. The property is huge, with more than 1.7 million hectares of a continuous mosaic of protected areas, and the extension made it the biggest complex of its kind in Africa. The delegation congratulated the State Parties for the work done.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the State Parties for the inscription of the Pendjari Complex as an extension of the National Park of the Niger, a World Heritage property since 1996. The extension resulted in the combination of four National Parks, a transnational property across three countries that resulted in an effective regional management framework and eco-management system with local populations and a sustainable funding mechanism. The extended property is the largest and most important continuum of terrestrial, semi-aquatic and aquatic ecosystems in the African savannah belt. The site's long-standing legal protection and sustained funding makes it, along with the high-level of commitment of the States Parties for conservation management, an excellent addition to the World Heritage List. Jamaica also supported the recommendation of Angola in the adjustment to the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Cuba** congratulated the States Parties for proposing the extension of the site's natural value, as well as the geographic scope of nature protection in Africa through an extension of this Park. It encouraged them to continue the good work and it supported Angola's proposal.

The **Representative of IUCN** noted a small amendment in the dates for and submission of further maps. IUCN was extremely supportive of this nomination and had no further comments to make.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Angola to amend the date from 2017 to 2019 in paragraph 5.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.3 adopted as amended.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** profite de cette assemblée pour exprimer ses cordiales et sincères salutations aux autorités polonaises et au comité d'organisation de la 41^e session pour l'accueil chaleureux et la bonne organisation de la session. L'aboutissement heureux du dossier d'inscription du complexe W-Arly-Pendjari, sur la liste des sites du patrimoine mondial naturel que nous célébrons aujourd'hui après votre décision témoigne de la bonne et franche collaboration entre les trois pays, la République du Bénin, le Burkina Faso et la République du Niger, soit une gestion coordonnée et harmonisée de cette importante réserve mondiale de diversité biologique. Cette inscription interpelle donc les trois pays à redoubler d'efforts dans la gestion concertée du complexe. La délégation remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les membres du Comité pour l'inscription de notre complexe W-Arly-Pendjari, et les partenaires techniques et financiers, qui n'ont ménagé aucun effort pour accompagner le processus d'élaboration du dossier.

La **Délégation du Bénin** remercie le gouvernement polonais et l'équipe d'organisation de la 41^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial pour leur accueil et les excellentes conditions de séjour à la délégation. Elle manifeste sa reconnaissance et gratitude envers l'inscription du complexe W-Arly-Pendjari qui est le premier site transfrontalier de savanes et dernier refuge de la faune de la savane ouest-africaine, partagé par trois États parties. Elle insiste sur le fait que les États parties reconnaissent l'importance de cette inscription et sont d'ores et déjà engagés dans la sauvegarde de ce bien. Le 24 janvier 2017 à Cotonou au Bénin s'est tenue une réunion des ministres du Bénin, Burkina Faso et du Niger en charge des aires protégées, des ressources halieutiques et du tourisme. L'objectif de cette réunion était de donner des orientations ou une meilleure harmonisation des approches en matière de protection, de sécurisation et de valorisation de la biodiversité du complexe W-Arly-Pendjari, ce qui témoigne de la volonté des trois États de répondre aux défis multiples et d'assumer leurs obligations internationales. La délégation assure que la reconnaissance du complexe WAP encouragera les trois États à mobiliser davantage de ressources afin d'assurer une surveillance permanente du complexe tout en créant les conditions nécessaires pour la promotion d'un tourisme durable, la valorisation des ressources naturelles avec l'implication des communautés riveraines et l'éducation des générations futures. Enfin, elle félicite le Groupe régional d'experts qui a travaillé sur le dossier et remercie l'administration des trois pays et l'ensemble des partenaires qui ont soutenu le processus d'inscription, à savoir le Centre du patrimoine mondial, l'UICN, le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain, l'École du patrimoine africain, et la coopération allemande et l'Union européenne à travers l'UEMOA.

La **Délégation du Niger** se réjouit de l'aboutissement ce processus en vue du rôle que le Niger a joué dans son déclenchement et remarque que cela renforcera la collaboration et la cohésion des trois États notamment dans la mise en œuvre des activités régionales. Elle remercie aussi au nom de l'administration en charge des aires protégées du Niger tous les partenaires techniques et financiers qui ont accompagné ce processus.

ASIA-PACIFIC

Qinghai Hoh Xil (China)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/17/41/COM/INF.8B2)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.4](#)

The **Chairperson** moved to the next item on Qinghai Hoh Xil, China,

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre had received information asserting that the potential inscription on the World Heritage List of Qinghai Hoh Xil would represent a threat for the traditional way of life of Tibetan pastoralists present in the nominated area. In compliance with paragraphs 12 and 123 of the Operational Guidelines, States Parties are encouraged to prepare nominations with the widest possible participation of stakeholders, as well as to ensure the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders. The World Heritage Centre sought comments by the State Party on this assertion by sending two letters. China replied on the 30 June [2017] indicating that those assertions were inaccurate and indefensible, and did not reflect facts and realities. China stated that the Government had never taken and would never take any forced relocation measures at the nominated property of Hoh Xil and that it was determined to protect the property and to fully respect the will of local herders and their traditional culture, religious beliefs and lifestyle.

The **Representative of IUCN** presented the evaluation of the site and the recommendation to the Committee to inscribe Qinghai Hoh Xil on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (vii) and (x).

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated China for the nomination of this property, which from a natural point of view encompassed a significant number of endemic species and was very important for the migration of Tibetan antelopes. Climate change had been reported as a threat in this area and this concern should be addressed in the monitoring of natural values in the property's management system. As regards the involvement of all stakeholders in the site's protection, the delegation understood how local communities and their traditional users contribute to preserve the landscape and the conservation of species and their habitats, and were thus integral elements for the efficient conservation of this property. This coexistence seemed to be an essential dimension of the property's OUV and should be thoroughly upheld and safeguarded.

The **Delegation of Poland** noted that the property represented an extraordinary beauty of alpine mountains and steppe systems at high elevation. High levels of endemism of flora and fauna fully supported the inscription on the basis of criterion (x). Its inaccessibility and tough climate kept the property free from strong human influences, and the large area of Plateau, at almost 4 million hectares, could also in the future give rise to its inscription under criterion (ix). Nevertheless, it should be combined with the long tradition of grazing that coexists with and creates the diversity of nature. The property thus deserved to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Finland** expressed warmest congratulations to China and was pleased that a part of the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau area was now on the World Heritage List. It is indeed a remarkable landscape with many endemic species, such as the antelope and wild yak. Finland also took note of the issues raised by representatives of the Tibetan monks, emphasizing the importance of involving local communities and stakeholders in the management of the property.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** remarked on the magnificence and rare beauty of the site that drew attention to the issue of climate change, as previously discussed by the Committee. States Parties needed to join forces towards [implementing] sustainable strategies to prevent potential damage that might occur in the future. The delegation [on a personal basis] recently visited China, and although the visit was to see other nominations, it expressed sincere admiration for the commitment and excellence that China demonstrated in enriching the diversity of World Heritage.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** recognized the OUV, integrity and authenticity of Qinghai Hoh Xil as a property worthy of inclusion on the World Heritage List. The site itself is breathtaking and considered to be the world's third pole on the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau, the largest and highest plateau in the world. It is composed of a system of alpine mountains, steppe and wetlands, hence the phrase 'three mountains surrounding two basins'. Its magnificent landscape lends a habitat to the herds of rare wild yaks and antelopes and other associated species. It therefore congratulated and lauded the State Party for its impressive efforts.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** noted that Qinghai Hoh Xil, located in the vast Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau, marked its place as the largest, highest and youngest plateau in the world. The unique geographical formation and climatic conditions of the property nurture unique biodiversity. The delegation was happy to see this property with high levels of endemism in flora and fauna inscribed on the World Heritage List, and sincerely wished that the magnificent natural features, together with the biodiversity as is found in the site, could be protected for the benefit of humanity.

Noting the time, the **Chairperson** proposed to end the discussion on this Item after lunch.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted the extreme climate topography and the beauty represented by the site, commending and congratulating China for this nomination and for its inscription.

The Secretariat announced that the Operational Guidelines Working Group would meet at 2 p.m. There were three side events, one organized by the World Heritage Centre and the African World Heritage Foundation concerning Atlantic Slave Trades, and two other events organized by IUCN and Partners on Wilderness and Large Landscapes and Seascapes, and the Benefits of Natural World Heritage. There was also an exhibition of the Warsaw Uprising 1944.

[Close of morning session]

FIFTH DAY – Friday 7 July 2017

TENTH SESSION

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

Vice-Chairperson: Mr José Filipe Morais Cabral (Portugal)

ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST [Continuation]

Qinghai Hoh Xil (China)

The **Chairperson** opened the session by giving the floor Cuba.

The **Delegation of Cuba** supported the State Party, congratulated them on their efforts and the proposal for the nomination of the site, which was of importance to the region.

La **Délégation du Liban** félicite la Chine pour avoir présenté ce bien naturel et est ravie de le voir inscrit sur la liste du patrimoine naturel.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the draft decision and congratulated China for the inscription of this site.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.4 adopted.

The **Delegation of China** extended its sincere gratitude to the Committee for adopting the Decision to inscribe the Qinghai Hoh Xil on the World Heritage List. In recent decades the Chinese Government had taken more effective protection measures in the property, including protecting the Tibetan antelope and the native animals, adding that all the protection activities had been undertaken with stakeholders at the community level and in consultation with international expert organizations. The delegation confirmed that the Chinese Government had never taken and would never take any forced relocation measures at the nominated property. It was noted that the nomination dossier submitted in January 2016 and the supplementary report submitted in February 2017 by the Chinese Government fully demonstrated its determination to protect the nominated property and to fully respect the will of the local herders and their traditional cultural, religious beliefs and lifestyle. The Government would continue to implement the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, and honour its commitment to protect the natural heritage of humankind.

The **Deputy Governor of the Qinghai Province** greeted and thanked the Committee [for the inscription of Qinghai Hoh Xil] and welcomed everyone to visit.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Representative of the International Campaign for Tibet**, Ms Tenzin Choekyi, remarked that Tibet is the world's highest and largest plateau. As the source of most of Asia's major rivers, it is of critical significance, not only to the Tibetan people and China, but to the rest of the globe. She noted that there was less acknowledgement of the Tibetans themselves when they should be honoured for preserving the natural and cultural heritage of their homeland to a degree that had allowed the site to be considered as World Heritage in the first place. This was a serious Decision put before Committee Members in deciding to help ensure the survival of the nomadic traditions, one of the richest spiritual cultures in the world. China sought to convince the world that its policies are solely aimed at conservation and protection, but the Chinese Government is imposing policies to displace nomadic pastoralists across the

plateau. It is a massive social engineering campaign that threatens to eviscerate a sustainable way of life that is uniquely adapted to the harsh landscape of the high plateau. This is despite scientific consensus in China and beyond that indigenous stewardship and herd mobility are essential to the health of the rangelands and to help mitigate climate change. The property is in the middle of three major nature reserves and China's policy is to exclude Tibetan landuse, such as nomadic herding. This inscription thus raises serious questions for this Committee with regard to contravening the principles enshrined in the Convention. It was thus essential to ensure that no forced relocation or exclusion of traditional nomadic pastoralism or any other policies that may result in the removal or exclusion of the traditional users of the property would be undertaken or pursued, while observing the Convention, its principles, the Operational Guidelines or any other applicable international legal standards. Unfettered access must be possible for independent observers and human rights mechanisms to ensure meaningful impact assessment. The involvement of Tibetans, as stewards, was seen as essential to sustaining the wildlife and the long-term health of the ecosystems and water resources on which China and Asia depend.

Bhitarkanika Conservation Area (India)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.5](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the the next nomination on the Bhitarkanika Conservation Area.

The **Representative of IUCN** presented the evaluation of the site and indicated that IUCN considered that the nominated property did not meet the integrity, protection or management requirements of the Operational Guidelines and that criteria (vii), (ix) and (x) were not met. IUCN recommended that the World Heritage Committee not inscribe the Bhitarkanika Conservation Area on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Finland** appreciated India's efforts to protect this property that includes both marine and terrestrial environments. However, the OUV had clearly not been demonstrated in the nomination file and therefore it support the draft decision.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.5 adopted.

Landscapes of Dauria (Mongolia, Russian Federation)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.6](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, the trans-boundary nomination of the Landscapes of Dauria.

The Secretariat reminded the Committee that the World Heritage Centre received a factual error notification concerning this nomination, which was in document [INF.8 B4](#), adding that this notification also had some minor impacts on the statement of OUV.

The **Representative of IUCN** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation to the World Heritage Committee to inscribe the Landscapes of Dauria on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (ix) and (x).

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Peru** did not wish to react to the technical explanations on this property and its exceptional value based on criteria (ix) and (x) but rather to congratulate the States Parties and IUCN for the quality of the evaluation, adding that the draft decision could be approved by consensus as the nomination was robust and entirely relevant. The delegation supported IUCN's recommendation.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted that the Committee had examined this property at its 39th session and at that time had decided to change the deferral to a referral owing to issues with integration and management. However, the Committee trusted the Stated Parties that they would come back with a good nomination, which proved to be the case, having resolved all the integration, management and protection issues. The World Heritage List now gained another important property, filling the gaps in the world with this large ecosystem that was missing. The delegation strongly commended both countries and congratulated them for bringing forward this nomination.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** supported the nomination. Indeed, the Landscapes of Dauria represented very important ecosystem and was the reason behind its listing as among the Global 200 ecoregions in the category of temperate grasslands, savannahs and shrublands. The steppe lakes of the proposed territory serve as an important breeding and stopover site for birds on their migration routes and hosts several globally threatened bird species. The vast area of Dauria also supports large populations of migratory vertebrates, such as Mongolian gazelle, providing them with sufficient territory for their seasonal migration. It was also an example of successful transboundary cooperation that all could learn from. It showed not only the commitment of the countries for collaborative management of the territory, but also its successful implementation for over 20 years. The joint activities carried out in the framework of internationally protected area agreement in China, Mongolia and the Russian Federation, which included both management and research, presented evidence of mutual agreement and would thus ensure the long-term protection of the site. The inscription of this nomination to the World Heritage List was thus fully justified.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** appuie le projet de décision et félicite la Mongolie et la Russie pour leurs efforts et la coopération étroite et fructueuse qui a mené à l'inscription de ce bien.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** congratulated the Russian Federation and Mongolia for their robust partnership efforts towards the protection and conservation of one of the world's most important avian migratory routes. It highly encouraged the two State Parties to fully address the Advisory Body's request for concrete joint measures that deal with the gaps in management coordination and transnational cooperation in the long-term. The delegation further hoped that no mining exploration and exploitation activities would take place in the area.

The **Delegation of Finland** was very pleased with the great efforts made by the States Parties to address previous recommendations by the Committee and to come back with a much stronger nomination of this magnificent area, rich in biodiversity. It express warmest congratulations to Mongolia and Russia.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** congratulated the States Parties for the work put into this nomination after the referral. It was very impressed by the analysis presented by the Advisory Body and it also appreciated that it is a very important part of the ecosystem in this region. Zimbabwe therefore supported the draft decision for inscription.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated IUCN and the States Parties of Mongolia and the Russian Federation for the combined effort. In the course of the revision of the nominated dossier, the property had been reconfigured and the added identification of the four components resulted in the nomination of the Landscapes of Dauria as a transnational serial property. Portugal supported inscription, underlining the importance of the Landscapes of Dauria as a good example of transboundary ecosystem cooperation, encompassing governmental, scientific and non-governmental institutions. Considering that mining, fires, hunting and poaching represent a potential threat to the property, Portugal congratulated the

States Parties for their commitment to set up additional zones of peace and to reduce the hunting season in the surrounding areas.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** joined the previous speakers in commending Mongolia and the Russian Federation for this nomination and welcomed the efforts of the States Parties for the protection of the wider Daurian Steppe ecosystem, encouraging the States Parties to develop the coordination needed for better management of the nominated property.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** rejoint les autres délégations, félicite et remercie la Mongolie et la Russie, ainsi que l’UICN, pour leurs efforts et elle soutient l’inscription de site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** congratulated both IUCN and the States Parties for this cooperation and their successive nomination, which contained key aspects of evolutionary processes of ecosystems and biological diversity that resulted in providing key habitats for rare fauna and a sanctuary for endangered species. It thus encouraged both Parties to engage in a continuous cooperation owing to the importance of the migration route of the Mongolian gazelle and other rare birds, and it trusted both States Parties to resolve the issues of mining exploration activities.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** commended the States Parties for their commitment and patience in the preparation of this dossier that was earlier referred. It concurred with the Advisory Bodies in their analysis of the dossier, and it fully supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Croatia** congratulated the States Parties for its continuous efforts, and it supported inscription to the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Poland** congratulated the States Parties for showing a very good example of international cooperation for the good of nature, which represented unique natural habitats.

The **Delegation of Cuba** thanked the States Parties for the results achieved in this joint transboundary site of great importance for conservation, and it encouraged them to continue working in this vein. It also thanked IUCN for its efforts, patience and support to the States.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** joined the previous speakers in commending the efforts and cooperation by the States Parties over quite a long period of time. It appreciated efforts by the States Parties in the process of modifying boundaries and in its management plans. The delegation wholeheartedly congratulated this nomination.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.6 adopted.

The **Delegation of Mongolia** thanked the Members of the Committee for making this very important decision to inscribe Landscapes of Dauria, and for their statements of support. It also congratulated colleagues from the Russian Federation for accepting this joint heritage site. The delegation expressed gratitude to Germany and the IUCN for their continuing support and cooperation at all levels of the nomination. The delegation complimented the continued efforts and study jointly conducted with colleagues from the Russian Federation, with particular congratulations to Mr Alexander Kuznetsov, Ambassador of the Russian Federation to UNESCO. The Government of Mongolia was fully committed to implementing the policies and conservation management plan in compliance with the recommendations made by IUCN and by the Decision of this 41st session of the Committee. The delegation concluded by thanking the host country and the Secretariat for the excellent organization and for the warm welcome and hospitality.

The **Chairperson** thanked and congratulated Mongolia.

The **Delegation of the Russian Federation** commended the Committee after an hour of hatred, as witnessed earlier, and cited an expression by George Orwell's 1984, "we deal with more pleasant issues". Dauria is undoubtedly one of those issues. The delegation celebrated the fact that this beautiful region was now part of World Heritage and it was thankful to the Committee for its wise and timely decision. Obviously, it is better to protect such regions with unique natural characteristics before important human presence and economic activities take place. Dauria is such a unique region, not only for its charming landscapes but also with its extremely rich animal diversity. Over 20 years, experts from different countries have successfully worked towards the preservation of the natural landscapes of Dauria, and the delegation took the opportunity to thank its German partners who contributed to this nomination, including with financial support. The delegation thanked IUCN for its valuable expertise, and it was particularly grateful to its Mongolian partners. The delegation was sure that the inclusion of Landscapes of Dauria to the World Heritage List would further boost international cooperation to preserve this ecosystem and biodiversity for the world.

Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe (Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Italy, Germany, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2](http://whc/17/41.COM/INF.8B2)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.7](http://whc/17/41.COM/INF.8B2)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next nomination and the serial transborder extension of the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Ancient Beech Forests of Germany to become the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe.

The Secretariat reminded the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF 8B.4](#).

The **Representative of IUCN** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation that the Committee defer the nomination of the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe to allow further critical review by concerned States Parties, and IUCN was ready to be actively involved in such a review.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that this extension dossier was – first and foremost – aimed at protection and the recognition of the OUV of a continent-wide ecosystem. At the last Committee meeting in Istanbul, cooperation was proposed as one of the main strategies to promote and protect World Heritage, and this dossier gave an outstanding example for jointly safeguarding heritage. The 2011 Decision of this Committee on inscription of the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany encouraged States Parties to cooperate towards an extended nomination. It fully represents the post-glacial expansion of European Beech. The delegation noted the efforts taken by the 10 States Parties that made a clear proposal in line with the OUV of the previous session and, taking into account all these forests in Europe, the ecological value hence of all sides was thus convincingly explained in the dossier. The extension covers more than 80 per cent of relevant forests and was based on the comprehensive expertise of almost 300 scientists and experts from the world over. The delegation listened to IUCN's valuable comments and why the States Parties had been in constant dialogue with IUCN to address the issues raised. It also had the full commitment of the State Parties to respond to the IUCN's comments in terms of financing the integrated management system and safeguarding across all components, emphasizing appropriate buffer zone management and including monitoring of threats and risks. The delegation acknowledged this unique cooperation between the 12 countries, which was also backed by academia and civil society, and it supported their commitment to safeguarding and protecting the last natural beech forests in Europe. The

delegation felt that the Committee should not wait and therefore support inscription. The delegation also wished to thank Finland for its contribution to the preparation of the draft decision. [Another speaker] The main reason that the delegation was convinced of inscription was due to the fact that the Committee [in 2016] in Istanbul had inscribed the first component of the transboundary nomination but left out the most important genetic research of the species present in the south. After the post-glaciation period, these refuge areas provided the genetic material to the north and, looking at the 63 important components contributed by 10 countries that are large enough, IUCN should be satisfied with the size of those southern populations in Spain, Italy, Albania and Bulgaria. Thus, the delegation was convinced that this extension should be approved by the Committee, as there was a strong argument this time to inscribe the site, otherwise some of these components might be lost if the Committee decided to defer.

The **Delegation of Portugal** remarked that the nomination was a complex transnational serial property that proposed to cover the most important remnants of European ancient or primeval forests. Beech is the most significant tree in the temperate broadleaf forest biome and represents an outstanding example of re-colonisation and development of terrestrial ecosystems and communities since the last Ice Age. The delegation applauded the States Parties for establishing an exceptional Europe-wide network of best-preserved beech forests adapted to different ecological conditions and repositories of unique biodiversity with each forest having a unique ecological history. It acknowledged the unique cooperation between 12 countries, which was also supported by academia and civil society that reflected their commitment to safeguard and protect the last well-conserved beech forests in Europe. This transnational series would thus become a model for transnational management of natural heritage worldwide. The current ancient and primeval beech forests would increase from 30 to 80 per cent. By taking into account largely different environments across all beech forest regions in Europe, this extended nomination was able to fully represent the post-glacial expansion of European beech in line with the OUV of the previous extension. With this extension of the original property, 10 State Parties strived to upscale the conservation and development of wilderness. The protection and monitoring of naturally developing ancient and primeval beech forests would establish a benchmark for inspiring sustainable forest management and safeguarding crucial ecosystem services in the different ecological regions of Europe. Indeed, planning and management of the primeval beech forest requires an effective implementation based on multilateral agreements with stakeholders, as well as embrace the complexity of ecosystems present in the various components. Cooperative management agreements with local groups and other stakeholders were also essential to the achievement of management goals and to ensure local community engagement in the component parts. Portugal congratulated the States Parties for the joint and courageous work, as well as the effort of bringing together the European Beech Forest Network. This nomination required extensive work from IUCN, to whom the delegation expressed its appreciation. The delegation was thus pleased to co-sponsor the relevant draft decision to inscribe this property.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** noted that the proposal was submitted by the States Parties despite the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommendation of defer consideration of this dossier for the four reasons mentioned. However, the countries that recently submitted the nomination refuted IUCN's findings, which qualified the nominated site for inclusion on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (ix). The delegation however approved inscription of this natural site on the World Heritage List. It welcomed all the European countries who had shown the example of cooperation, culturally speaking, but also in applying UNESCO's principles. For these reasons, it supported the remarks by Portugal. It also sought clarification of certain elements in the draft decision, and wished to hear scientific and technical opinions in this regard, as well as more information on the cooperation project.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** souligne que comme le cas de la coopération entre trois États parties, du Bénin, du Burkina Faso et du Niger, pour la coopération qui a abouti à une

heureuse conclusion du dossier et la coopération entre deux États, de la Mongolie et de la Fédération de Russie, le cas présent représente un cas d'école, dans le sens où il réunit autour d'un même bien et héritage une douzaine d'États parties, ce qui est en soi une performance et devrait devenir un exemple pilote des biens en série transnationaux, et en l'espèce continentaux. D'après la délégation c'est un exemple qui doit être soutenu au moins pour le principe et qui devrait être étendue à d'autres types de biens, à d'autres biens en série de par le monde, dans d'autres contextes. La Tunisie soutient l'inscription de cette extension, quitte à ce des compléments d'information ou des précisions soit donnés plus tard.

The **Delegation of Poland** supported the amendments presented by Turkey and congratulated the ten State Parties for their effective cooperation, which was a great achievement. Among the arguments for inscription, the delegation underlined that inscription would considerably help to improve the management of the sites already in place.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** commended all ten countries for their cooperation and their commitment to the conservation of the unique and comprehensive property. The OUV of the European beech forests had already been recognized at the moment of inscription of the German nomination in 2011. The new series with components in ten countries would provide a much more complete picture of the continental character, diversity and unique biogeographical characteristics of beech forests, although the inscription would have to considerably upscale the management of the site already in place. The delegation supported inscription.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that the ancient and primeval beech forests were under tremendous pressure in Europe. The last remnants of the most natural and undisturbed beech forests within the different beech forest regions were thus of utmost importance for biodiversity. Finland has high respect for the State Parties and the Advisory Body for their hard work in putting the nomination together and evaluating the content of the nomination. Nevertheless, more time to discuss the nomination would have been desirable in order to further strengthen the nomination where possible and, especially, to achieve a better common understanding of the concept of OUV. Finland had carefully read the material, including the much-appreciated questions and views raised by the Advisory Body. It concluded that the nomination was prepared in an open process with a large number of experts and authorities involved, screening all known ancient and primeval beech forests in Europe. By using the criteria for OUV, the most valuable sites were selected to the so-called [Vienna Shortlist](#) with the most representative beech forests in Europe. However, the whole Vienna Shortlist was not included in the nomination. The Advisory Body also raised concerns regarding the size of some of the components, as well as the functionality of the buffer zones. Finland gave credit to these observations and felt that they should be correctly reflected in the draft decision. Finland also supported the inscription of this serial extension, and thanked the States Parties and the Committee for fruitful and constructive discussions on this matter.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** remarked that the nomination was a thoroughly well thought solution to inscribing the temperate forests [of Europe] that focused on one of their most important elements, the beech, for which the processes started, following the last Ice Age, were still ongoing. It was the third time the nomination was revisited by the countries concerned, and the delegation believed that the newly nominated component parts would add to the OUV stipulated in Decision 35 COM 8B.13 for the already inscribed property, making it more substantial and presenting the full picture of the European post-glacial development processes of the beech forests. The new component parts would showcase this characteristic species of temperate forests under the wide variety of environmental conditions. The long-term protection was provided by the protected areas concerned, which included Biosphere Reserves and National Parks in the limits of national legislation. Nonetheless, there was a certain inconsistency in the design of the buffer zones of the different component parts, but this was due to different national legislative settings and

approaches and should thus be respected as part of the integrity and protection of the property. The Primeval Beech Forests is a very complex nomination and required a lot of effort and commitment from the participating States in jointly managing this property. Hopefully, the integrated management strategy would be extended in due course to sustain the common management goals committed to its implementation. Kazakhstan supported the inscription of the nomination on the World Heritage List, thus seconding the amendment proposed by Turkey.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the amended draft decision proposed by Turkey. It was understood from the States Parties that an unprecedented number of experts were mobilized to select the areas that were now under consideration by the Committee. In addition, further analysis was not required as the OUV of the beech forests was recognized as early as 2011. The delegation appreciated the readiness of the States Parties to develop an integrated management plan and applauded their cooperation to preserve this forest. It also applauded the involvement of civil society and communities in this endeavour. The delegation thus recommended that the States Parties continue to work with IUCN in order to address and resolve any other outstanding issues.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended the States Parties for the significant nomination under criterion (ix). IUCN recommended deferral of the nomination and took note of the potential for parts of the nominated property to meet criterion (ix). The Advisory Body also indicated that further analysis was needed to ensure adequate site selection so that the nomination is well-buffered and protected, and there was a clear demonstration of the OUV. The States Parties have reviewed the nomination and presented an amended nomination for the inscription of this site. Jamaica saw tremendous value in the proposed amendment but wished to hear from the Advisory Body regarding this proposed amendment.

The **Delegation of Cuba** congratulated the States Parties for taking account of the OUV for the good of Europe and the rest of the world. With the demonstrated protectionary system shown in all of the documents provided, as well as the involvement of civil society and the scientific community, the delegation supported the proposal as submitted.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** acknowledged the efforts of the ten European countries for their exceptional collaboration and the nomination of a complex, transnational serial property. This nomination was a good example of how the identification and protection of shared World Heritage could be a positive force for cooperation. The Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe composed 77 components of undisturbed, complex, temperate forests, exhibiting the most complete and comprehensive ecological patterns and processes of pure and mixed stands of European beech across a variety of environmental conditions. The delegation believe that the beech forests satisfied criterion (ix) for OUV as its initial component was inscribed by the Committee in 2011. These new extensions were thus important to safeguard the last primeval beech forests in Europe as a whole, hence it welcomed the amendment submitted to the draft decision. Inscription would no doubt further strengthen the protection of this valuable natural heritage. The delegation noted the solemn commitment by the States Parties concerned to continue their extensive cooperation and fulfil all the requirements.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** welcomed the efforts of the States concerned in preparing this nomination, which was a good example of cooperation. This property is a unique natural habitat comprised of beech forest ecosystems with a wide range of diverse indicators that are highly important to protect and conserve. The nominated Beech Forests of Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe included 16 transboundary natural or mixed sites and would include more than three countries' efforts on protection and consideration. Azerbaijan welcomed this nomination.

The **Delegation of Peru** noted that all the Members had shown themselves to be favourable to inscribing this property, obviously the far-reaching antecedents of the structural elements in the Carpathians presented in the dossier by the ten countries support the serial

presentation. The delegation noted a number of virtues to the nomination. Firstly, the technical and scientific research supported criterion (ix) in demonstrating the OUV of this property. Secondly, these forests have different dimensions with areas that may be managed in very different ways, but these elements could and would be perfected once the property is inscribed on the List. The delegation wished to recall that in its presentation, the IUCN clearly said that they did not question the application of article (ix) demonstrating the OUV of this property, but that its doubts concerned the non-continuity of the complex pattern of the forests. In this context, the delegation congratulated the Advisory Bodies for the work done in the report, particularly by Norway, and its focus on common dignity and the importance of a human rights orientation in the concept of heritage. The delegation added that the doctrine of human rights was based on the *pro hominum* principle, i.e. that the protection of human beings is always given priority. When there are violations, rights must be restituted and made good. In the case of natural heritage, there had to be a principle for protection, which was to say that where proper argumentation demonstrated OUV, it was a duty to protect it. Thus, with this feeling of that duty, the delegation fully supported Turkey's amendment.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** remarked that a natural site nomination this size with more than ten States Parties represented not only an unprecedented level of international cooperation, but also challenges and complexity. For this reason, it congratulated the States Parties for their cooperation in developing this nomination, and it encouraged them to continue this close cooperation [in tackling] the complex challenges. The delegation was happy to support the inscription of this property as set out in the amendment to the draft decision. However, it requested the relevant States Parties to expand the integrated management system and the implementation of the European Beech Forest Network, which would ensure protection within the component parts through standard-setting research and the sharing of technical expertise. It hoped the nominated States Parties could work in close cooperation and in dialogue with IUCN to further improve the site as a whole. The delegation congratulated all ten nominated States Parties.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** note l'effort de coopération entre les 10 États qui se sont souciés de la conservation de la diversité génétique des espèces végétales ligneuses de grande portée économique. La valeur universelle exceptionnelle des forêts primaires d'hêtres en Europe a été reconnue par le Comité lors de l'inscription de sa première série en 2011. La nouvelle série, qui inclut 10 États, constitue une meilleure représentation du caractère continental de la diversité et des caractéristiques biogéographiques uniques des forêts anciennes et primaires d'hêtres en Europe. La délégation estime que l'inscription du bien favorisera une coopération plus étroite entre les États parties et aidera à améliorer la gestion des sites déjà inscrits, et que la recommandation de l'IUCN de différer le dossier de candidature se base sur un manque d'informations notamment concernant la définition de la zone tampon. Pour ces raisons, elle s'associe aux États membres qui demandent l'inscription de cette extension pour le bien.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** expressed keen interest in this complex nomination, commending the impressive analysis by the Advisory Bodies and noting the expansive coverage of the property. It also praised the keenness and involvement of the ten States Parties that had come together to ensure the preparation of the dossier with valuable scientific input and cooperation. On a technical note, the delegation was satisfied that the OUV of this property was justified under criterion (ix) despite some remaining issues raised by the Advisory Bodies, the scale of which it did not believe warranted the property's deferral. The overall impression was that, given the sheer size of the nomination and its ecological complexity, both in spacial and administrative terms, the overall benefits for inscribing this site far outweighed its rejection. The inscription of the property, together with the measures to strengthen its management and integrity, would be a welcome approach at this juncture. It thus support the inscription of this site.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** invited IUCN to respond to the questions.

The **Representative of IUCN** noted the question from Jamaica that requested comments on the amended draft decision, which in essence proposed inscription and a name change to the property, compared to the proposal in the dossier that raised a number of points that should be regulated after inscription. The Representative remarked that in essence the name change confirmed the sense that the definition of OUV was not fully grounded, adding that the idea of inscribing first and addressing issues later was not the principle on which the Operational Guidelines was set up. He took note of the comment from Tunisia that drew the parallel between the two inscriptions already celebrated today: one being the tri-State collaboration with the W-Arly-Pendjari Complex, which was a dossier that had previously been deferred but the three States Parties came back with a successful resolution, and the second was the Landscapes of Dauria with Russia and Mongolia, a site that had previously been referred. In these cases, the States Parties took the opportunity to come back with a nomination that fully met the requirements of the Convention. The Representative thus suggested the Committee adopt a consistent approach in cases where States Parties presented something which undoubtedly had significant merit and conveyed exceptional commitment to a good project, but was not yet fully meeting the standards of the Convention. This might be even more important in this instance because it involved an extension of a site currently included on the List whose State of conservation Decision 41 COM 7B.4 had already been adopted by the present Committee. Thus, it might be appropriate that decisions on inscription might hold to a similar standard. He noted the remark by Turkey that there was a risk of losing the sites if the site was deferred or referred, adding that this was clearly a question about the degree to which national protection was really in place that was underpinning the inscription in the interests of all the States Parties. He also noted in the proposed amendment a reference made to the Vienna Shortlist, which implied future inscriptions for States Parties that were not currently part of the nomination. Indeed, the World Heritage Centre might need to confirm whether in fact this was even part of the documentation in the nomination. There was also the question of what the Shortlist would mean, but the IUCN could not offer an evaluation of what that might imply in terms of the finite series and on what territories. The Representative reiterated how much good IUCN saw in the programme to protect European beech forests, and cited an English saying, 'Buy in haste, repent at leisure', adding that hasty inscriptions did not serve the interest of the Convention nor the Committee, and nor the nominating States Parties in the long run. Dialogue was thus needed to engage in this instance given the complexity of the nomination, which the two-month period of dialogue had been able to resolve in the issues that remained. IUCN thus preferred to see a strong and encouraging position from the Committee that might allow IUCN to complete the dialogue necessary to reach a consensus proposal that all could feel completely comfortable with, though IUCN would work with whatever decision the Committee took.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment to the draft decision from Turkey, Kuwait, Tunisia, Portugal, Zimbabwe, Azerbaijan, Lebanon, Angola and Tanzania. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified, which would now read, 'Approves the extension of Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forest of Germany, Slovakia, Ukraine and Germany, to become Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe, Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Italy, Germany, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Spain and Ukraine, on the World Heritage List, on the basis of criterion (ix)'. The other part of paragraph 2 was deleted. A new paragraph 3 would read, 'Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value'. A new paragraph 4 would read, 'Accepts the outcome of the screening process as a proposal for the finite series in this nomination process, based on the strictly scientific selection. The defined Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the amended property names being coherent with the current inscribed property and will ensure that the possibility of future extension will be clearly and consistently configured'. The original paragraph 3 would now become paragraph 5 with a slight amendment. The new paragraph 5 would read,

'Thanks the States Parties for their cooperation in developing this nomination'. The other part of paragraph 5 was deleted. A new paragraph 6 would read, 'Requests the States Parties to consider the future enlargement of components to at least 6 hectares and to strengthen the protection level within buffer zones and the improvement of ecological connectivity especially between components parts'. Paragraph 7 would read, 'Also requests the States Parties to ensure that committed funding arrangements are able to safeguard consistent site management at the component level as well as coordinated management across the transnational serial property; further requests that special emphasis shall be given to appropriate buffer zone management in order to support undisturbed natural processes with special emphasis on dead and decaying wood, including ongoing monitoring of threats and risks, making effective use of the expertise and institutional capacity in the management of the property'. Paragraph 8 would read, 'Requests furthermore the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2018 a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned request for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019'. In addition, the Rapporteur proposed, for the sake of consistency, to split paragraph 7, with the first part, 'Requests', and paragraph 8 that 'Further requests', adding that this was consistent with the best practice of this Committee. Finally, in paragraph 9, the Rapporteur proposed to change the word 'request' to 'recommendation' as this was the word used in this Committee decision.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraphs 1–3 adopted as amended.

The **Representative of IUCN** commented that some of the wording was unclear in the mention of the 'screening process' with regard to the Committee's understanding of it in the documentation. The other point [also in paragraph 4] concerned the wording in 'a defined Statement of Outstanding Universal Value' as the Committee had only adopted a *provisional* Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Thus, it was felt that in the first case, safer wording would be 'accept the outcome' or 'to take note of the outcome' of the screening process, and in the second case, to use 'the defined Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the amended property name should be coherent with the currently inscribed property and ensure that possible future extensions could be clearly and consistently configured'. In this way, it avoided being both an illogical statement but also one where the Committee clarified the point vis-à-vis the States Parties concerned, as well as other States Parties that might wish to eventually join this nomination in terms of how this screening process would move forward.

The **Delegation of Portugal** thanked IUCN, adding that it had intended to propose something very similar, so it supported the modification.

The **Chairperson** remarked that the draft decision should read 'a *provisional* Statement of OUV'.

The **Representative of IUCN** explained that the proposal 'defined' should be retained as this was what the Committee now needed to create, which in this instance was 'provisional' and now had to be converted to a 'defined Statement of OUV'.

Noting no further objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraphs 4 and 5 adopted.

The **Delegation of Portugal** noted in paragraph 4 that it should be read, 'Takes note of the outcome' [as explained earlier by IUCN].

The **Delegation of Turkey** wished to add in paragraph 6, after 'Requests the States Parties to [...], 'as well as the other interested States Parties', which would assume a further extension of these nominations in the future.

The **Representative of IUCN** remarked that this paragraph, as drafted, pertained to the problem in the existing series just adopted in that there was a number of small components where it was hoped they would be expanded, adding that IUCN had already expressed its views on this minimal approach of 50 hectares. Thus, it was advised that this should not

apply to the future but to the current [situation]. It was hoped that future extensions would seek a higher standard of component size than 50 hectares wherever possible. It would thus be a pity to encourage a reduction rather than encourage an increase in terms of the scale of beech forest protection.

The **Chairperson** noted that IUCN proposed to go back to the previous version of paragraph 6.

The **Delegation of Turkey** explained that the reason 50 hectares was mentioned as a minimum size was because there were small areas available, but proposed to delete the reference to 50 hectares and add instead 'in consultation with the IUCN and the World Heritage Centre'.

The **Delegation of Portugal** wondered whether paragraph 4 did not already cover the concerns of the Turkey.

The **Representative of IUCN** remarked that these were matters that were difficult to improvise, adding that the paragraph was getting quite complicated. One issue was to seek to increase the size of the small components in the series, which had just been listed to a minimum size. The other issue was to encourage the largest area of conservation in any further additions, essentially so that the Committee did not have to go through this same set of problems when the file returned to the Committee again. Despite the legitimate point made by Turkey in looking to the future, the paragraph was somewhat confused in that it tried to end up with a better version of the current series adopted in the earlier paragraphs. The Representative suggested taking the wording off-plenary so as to come back with better wording.

The **Chairperson** asked Turkey whether they could accept this proposal.

The **Delegation of Turkey** suggested that IUCN could help in the wording later to save time.

The **Delegation of Peru** noted that this was indeed a drafting matter, which was getting progressively complicated because the original intent was not to adopt this minimum of 50 hectares. The delegation suggested that in order to be constructive and come up with some form of consensus in the wording that would cover IUCN's concerns, as well as, obviously, the positions of the States Parties presenting the text, the Committee could agree to leave paragraph 6 for now and consult on a consensus draft that could be presented for consideration and adoption the following day.

The **Chairperson** concurred with the rational proposal, noting that five paragraphs had been adopted. He then turned to the next item on Los Alerces National Park.

Los Alerces National Park (Argentina)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2](http://whc.17/41.COM/INF.8B2)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.8](http://41.COM.8B.8)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Los Alerces National Park.

The **Representative of IUCN** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation to the Committee to inscribe Los Alerces National Park on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (vii) and (x), but with the Los Alerces National Reserve being included in the buffer zone of the inscribed area.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Peru** concurred with the remarks by IUCN, adding that the whole technical explanation, given the different reasons and basis for the inscription of the property, was correct. Peru thus supported the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Finland** congratulated Argentina for protecting this magnificent property and nominating it as a World Heritage site, which is home to many rare and threatened species. As the world continuously receive disturbing news of loss of species in different parts of the world, it was comforting to note that the Convention still functioned as a tool to highlight the importance of nature conservation and its benefits for people. It encouraged Argentina to consider future extensions enhancing the connectivity between the several protected areas in the region.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** noted that the property celebrated key features of majestic landscape that represented natural beauty formed by glaciations, creating astonishing scenes of geomorphic features like the natural clear-water lakes and rivers reflecting different spectacular shifts of colours. The delegation welcomed this inscription and encouraged the State Party to cooperate with Chile to consider the potential future extension of the property to enhance its natural values.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated Argentina for conserving an outstanding example of a dynamic natural landscape, calling attention to the Alerce trees that are known to be the second-oldest living organism on earth, as well as the diverse flora and fauna, high bird diversity, the presence of several mammal species and the overall high level of endemism throughout the site. It thanked the State Party for putting in place legislation that ensured the full protection of the site as a National Park. Jamaica endorsed inscription to the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated Argentina for this very well prepared and impressive nomination, adding that the uniqueness of this area deserved to be protected and maintained as a World Heritage site, and it supported its inscription on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Poland** congratulated Argentina for the opportunity to have such a beautiful piece of the world on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Cuba** congratulated the State Party for the quality of the property.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** prend la parole pour féliciter l'État partie.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** rejoint les délégations précédentes et soutient l'inscription, en félicitant l'État partie pour la qualité du dossier et pour la grande valeur de ce bien.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted that this was a great place for the world's only conifer species in its natural habitat that contained diverse tree populations, and it congratulated the State Party.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** congratulated Argentina for the inclusion of the Los Alerces National Park on the World Heritage List, adding that it was initially concerned but now deeply heartened that efforts had been made to address the issues regarding the further development of the Futaleufú Dam. The delegation requested that the State Party ensure proper conduct of environmental and social impact assessments before planned upgrades of the dam. It commended the efforts of the State Party to reduce habitat fragmentation and mitigate climate change impacts through the Global Environment Facility project and the Biosphere Reserve initiative, which would greatly help in the preparation of a potential extension of the property. The delegation encouraged the State Party, with the support of IUCN that had done a tremendous job, to work towards resolving the relationships between the private landowners in the buffer zone, capitalizing on the lessons learned in other World Heritage properties on access and benefit-sharing.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.8 adopted.

The **Delegation of Argentina** thanked the Polish Government for the excellent organization of this Committee session and the authorities for their welcome, adding that Krakow and Poland are a symbol of peace, understanding and tolerance. After the terrible suffering that has happened, UNESCO's ideals are now ideals that would help solve all of our differences. In all sectors of society, people have always believed in the importance of protecting the thousand-year-old Alarces species and the many species of flora and fauna that are part of the National Park that was created and preserved for that reason and for future generations. Argentina had always carried out this duty and would continue to do so for the good of humanity as a whole. The delegation thanked the World Heritage Centre for its constant orientation and support throughout the entire preparation of the file, and the IUCN for its professionalism and firmness during the evaluation and mission, as well as for the very fruitful dialogue afterwards that successfully led to the submission of the file. The delegation congratulated the Chairperson for the masterful way in which he had led the proceedings through very difficult issues and with great efficiency and flexibility.

The **Vice-President of National Parks, Argentina** thanked the Committee for including its fourth National Park on the World Heritage List, which was the 11th in its territory. This Park would celebrate its 80th anniversary as a protected property in 2017 and its inscription would help it further along that path. Protected natural areas were a central element of environmental management of the present administration of President Mauricio Macri, who intended to double the surface of legally protected natural areas in the country. The Los Alerces National Park is very special because it contains an Alerce tree that is 3,500 years old. The Vice-President also thanked the technical experts of the National Parks, the Argentine Committee for Cultural Heritage, and the Ministries of Environment, Culture and Tourism, the Foreign Affairs Ministry, and especially UNESCO, Poland and Krakow for hosting this meeting and for their hospitality and warmth.

Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe (Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Italy, Germany, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine) [Continuation.]

The **Chairperson** returned to the adoption of the draft decision on the Primeval Beech Forest nomination, reminding the Committee that it had stopped at paragraph 6, inviting Turkey to present the revised amendment.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted that the re-wording of paragraph 6 was agreed with IUCN.

The **Representative of IUCN** presented paragraph 6, which would read, 'Requests the States Parties to consider the future enlargement of components in consultation with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, to at least the established minimum size of 50 hectares, and to strengthen the protection level within buffer zones and the improvement of ecological connectivity especially between component parts, and further recommends interested States Parties to ensure that component parts included in any future extensions exceed minimum requirements to fully meet integrity, protection and management requirements'.

The **Delegation of Turkey** confirmed that this would replace the previous paragraph 6.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.7 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated all the State Parties.

The **Delegation of Austria** spoke on behalf of Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Italy, Romania, Slovenia, Spain and Ukraine to thank the Committee for adopting the Decision to inscribe the extended European Beech Forests, and for its clear signal of support, solidarity and trust. The delegation added the States Parties would take seriously the concerns expressed and the specific requests in the Decision adopted. In addition, the Joint Declaration of the Governments of all twelve State Parties would hold each individual State responsible for the appropriate management and protection of the inscribed

components. The Decision thus supported the protection and preservation of this unique continental ecosystem.

[The Vice-Chairperson (Portugal) took up the role of chairing the proceedings]

MIXED PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that the Committee had terminated with the nominations for the natural properties and would continue with the examination of one mixed property, which would be presented by the two Advisory Bodies.

Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica (Mexico)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.9](#)

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received in the evaluation of this nomination, which could be found in document [INF 8B.4](#).

The **Representatives of IUCN and ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation that this site be deferred.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that no doubt there was outstanding value in terms of natural and cultural criteria, adding that the Advisory Bodies had given a very objective assessment of the potential of this site. It was also noted that some of these elements needed to be updated so that the OUV of the site could be corroborated. Indeed, some of the key elements, such as the pre-Classical and the Classical period and even later, such as the Colonial periods, did require a little more effort. However, bearing in mind the capacity of the State Party for updating and fine-tuning these recommendations, Cuba submitted a proposed amendment to the draft decision so as to defer this nomination back to the State Party. It was also noted that the Advisory Bodies had talked about the importance of demonstrating cultural as well as natural OUV and had issued a whole series of recommendations, which was now reflected in the amendment submitted.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Cuba. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified, which would read, 'Refers the mixed nomination of the nomination of Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica, Mexico, back to the State Party in order to clarify: (a) in relation to the cultural criteria, a revised approach focusing on the chronological development of property starting with prehistorical sites, preclassical villages, classical cities, proclassical kingdoms and early colonial statements, based on irrigated agriculture; associated industries, techniques and practices; and aspects of ancestral religious expression that emphasize the cultural dimension of the nomination property'. Point (b) was also modified, the first part was deleted, and would start with, 'Regarding the natural criteria, clarify and clearly in the expression that all natural attributes contributing to the potential Outstanding Universal Value are included within the serial components of boundaries of the nomination property within Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Biosphere Reserve'. Part (c) was deleted. Paragraph 3 was also modified and would start, 'Recommends the State Party give additional consideration to the following: a) Undertake an

augmented comparative analysis of sites with evidence for irrigation within Mesoamerica to justify the complexity of the systems compared to others'. Point (b) was deleted, and (c) would become (b), which would read, 'Finalize the specific plan of the management and protection of the archaeological sites within the nominated property and link it to the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Biosphere Reserve Management Programme to cover the conservation aspect of archaeological sites in their natural context'. Point (d) would now become (c), which would read, 'Provide evidence of institutional coordination for sustainable funding in the appropriately skilled staff for holistic, integrated management of natural and cultural heritage values within the nominated property; and strengthen the overall human financial resources for management of cultural assets within the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Biosphere Reserve; (d) Develop a visitor management strategy for the nominated property that is based on a holistic approach'. Paragraph 4 was slightly modified in the latter part and would read, 'and to build sustainable development capacities of local communities and other sectors to handle increasing tourism interest in the nominated property. Paragraph 5 was slightly modified in the latter part, which would read, 'ensure the economic needs and sustainable development aspirations of these communities are appropriately addressed.' Paragraph 6 was deleted.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked on the massive amendments that were new, and thus sought to hear from both Advisory Bodies, while suggesting to go slowly through the amendments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** commended Mexico for nominating Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley as a mixed property in reference to the spirit of place by correlating the exceptional biological and geological diversity of the Valley with the cultural diversity established by the ancestral populations of Mesoamerica. In the nomination dossier, this was done through a selection of sites with material evidence of early plant domestication and settlement, water management and religious activities, salt mining and pottery production, as well as through linguistic and documentary evidence. As it currently stood, the delegation believed that the property would contribute to a better understanding of the long evolutionary process of human adaptation in Mesoamerica in line with the objectives of the recent programmes. As underlined in the nomination dossier, this process involved construction and reconstruction to turn to the needs of continuity and change in the original communities. Its uniqueness was therefore better understood within the framework set by the / [on Authenticity] which may apply to many assessments of cultural landscapes, relict or associated. The delegation believed that the uniqueness of human progress in the nominated Valley may be further illustrated by expanding the series of the 22 archaeological sites, but in the format of a serial nomination and not as a cultural landscape, as recommended in the Advisory Body report. Also, although the rationale of the Advisory Bodies' proposal to narrow down the nominated property to the water-management infrastructure of the Valley was well understood, the delegation would support the nomination of the property as a series of mixed cultural and natural sites as proposed by the State Party in such a way as to encompass all the attributes that have been referred to. However, the State Party should be given more time to improve the nomination criteria and comparative analysis, as well as the management and protection issues highlighted in the Advisory Bodies' report. Turkey thus supported the referral of the dossier back to the State Party.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** soutient le projet de décision proposé par Cuba pour renvoyer le dossier de la Vallée de Tehuacán-Cuicatlán. Elle est sûre que cette décision permettra au pays de revenir au Comité avec un dossier consolidé pour l'inscription de ce bien particulièrement exceptionnel en termes de biodiversité et de l'interaction entre la nature et l'homme.

The **Delegation of Croatia** fully agreed with the amendment by Cuba, adding that it had no issue with the natural value, but in the case of the cultural value, the revised nomination request was not realistic in terms of the landscape request. Nevertheless, the OUV of one of the oldest sites of the Mexican territory, hand-in-hand with the already recognized sites of the Olmec civilization, deserved to be inscribed. It thus agreed with the referral amendment.

The **Delegation of Portugal** understood that the Advisory Bodies identified challenges in the nomination, and that mixed nominations were indeed challenging dossiers to submit and required strong commitment by the States Parties while continuing collaboration with the Advisory Bodies. It understood that the State Party was really committed to pursue the mixed nomination. The delegation also understood Finland in that the Committee should go slowly through the revised nomination, but it had no doubt that the State Party could proceed with its efforts on both the natural and the cultural parts of this mixed nomination and come back to this Committee with a nomination that responded to all the identified challenges. Thus, a referral would serve the State Party in completing this work in collaboration with IUCN and ICOMOS.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** remarked that despite the recommendation by the Advisory Body to revise the nomination related to the water management system, it believed that the site conveyed a great example of human interaction with the environment such as in the arid zone through plant domestication that demonstrated the innovative process of these settlers. The delegation supported the amendment proposed by Cuba.

The **Vice-Chairperson** asked IUCN and ICOMOS to address the queries by Finland.

The **Representative of IUCN** returned to Finland's request on the amendment [by Cuba], and would refer specifically to those paragraphs relative to IUCN's evaluation. The first in 2. b) seemed to essentially convey the same sense, as had been recommended by IUCN, so it did not have any difficulty with it. In paragraph 2.c), it might be useful to discuss whether the whole of the sub-paragraph would be deleted because part of it related to the relationship of cultural and natural values, which could be retained if the idea was not to ask for a revised nomination. Otherwise, there was clearly some regret from IUCN that the decision, if taken to adopt a referral, removed the potential to consider adding criterion (ix) to the property, as this area has a very high global status in term of its ecosystem values, which seemed a pity because there was a strong potential to meet criterion (ix). Apart from that, the other amendments, with very small drafting points, appeared to be consistent with the original decision, and in fact, paragraph 5 improved the original decision slightly. The Representative added that clearly the issue behind this was the question of the relative merits of referral and deferral, and the importance of a referral if taken, i.e. did it disadvantage Mexico, as discussed in the Orientation Session, because sometimes to convert from a deferral to a referral prevented the possibility for a further mission or advice on the ground, as a referral gave no potential for that option. Thus, it was important for the Committee, having heard from ICOMOS, to reflect on whether it was a help for Mexico to have a referral, or whether it would in fact prevent issues from being considered and fully explored in a revised nomination.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** explained that one of the points that ICOMOS made in its evaluation was that this nomination was, in its view, a bit premature in that the evidence brought forward for the cultural sites was quite limited in some areas. ICOMOS felt that if a nomination was to come back after a revision, then it would need to be based on a much wider set of data on what was in the Valley and how the individual sites related to each other and to the wider landscape. In suggesting the irrigation system, ICOMOS was seeing it as a profound reflection of human interaction with its landscape in the way people harnessed water to support agricultural development and thus settlements, and so on. Thus, it was not seen as a sort of technical challenge but rather as a way of understanding the landscape through the irrigation. However, if these other dimensions, mentioned in 2.a) could be strengthened, perhaps there was a possibility to see this whole picture from prehistory down to the present day. Nevertheless, this would be quite a challenge because the information in the present dossier was not nearly complete enough to present a clear picture that would be needed. ICOMOS thus reiterated the remarks by IUCN in that in one sense referral was a bit limiting. ICOMOS felt that the dossier justified much more work, noting the remarks made by Portugal on the challenges faced by mixed nomination and the need for the State Party to work together with ICOMOS and IUCN. ICOMOS welcomed the chance to collaborate with

the State Party on this nomination, but this would be slightly constrained in the case of a referral, though it would certainly do its best if that was the decision.

The **Delegation of Peru** supported the proposed amendment by Cuba, adding that although a referral excluded a new mission, it did not exclude cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, and this was the practice and spirit in which to develop. The delegation also highlighted a minor concern regarding paragraph [2.a)] in which some guidance was given on the cultural aspects whose periodicity was ascribed to development. From a sociological, historical and social science point of view, the delegation was unsure that ascribing those different periods could actually be applied as a one-size-fits-all. Obviously, there were different descriptive concepts that describe development differently. Thus, the delegation would be surprised to see the Committee adopting this official period-naming that would run counter to the very specificities of the site. However, this was a minor issue, and the delegation nevertheless supported the proposed amendment.

The **Delegation of Finland** wondered whether Mexico was confident that it did not want the opportunity to consider criterion (ix) because that would be impossible in the case of a referral.

The **Delegation of Mexico** stated that it was willing to undertake an analysis to bolster the possibility of including criterion (ix) and was thus perfectly willing to resubmit the dossier. It was convinced that criterion (x) could actually bolster its arguments in this regard.

The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraphs 1–2 adopted.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** remarked that the State Party had said that it was willing to consider criterion (ix) so the Committee might consider to take that into account.

The **Vice-Chairperson** concurred and surmised that Finland would go along the same line, and thus leave the paragraph as it was, i.e. ‘Consider including criterion (ix) in a revised nomination, in view of the global ecological significance of the region within which the nominated property is located’.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** noted that the criterion was very strongly implicated in the analysis, and thus proposed that the paragraph remain unchanged.

The **Delegation of Cuba** explained that the reason it deleted [the reference to criterion (ix)] was essentially because the nomination would be revised, while in paragraph 2.b) it clearly stated that the Committee would be looking at the OUV of the site.

The Secretariat outlined that actually in the framework of a referral, as presented in the Orientation Session, it was not possible to put forward a new criterion, and was thus like a poisoned arrow for the State Party. The question posed by Finland was in this sense, as adding on a new criterion in the framework of an evaluation, which was done on a desk basis without a site visit, and within the time limit of two months, was technically not possible.

The **Delegation of Portugal** noted that both clarifications from Cuba and the World Heritage Centre were very useful, adding that even if the criterion required another mission to be explored, it was already in the original revised draft presented by Cuba. At the same time, the Committee had heard the commitment of the State Party, not only in pursuing this dossier as a mixed nomination, but also in exploring criterion (ix). The delegation believed that the Committee could leave the reference to the criterion in the draft decision, as originally drafted by Cuba, while erasing point b), which would be consistent with a referral.

The **Delegation of Peru** understood from the State Party that there would be no problem in including criterion (ix), suggesting that the floor be given back to the State Party for clarification.

The **Delegation of Mexico** was committed to undertaking a review of criterion (ix), which was the conclusion it had also reached.

The Secretariat remarked that a revised nomination was not normally requested in the framework of a referral.

The **Vice-Chairperson** returned to the adoption of the draft decision, and pronounced paragraphs 3–6 adopted.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.9 adopted as amended.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Mbanza Kongo, Vestiges of the Capital of the former Kingdom of Kongo (Angola)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.10](#)

The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next item and the nominations of cultural properties, and the nomination of the Historic Centre of Mbanza Kongo in Angola.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received in the evaluation of this nomination, which could be found in document [INF 8B.4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation that Mbanza Kongo be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv).

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** appuie la proposition d'inscription du Mbanza Kongo sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et félicite l'Angola pour son travail qui a permis de parvenir à ces résultats satisfaits. Les vestiges de Mbanza Kongo évoquent l'importance politique et symbolique du royaume historique du Kongo et son rôle comme portail du christianisme sur le continent africain, en plus de présenter une valeur architectural remarquable. Comme la conclue l'ICOMOS, les attributs expriment la valeur universelle du bien dans les délimitations du bien et la délégation félicite l'Angola pour cette proposition d'inscription.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated Angola for its first nomination to the World Heritage List. Mbanza Kongo is indeed a site of OUV with important significance in the country's history and for its contribution to the history of the African continent. Its links with Portugal are old and very significant, dating to the 16th century. The Kings of Kongo actually established diplomatic relations with the Kings of Portugal. The delegation was especially pleased that an archaeological mission from Portugal, led by an expert of the delegation present at this session, also contributed to the knowledge of the property and had supported the Mbanza Kongo nomination. With regard to the documentary corpus and the need for more research mentioned in the evaluation, Portugal was glad to be already cooperating with Angola in finding further reference to the Kingdom of Kongo in Portuguese archives. The documents that it already found testified to the utter importance of this Kingdom. It was recalled that cooperation in this area had already been very successful with inclusion of the Ndembu Archives in the Memory of the World Register in 2011, a documentary heritage submitted jointly by Angola and Portugal. The delegation congratulated Angola once more for extensively working with ICOMOS, which had permitted to identify an additional criterion.

The **Delegation of Poland** congratulated Angola for its first inscription on the World Heritage List, as well as the Advisory Body for its very impressive work. As a host, it was especially satisfied that this historic nomination was adopted in Poland.

The **Vice-Chairperson** remarked on the long list of speakers that would speak at the next session, adding that there was only a minor modification to the draft decision. The

Secretariat presented five side events: one on World Heritage and Climate Change by Earthjustice, another on ICCROM-ATHAR's action plan aiming to strengthen cultural heritage protection in the Arab region, a film screening by the Warsaw Uprising Museum, and two side events organized by the World Heritage Centre, both of which were related to resource mobilization, the Marketplace (a new initiative), followed by partnership events.

[Close of afternoon session]

SIXTH DAY – Saturday 8 July 2017

ELEVENTH SESSION

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 8B [Continuation]: NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Mbanza Kongo, Vestiges of the Capital of the former Kingdom of Kongo (Angola)
[Continuation]

The **Chairperson** began by expressing gratitude to the Ambassador of Portugal for chairing the previous session. He then proceeded to the nomination of Mbanza, Kongo of Angola.

The **Delegation of Finland** was pleased to discuss this solid nomination, adding that it was also a very welcome addition to the World Heritage List from an underrepresented region. When comparing the original nomination file, on which the ICOMOS interim report was based, with the final evaluation of ICOMOS, one realized the enormous work carried out by the State Party in producing a fully realized file in just two months, which was a remarkable achievement and one that served as an example to other States. It was noted that ICOMOS had made some changes regarding the criteria that were well argued and it supported the inscription of the nominated site on the World Heritage List. It was further noted that the draft decision contained a number of recommendations from ICOMOS, which the delegation supported. However, it regretted that some technical recommendations, such as the request to dismantle the telecommunications antenna, were given greater importance than the recommendation to continue further research. The delegation was happy that Portugal also highlighted the issue of research in its earlier intervention, as research is the soul of the Convention's work and should be emphasized more in the decisions.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** extended deep appreciation to the State Party for sharing an exceptional urban cultural landscape that captured the customary practices and religion of the people whose history it represented. This was yet another property whose story resonated far beyond national borders. It was from this urban centre that the world saw the significant expansion of the Christian faith. It was from Mbanza Kongo that enslaved people were transported to the Americas and to the Caribbean. It was heartened by the State Party's spirit of openness in the evaluation process, having taken on board recommendations that saw them fully revising their nomination dossier. It congratulated Angola on its inscription to the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** joined others in congratulating Angola for its first inscription, adding that this inscription was of a cultural centre that highlighted the general history of Africa. It was grateful for ICOMOS for its analysis and support, and it also urged the Advisory Bodies to familiarize themselves with the work that UNESCO had done on the [General History of Africa](#) where the great kingdoms such as the Mango Kongo dynasty are located. It was hoped that more knowledge would emerge from further research on African dynasties and the natural and cultural heritage they left behind. The delegation asked the World Heritage Centre to offer support to conduct further research on other sites related to this kingdom. It also supported the recommendations by Finland relating to further research in this area. Regarding the telecommunications antenna, it was understood that the State Party had already addressed some of those concerns and was looking at other areas of the airport

runway.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** found that the facts provided by ICOMOS on the OUV of the Mbanza Kongo property under criteria (iii) and (iv) were clear on the existence of African civilization during the pre-colonial era with the state of Mbanza Kongo maintaining its sacred and symbolic function for over a period of four decades. It was noted that the importance of inscribing this property was twofold. One, it provided an opportunity for the State Party to preserve African pre-colonial and colonial history, and secondly, it attested to the contribution of African civilization to the rest of the world. The delegation concurred with the recommendation by ICOMOS to inscribe Mbanza Kongo, vestiges of the capital of the former Kingdom of Kongo on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). It also supported the other recommendations in the draft decision, including the dismantling of the telecommunications antenna as planned, the confirmation of the transversal management system, the provision of details on actions, persons responsible and funding of the conservation system, the establishment of a tourism management strategy, and the drafting of specific monitoring indicators. It was noted that these recommendations were at various levels of implementation, as also noted by Zimbabwe. However, on the issue of the airport runway in the buffer zone, which should be removed, it was understood that the State Party would soon initiate a new modern and larger airport project. It was in this spirit that the delegation would propose an amendment to the draft decision to extend the time of reporting to allow for the removal of the runway. The delegation congratulated Angola.

The **Delegation of Cuba** recognized the process that had led to this decision, which undoubtedly proved the will of the State Party to conserve this site, adding that it was undoubtedly an example of OUV. Indeed, this is a site that had been modified over the years to try and balance out the different types of usage of this area. The delegation also saluted the contribution of Portugal in helping to deepen the research process.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked on the properties coming to the forefront from Africa with very unique values, and it believed this inscription would add great value to the World Heritage List. It appreciated ICOMOS for its great support and contribution to the evaluation by the addition of criterion (iv), as well as providing guidance to the State Party for a better formulation of the inscription dossier. The delegation also congratulated the State Party for fulfilling ICOMOS' recommendation enthusiastically in a very short period of time, which showed how better dialogue and collaboration can be achieved in the evaluation process. It supported the advice by Finland to formulate the recommendations in the order of priorities, and additionally recommended that this formulation be applied to all draft decisions. The delegation supported the draft decision and congratulated Angola on its first inscription since it became a Party to the Convention in 1991.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** congratulated the Government of Angola for the work carried out, adding that it supported Tanzania's amendment concerning the different types of modifications.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** extended its warm congratulations to the State Party of Angola on its first World Heritage site Mbanza Kongo. This inscription was very much welcomed by the Committee as an addition to a less represented region of Africa in the World Heritage List. It hoped that the State Party would continue its commitment to safeguard the property's OUV and it thanked the State Party for the dismantling of the telecommunication antennae and its eventual removal. The delegation also hoped that the removal of the runway would pave the way for further archaeological research within the property. As this is the first World Heritage site of Angola, it urged the State Party to devise a tourism management strategy in line with the 1972 Convention. The delegation looked forward to its further cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** congratulated the Government of Angola on the inscription of the historic centre of Mbanza Kongo, the former capital of the former Kingdom of Kongo as

World Cultural Heritage. It also commended the State Party for its excellent work in refining the dossier to meet the standards of the Operational Guidelines in close cooperation with the Advisory Body. Indonesia hoped that the hard work shown by Angola would inspire other States Parties. It believed that it was a very special moment for the Government and people of Angola as it was their first inscription. The delegation hoped that this inscription would further encourage the State Party to strengthen its efforts to protect and conserve the property. Indonesia was confident that the State Party would fully implement the decision of the Committee and maintain its close work with the Advisory Body. It looked forward to seeing more nominations from Angola in the future.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** also commended the State Party with this successful nomination. Indeed, Mbanza Kongo represented an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble that could be seen nowhere else in sub-Saharan Africa, which reflected the profound changes that emanated from the introduction of Christianity and the arrival of the Portuguese in central Africa. The delegation encouraged Angola to continue its dialogue with the Advisory Body, namely to remove all those obstacles that could potential impact the OUV. It congratulated Angola on its first inscription to the World Heritage List.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** wished to clarify that the recommendation concerning further research in paragraph 4.b) of the draft decision on archaeological investigations actually concerned the airport project and not the overall recommendation.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Tanzania. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remained unchanged. The first part of paragraph 4 in 4.a) remain unchanged. The proposal in part 4.b) was to delete the first part, and add, 'Ensuring that the airport runway is removed after the new airport is constructed and is operational, and therefore undertake detailed archaeological investigations to identify the location of graves, former churches and other remains linked to the historic centre'. The rest of the paragraph remained unchanged. Paragraph 5 had a slight modification in the date, which would now read, 'Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2022 a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations'. Paragraph 6 remained unchanged.

The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

The **Delegation of Portugal** supported the modifications suggested by Tanzania, adding that the issue of the airport was reasonable and did not affect the integrity of the property and would also allow for further research.

The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraphs 1–4 adopted.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that the proposed date was too far into the future and that the State Party could actually report on the recommendations before 2022, as this did not imply that all the work had to be carried out by that date.

The **Delegation of Portugal** suggested that Angola be asked for a suitable date.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** félicite la Pologne pour son excellente organisation et son accueil dans la belle ville historique de Cracovie et exprime sa grande joie de voir la ville historique de Mbanza Kongo inscrite sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO. La décision du Comité permet à l'État partie de l'Angola d'inscrire son premier site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Pour atteindre cet objectif le chemin a été long et semé d'embûches, mais grâce à la volonté du Comité et à l'appui de nombreuses personnes et institutions, en particulier le Président de la République de l'Angola, José Eduardo dos Santos, l'inscription a été rendue possible. La délégation remercie particulièrement le Centre du patrimoine mondial, l'ICOMOS et le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain pour leurs conseils et leur accompagnement efficace. Elle remercie également l'Union africaine, et de la Communauté des pays de langue portugaise (CPLP) pour leur appui institutionnel et la diplomatie

culturelle partagée. L'Angola est doté d'un patrimoine naturel et culturel extrêmement riche et varié méritant une meilleure présentation sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. L'État partie prend l'engagement de continuer à travailler pour maintenir la valeur universelle exceptionnelle et renforcer la protection du site en accord avec les recommandations de l'ICOMOS. Finalement, elle souhaite dire que l'inscription de Mbanza-Kongo servira pour maintenir cet héritage historique comme un lieu de mémoire de toutes les communautés qui font partie de cet espace, notamment la République démocratique du Congo, la République du Congo et la République du Gabon, sans pour autant oublier la diaspora congolaise, mais aussi pour la promotion de la culture de la paix entre les peuples et en vue de la préservation de la mémoire collective, et pour garantir le bien-être dans le cadre d'un développement durable.

The **Chairperson** noted that the issue had been resolved with the date set at 2020.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.10 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Brazil** informed the Committee that in May [2016], the Ministers of Culture of the Communities of Portuguese Language Speaking Communities (CPLP) adopted a resolution declaring their support to the Mbanza Kongo nomination. Brazil, in its national capacity and in its temporary presidency of CPLP, congratulated Angola for the inscription of its first property on the World Heritage List. The Portuguese speaking communities and UNESCO share many principles and values; both organizations believe that through the protection of common heritage and the promotion of cultural diversity, one can cooperate to foster dialogue and build peace. The delegation congratulated Angola for Mbanza Kongo. *Parabéns.*

La **Délégation de la France** félicite l'Angola pour l'inscription du site de Mbanza-Kongo, des vestiges de la capitale de l'ancien royaume du Congo, et remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial avoir réalisé cette inscription au patrimoine mondial de l'humanité. Elle insiste sur l'exemplarité du site, de part par la coopération internationale qui a abouti à son inscription, et souligne la participation de l'Institut national de recherche archéologique préventive français.

Asmara: a Modernist City of Africa (Eritrea)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.11](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Asmara: Africa's Modernist City (Eritrea).

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B 4](#). It was noted that this notification had little impact on the statement of OUV already incorporated into the final version.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and recommended that Asmara: Africa's Modernist City be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) under the name 'Asmara: a Modernist City of Africa'.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** congratulated the State Party for submitting this well-supported inscription on Asmara. Zimbabwe noted with satisfaction that the Advisory Bodies were fully satisfied with criteria (ii) and (iv). Asmara's significance lies in this planning, which is a remarkable example of colonial city planning based on functional and racial segregation principles that were adapted to the local geographical conditions. Equally remarkable is that Asmara, despite its colonial associations, is also closely linked with the struggle of the Eritrean people for self-determination. The Committee was therefore not only inscribing

colonial history, but a blend of colonial and post-colonial life. The criteria on which the property was inscribed had been adequately supported, and the State Party had put in place the necessary management and protection mechanisms to ensure that the OUV is safeguarded. The delegation understood that the State Party was comfortable with the recommendation by the Advisory Body to change the title of the property to Asmara: A Modernist City of Africa. It also recommended and supported the ICOMOS recommendation that they continue discussions with the Advisory Bodies on the boundary issue in order to allow for future urban development within Asmara. The delegation supported the inscription of Asmara and congratulated Eritrea.

La **Délégation du Liban** remarque que la nomination de la ville moderniste d'Asmara sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial comble un vide dans la Liste puisque qu'il est clair que toutes les études montrent qu'il y a une sous-représentation du patrimoine moderne dans la Liste du patrimoine mondial, et plus particulièrement le patrimoine moderne en Afrique. Elle espère que cette nomination ouvre la porte à d'autres nominations, comme par exemple, si la situation en Libye s'améliore, avec la nomination du quartier italien à Benghazi, ou, de nouveau, la nomination de Casablanca, qui a été retirée et qui est quand même extrêmement importante. La délégation pense qu'il y a un travail très important à faire et propose à l'ICOMOS de possiblement faire une étude thématique sur le patrimoine moderne en Afrique, puisque c'est un point qu'elle estime particulièrement intéressant et important.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** congratulated the State Party on its first inscription and joined others in conveying its strong support and delight on this happy occasion. The futurist modernist architecture of Asmara was well preserved in numerous examples and it was also a strong influence in other planning of the early 20th century using the zoning principle and organizing functions. These criteria of urban properties from the 20th century also contribute in achieving diversity in the heritage types on the List. Heritage is dynamic and living but by its nature could be easily changed by development. The delegation recognized the difficult task of maintaining the level of change in the city and it hoped that the protective designations for the property and the finalization of the Urban Conservation Master Plan were well implemented, as recommended.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** concurred with the recommendation to inscribe Asmara: Africa's Modernist City on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv). On the issue of the name, Tanzania would go with the name if confirmed by the State Party. Tanzania congratulated Eritrea for inscribing her capital city as a World Heritage property. Asmara's urban character and strong urban form exhibit a human scale in its relationship between buildings, sites, open spaces and activities adapted to local conditions that embody both colonial and post-colonial African life. The delegation remarked that many African capital cities had developed their architectural and planning from colonial times, but had not yet managed to attribute them with World Heritage OUV status. Eritrea had succeeded, which was testimony to a cultural civilization that is living with the preserved architectural structures and original urban layout, including most of the characteristic features and public spaces maintained in their entirety, making Asmara stand out from the rest. Tanzania encouraged the State Party to set up the central management body and research in the property's integrated management plan, which was considered key to ensuring that all the recommendations by the Advisory Bodies were met for the appropriate conservation of the site. Based on the above, it supported and congratulated Eritrea.

La **Délégation du Koweït** appuie la recommandation de l'ICOMOS pour l'inscription de la ville d'Asmara, capitale de l'Érythrée sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, sous le titre Asmara : une ville moderniste d'Afrique, sur les bases des critères (ii) et (iv), l'évolution de l'architecture et un exemple concret sur la qualité de la construction ou de l'architecture ou un exemple technique. Cette ville unique contient l'une des plus grandes collections d'architecture moderniste dans le monde. Depuis plusieurs siècles la ville d'Asmara a été influencée par différentes cultures et religions et différents dirigeants, égyptiens, ottomans et européens. Ces derniers ont laissé leurs traces sur les monuments de la culture et de

l'architecture, en particulier la culture italienne, qui a laissé une marque forte dans l'architecture de la ville. Tout en félicitant l'État partie pour ces efforts, la délégation du Koweït recommande l'inscription de cette ville sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et rejoint les autres délégations qui se sont exprimées avant elle.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the State Party on the nomination of Asmara: Africa's Modernist City under criteria (ii) and (iv). Designed by Italian architects and engineers, the urban scape of Asmara followed the models for colonial planned cities and showed how colonial planning was applied and adapted to the local conditions to achieve symbolic messages and functional requirements. The town includes open spaces, public and private buildings, religious structures, industrial facilities and private homes. This unusual urban environment was influenced by the natural features of the environment and the pre-existing settlements. Jamaica urged the State Party to fulfill the request from ICOMOS that includes finishing the Urban Conservation Master Plan, and to provide additional information on the building techniques, materials and forms used in the construction of the town and its buildings. It supported the inscription of Asmara and expressed congratulations to the State Party for sharing this special site with the world.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** congratulated Eritrea for its first property listed in the World Heritage List. It acknowledged that the city is an outstanding example of a well-preserved and planned colonial city, which also anticipates a human scale in the relationship between building, street, open spaces and related activities. Although it noted with concern an indication of uncontrolled development in the nominated property, the delegation was confident that the State Party would work closely with the Advisory Body and the Secretariat to prepare a sufficient management plan to handle this issue. Indonesia supported the inscription of Asmara.

The **Delegation of Finland** recognized Eritrea's great achievement with its nomination file. It was clear that the property demonstrated OUV and the delegation was happy to see yet another urban heritage site on the World Heritage List. The exceptionally well-preserved and planned urban city outstandingly conveys how colonial planning was applied and adopted to the local geographical conditions to achieve symbolic messages and functional requirements. The delegation sincerely congratulated the State Party on their first site inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that Asmara was a very important example of a unique type of urban planning that creatively combined local character with rationalist modernist planning principles. Asmara's inscription was a great contribution to the ongoing theoretical discussions about modernity and modernism in the African continent and the impact of urbanization, as such discussions had invariably been limited to known examples mainly in the West and to some extent in the East. Following inscription, the site would come to be known for much more and would therefore serve as a school in itself in the field of urban planning. It was very happy to see that the Convention was not only ready to protect and promote heritage but also add values to the enlarging literature. The delegation thanked Eritrea for this precious and unique nomination, congratulating the State Party on its first inscription.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** spoke of Asmara as a true gem, adding that this nomination had been much awaited. It welcomed the inscription of this property and congratulated Eritrea, not only for the work done on this nomination but for its efforts to ensure conservation despite obvious limited resources. The delegation joined the international community to continue contributing to the conservation of this wonderful modernist city. It fully supported the draft decision and extended congratulations to Eritrea on its first inscription.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** supported the inscription and also commended the efforts by the State Party in implementing measures to protect and manage the property. It also encouraged the Eritrea to develop strategies to ensure financial and human resources, as

well as technical capacity. It congratulated the State Party on its first inscription to the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Poland** spoke of Asmara as a significant example of a modern architectural structure and innovative urban layout and it thus supported the recommendation to inscribe Asmara: Africa's Modernist City on the World Heritage List. It congratulated the State Party for a very effective preparation of its first inscription, which happily occurred in Poland.

The **Delegation of Portugal** remarked that this nomination of a 20th century property encompassed multiple stories and experiences. It warmly congratulated Eritrea for its inscription on the World Heritage List. Asmara is a very significant nomination. Of the several Eritrean towns and cities planned in the 1910s through to the 1930s none were as large or as fully developed as Asmara, and none were so abundantly modernist in architecture or achieved such importance in the post-colonial era in terms of the formation of the national identity. Asmara is an outstanding example of the modernist urban landscape in an African setting through an exceptional urban planning process that encompasses the whole city and combines local, natural and cultural conditions. Portugal supported that Asmara be inscribed on the World Heritage List and further encouraged the State Party to continue investing on rehabilitation and conservation. This was an excellent example of how useful the close cooperation between experts, State Party and Advisory Bodies could be in terms of presenting consistent candidatures to this Committee. The recognition of the OUV of Asmara was another happy event of this session. It also supported the suggestion by Lebanon regarding a study on the modern heritage in Africa, adding that it was an excellent idea and that it would be ready to cooperate closely in this endeavor.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** rejoint les délégations précédentes pour féliciter l'Éritrée pour cette première proposition d'inscription et appuie les recommandations faites par les organes consultatifs. Elle tient à marquer aussi sa sensibilité pour la proposition faite par le Liban compte tenu du potentiel des villes africaines, de façon à harmoniser la liaison entre l'époque précoloniale, l'époque coloniale et le modernisme qui le suit. Elle félicite l'État membre et appuie l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** partage les positions favorables exprimées sur les recommandations formulées par l'organisation consultative, qui est favorable à l'inscription du site durant cette session du Comité. Elle note particulièrement le caractère exceptionnel d'Asmara dans la sous-région et dans son contexte historique, surtout la singularité du schéma directeur et de gestion proposé. Le Burkina Faso félicite l'État partie pour avoir révélé à la communauté internationale ce joyau, témoin d'une culture exceptionnelle en Afrique et appuie la recommandation d'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** soutien et applaudit l'inscription d'Asmara sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, félicite et remercie l'État partie pour cette inscription.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41.COM.8B.11 adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Eritrea on behalf of the Committee for its first inscription on the World Heritage List, inviting Eritrea to take the floor.

The **Delegation of Eritrea** remarked that it was the first time in the history of UNESCO and the history of the country that Eritrea had the honor of addressing this meeting. It was therefore with great pleasure that it occurred on the occasion of Asmara's inscription on the World Heritage List. Asmara, its beloved capital, is Eritrea's first ever World Heritage site. The city's recognition as heritage site of Outstanding Universal Value filled the country with tremendous pride and joy, but also a profound sense of responsibility and duty. The State Party pledged to respect and uphold the obligations of the Convention by not only protecting

Asmara but also by redoubling efforts to protect the nation's natural and cultural sites, some of which it looked forward to submitting in the near future. The delegation welcomed the Committee's acknowledgment of Africa's under-representation on the World Heritage List and it was proud to be part of the concerted effort by the international community to address this imbalance. The delegation thus sincerely thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, especially ICOMOS, for their support throughout the nomination process, and it expressed profound gratitude to all those that had supported this nomination, namely, the embassies in Eritrea of Norway, Italy, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, the European Union, the Gage Foundation, the Royal Institute of British Architects, and the different governmental and non-governmental bodies, nationally and internationally. Above all, it wished to thank all the Eritreans at home and abroad who had been so united in celebrating and protecting Asmara, and who all warmly welcome the delegates to Asmara.

The **Delegation of Italy** expressed great appreciation to Eritrea for its successful inscription of the city of Asmara on the World Heritage List. Asmara: Africa's Modernist City is the first site for the state of Eritrea to become part of this important List. It is a great achievement, and the delegation commended the Eritrea authorities, in particular, the Asmara Heritage Project (AHP) for all its efforts and remarkable work of research in the preparation of the dossier, leading to this valuable inscription, which would no doubt benefit the country and the entire continent. May Asmara, which is one of the most complete and significant collections of modern architecture in the world, be the first site of many others in Eritrea.

≠Khomani Cultural Landscape (South Africa)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.12](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item ≠Khomani Cultural Landscape.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification in the nomination had been received from South Africa. This notification could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation that the ≠Khomani Cultural Landscape be deferred.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** remarque les attributs significatifs concernant le peuple Khomani San qui a développé depuis des siècles des connaissances, des savoirs et des pratiques traditionnelles exceptionnelles en ethnobotanique. Ce site mérite une analyse objective et une attention particulière des membres du Comité présents à cette session. La délégation a analysé le dossier d'inscription soumis par l'État partie ; a considéré les informations additionnelles soumises par l'État partie en octobre 2016 ; a analysé et pris en compte les rapports d'évaluation de l'ICOMOS ; a pris en compte la modification des erreurs factuelles soumises par l'État partie en réaction au rapport de l'ICOMOS ; et, enfin, a analysé la réponse de l'ICOMOS face à la soumission de la notification des erreurs factuelles soumise par l'État partie. Elle note, avec un peu de regret, les erreurs factuelles dans le rapport d'évaluation par l'ICOMOS, telles que reflétées dans le document WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B4. Cependant elle reconnaît l'acceptation par l'ICOMOS de ce point soulevé par l'État partie au titre des erreurs factuelles. D'ailleurs, c'est avec satisfaction qu'elle a appris qu'il y a eu des concertations, ici même à Cracovie, entre l'État partie et l'ICOMOS, démarche qui est vivement encouragée. Toutefois, la délégation aimerait souligner que l'ICOMOS a peut-être mal interprété ce que l'État partie proposait pour inscription, c'est-à-dire le paysage culturel des Khomani San, et non le paysage général des San, ce qui a impacté parfois négativement la justification de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Par conséquent, avec l'acceptation de certaines erreurs fondamentales factuelles par l'ICOMOS, la délégation juge que la VUE est justifiée. Par conséquent elle

demande que la présente session du Comité inscrive les paysages culturels des Khomani comme bien du patrimoine mondial à la suite d'une analyse minutieuse de toutes les informations disponibles. Elle félicite l'État partie pour sa contribution dans la préservation de cet important patrimoine, cependant, concernant les critères cités, le point de vue de la délégation est que le critère (iv) n'est pas totalement justifié. Elle pense que le bien de l'État partie pourrait être inscrit sur la base des critères (iii), (v) et (vi). Le critère (iii) est justifié à travers la description de la persistance de la culture Khomani dans le bien proposé au cours de plusieurs millénaires, en dépit d'interruptions diverses qui n'ont pas pu effacer l'existence de la culture jusqu'à nos jours. Des informations issues des recherches sur des aspects comme l'ethnobotanique ont été soumises avec la proposition d'inscription et, du point de vue de la délégation, l'information fournie est suffisante pour distinguer l'usage paysager des Khomani. Le critère (v) est justifié par la description de plusieurs attributs qui représentent comment les Khomani ont survécu dans un environnement hostile et laissé des évidences de leur exploitation du paysage afin d'assurer la survie au fil des années. Finalement, le critère (vi) est justifié sur la base de la documentation de la culture khomani, les savoirs traditionnels, l'ethnobotanique, qui démontrent la richesse de la connaissance du veld encore en usage pour faire face aux conditions difficiles. Par conséquent, la délégation recommande fortement à cette session du Comité d'inscrire le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** remarked that the #Khomani property was another important type of site under consideration by this Committee, adding that when one walks into any cultural property its values could be clearly observed, experienced or celebrated in various ways. These are values one can only experience by feeling and by being informed, and there were values that one can get by reading or by participating. Because of the design of the Convention, the nominations were presented to the Committee in most cases by evaluators in the form of writing, and the act of expression through reading or listening. The delegation remarked that the experience for most of the Members who had not had the chance to visit this site would be that they were convinced of the existing OUV through the act of oral expression (writing) and with the aid of visual presentation. It had been demonstrated in Committee sessions that certain criteria were not demonstrated or justified. The reality was, however, that the justification in some cases was in fact elaborated through the power of words, i.e. presenting the same facts in a different way. Moreover, the question was: Who has this power of representation in the act of writing or expression? It was noted that nominations in the early years were less demanding in terms of the required facts. Today, with time, this had disadvantaged some of the regions, notwithstanding their usefulness. The issue of OUV, in the opinion of Tanzania, should not be difficult to identify for any person visiting a site; it should be vividly clear. The challenge in this Committee, when considering a property, is to understand the basic demonstration of experts from his or her experience in the field. Nevertheless, in some cases, a State Party might feel a certain injustice when a site is not inscribed and this was indeed a grey area. The delegation further remarked that ICOMOS had experts all over the world, as well as expert committees in some countries or regions. It is thus important to help State Parties, not as advisers to the Committee alone, but as advisers to the States Parties from the outset so that they did not have to labour so much, using up their scarce resources. In the case of #Khomani, the delegation experienced a number of difficulties in the understanding of the nomination dossier, which were posed by the Advisory Body, because they were not clearly demonstrated through the act of writing. The delegation spoke of the many areas [in the nomination dossier] that required clarification from Angola that now appeared to have the necessary justifications. The delegation thus supported Angola's draft decision, with the hope that the Advisory Body had the same understanding from the uploaded document 8B.4.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the amended draft recommendation by Angola, sharing the view that the property deserved inscription. It also echoed the eloquent statement made by Tanzania regarding this site, adding that the many factual errors had led to the misunderstandings between the State Party and the Advisory Body. The nomination clearly

stated that it was not about the San people but about the unique cultural landscape shared by the #Khomani. The #Khomani themselves are a unique community who are part of the broader San, whose imprinted features provided evidence of the survival of the #Khomani through the exploration of the harsh landscape. A comparison with the sites of Botswana on the Tentative List could be one of the recommendations that the State Party could undertake *after* inscription. The delegation did not think that the Committee should defer inscription until the State Party had carried out studies in other countries, as this was not yet a serial nomination. In Zimbabwe's view, the State Party had satisfactorily defined the conditions of integrity and authenticity, and had done so without equivocation. The nomination would certainly not be a lifeless museum edifice, as shown in the manifest actions of the #Khomani having regained their cultural rights of the land. It was regrettable that the maps testifying to the property's attributes of authenticity were missed by the Advisory Body, but the delegation was pleased that it did finally understand these maps. In light of these clarifications, it supported the revised draft recommendation for inscription by Angola.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** rejoint les positions exprimées par l'Angola, la Tanzanie et le Zimbabwe sur les recommandations en faveur de l'inscription du site à cette session. En ce qui concerne les problèmes soulevés par l'ICOMOS, relative à l'analyse comparative, elle accueille favorablement les remarques qui ont été faites même si elle est réservée sur l'option selon laquelle sans élément comparatif additionnel le paysage culturel des Khomani ne peut pas être considéré comme exceptionnel. L'ICOMOS semble se focaliser sur le fait qu'il n'existe plus certaines choses comme la langue san. Pour la délégation, il ne s'agit pas de considérer les Khomani comme un ensemble du groupe général san et insiste que l'analyse comparative telle que présentée par l'État partie devrait être suffisante pour que le Comité soit convaincu de l'unique valeur du paysage culturel des Khomani dans son contexte géographique et historique. Sa conviction se fonde également sur les différents facteurs et attributs qui ont une signification particulière, tels qu'indiqués dans le dossier soumis par l'Afrique du Sud. Les Khomani représentent une partie unique du cercle des cultures San, qui ont été développées de façon unique à des périodes données de l'histoire. De ce qui précède donc, la délégation ne considère pas qu'il y ait besoin de comparaison additionnelle de ces paysages uniques susceptible de prouver son caractère non exceptionnel. Par conséquent, elle soutient l'inscription du bien durant cette session du Comité.

The **Delegation of Finland** commended the State Party for its work on the nomination of the #Khomani Cultural Landscape. The property is a vast landscape including landmarks of San history, migration, livelihoods, memory and resources. In its opinion, the nomination would benefit from some additional time provided by a deferral so as to strengthen the comparative analysis justification of OUV, and to settle the question marks on the integrity and authenticity of the site. Having consulted with the State Party, South Africa was of the opinion that ICOMOS might have misunderstood the concept and the difference between the San people and the #Khomani San people, and the delegation thus sought clarification from ICOMOS on that specific issue.

The **Delegation of Croatia** fully supported the amendment by Angola and endorsed by Zimbabwe, Burkina Faso and Tanzania. Having heard the additional argumentation on the factual errors acknowledged by ICOMOS, it seemed that there had been some misunderstanding in the evaluation process. Furthermore, the understanding of universal values was very much dependent on education, geographical viewpoints and cultural backgrounds, which sometimes led to misunderstandings. The delegation was thus convinced of and supported the inscription of #Khomani Cultural Landscape on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that the Committee had observed in recent years an increase in the nomination of cultural landscapes, which was known to be a difficult category to nominate, evaluate and protect, especially in exceptional cases such as the #Khomani Cultural Landscape nomination. This associative landscape is among those sites that are

related to human evolution through interaction with the earth in the spirit of UNESCO's now-closed Human Evolution: Adaptations, Dispersals and Social Developments (HEADS) thematic programme. It was learned from the nomination that ethnographic research since the 19th century had documented #Khomani culture through the traditions transmitted from generation to generation for a long period of about 100,000 years in human history in terms of associations with landscape elements, such as specific trees between the dunes or ancestors' graves, herbal medicine, and beliefs in the healing and harmonizing powers embedded in this very landscape. Limited visibility of the traces left by the #Khomani in this millennial long coexistence with the fragile dune landscape rendered the assessment of the nomination difficult, especially from a more familiar architectural perspective of cultural heritage instead of a more anthropocentric one that takes into consideration tangible and intangible heritage values together. This very assessment was taking place in a period when the #Khomani were revitalizing the delicate associations with their ancestral land that now belong to them again, though legally defined and protected as Kalahari Gemsbok National Park. The delegation believed that inscription on the World Heritage List would ensure longevity of the #Khomani culture in association with this cultural landscape and contribute to an equitable representation of natural, cultural and intangible diversity since the very origins of human life on Earth. It thus supported the amended decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

Having reviewed the nomination file, the **Delegation of Jamaica** noted some significant errors where clarifications had been received and the factual errors reported, many of which had been acknowledged by ICOMOS. The nomination file spoke of the unique traditions of the #Khomani San people of South Africa and their landuse over the centuries until the present day. The clarifications indicated that the #Khomani San people were connected spiritually and traditionally with the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park in South Africa, which is part of the vast National Park straddling Botswana and South Africa. The delegation was of the opinion that the factual errors and the information provided by the State Party had provided greater clarity and demonstrated the OUV of the property. Jamaica therefore supported the #Khomani Cultural Landscape inscription under criteria (ii), (v) and (vi), as indicated in the amended draft decision, and it commended the State Party for its hard work.

The **Delegation of Cuba** also regretted that the Committee had been unable to evaluate the full value of this site, as stated by the previous speakers. The delegation therefore supported the inscription of this property, as well as the amendments put forward by Angola.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** remarque que tel que le dossier se présente, le bien referme la communauté qui a des racines très profondes dans l'histoire de l'humanité, et est parfaitement imbriquée dans son paysage, développant ainsi une technologie et un mode de vie qui lui ont permis d'être pérenne. En cela, la culture de ce peuple est unique, un peuple attaché à sa terre et à sa culture, en pleine harmonie avec l'ensemble de son paysage naturel dans sa double dimension biologique et botanique. Quant à l'intégrité du bien, elle se révèle selon nous justement à travers son étendue qui se justifie pleinement et qui ne doit pas du tout la fragiliser. L'authenticité enfin se vérifie au travers de ses traditions et de sa mémoire, la mémoire de ce peuple, qui les véhicule encore et cherche à les vivifier pour les passer aux générations futures, au point qu'ils se font appeler les traditionnalistes. Pour toutes ces raisons, et compte tenu des erreurs factuelles de l'ICOMOS relevées par l'État partie, la délégation soutient la proposition très appuyée de l'Angola de l'inscription suivant les critères (iii), (v) et (vi).

Having listened carefully to the Members, the **Delegation of Portugal** noted that each had contributed to this debate, namely, Angola, Tanzania and Zimbabwe, however, certain points remained unclear. For example, this was not a serial nomination, which perhaps the Advisory Body had missed, in addition to other factual errors that had been acknowledged. Thus, in order to have a clearer picture of this issue, the delegation aligned with Zimbabwe in wishing to hear from ICOMOS so that the discrepancies pointed out could be addressed. The delegation also sought to hear from the State Party to share its vision and willingness to

meet some of the requests that had been put forward by the Advisory Bodies.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** took note of the issues raised by ICOMOS concerning the conditions of integrity and authenticity of the property. However, it believed that this site reflected the hunter-gatherer way of life practised by the ancestors of all human beings, and it supported the decision amended by Angola.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** commended the State Party on the framework adopted for the protection and management of the property that integrated local resources, spatial planning and control, as well as safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Having heard the opinions of the other Members and their concerns, as well as the presentation by ICOMOS, the delegation believed that inscription on the World Heritage List would provide all the stakeholders involved the motivation to continue their efforts in safeguarding this cultural landscape. It acknowledged the universal value of the site as the place of the ancestors of the entire human race, and it supported the amendment by Angola to inscribe this site based on criteria (iii), (v) and (vi).

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** supported the amendment by Angola and the inscription of †Khomani Cultural Landscape under criteria (iii), (v) and (vi). It also agreed with Zimbabwe that some points and issues mentioned in the ICOMOS report could be discussed with neighbouring countries after inscription.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** also noted the number of factual errors and clarifications agreed between the State Party and ICOMOS. Nevertheless, there was a discrepancy in interpretation within ICOMOS and the Committee, especially with respect to the geographic expanse of the nomination. The delegation recognized the importance of the †Khomani Cultural Landscape in association with the unique culture of the †Khomani and related San people dating back to the Stone Age. It hoped that a healthy balance could be found between the will of the Committee and the expert analysis. As suggested by Portugal, perhaps narrowing the applicable criteria and inviting the State to address some outstanding issues might be the way forward.

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to respond to the questions.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted two points of importance that deserved clarification. Firstly, concerning the factual error letters, ICOMOS conceded that it had acknowledged a few factual errors but its main preoccupation remained those concerning, in particular, the level of documentation and the information provided on the cultural aspects that would support this inscription. The wording of the criteria might be seen as a detail but in some cases it also reflected how the property was understood, and it would also influence its management in the future. Concerning the distinction between the †Khomani San and the San, ICOMOS sought caution in the sense that the distinction between the †Khomani San and the other San group was not clearly made in the nomination file nor in the additional information provided, and could thus be quite problematic in that regard. This was why ICOMOS had asked to the State Party to better clarify the distinction in the relationship between the people and the landscape. Concerning the maps, ICOMOS had met with the State Party but the only point on which common agreement was found concerned the role of the National Heritage Resource Act. However, with regard to the quality and depth of the mapping and the commentary provided by the State Party, ICOMOS considered the material to be far from sufficient at this stage. Thus, all these elements, including the wording of the criteria and the supporting evidence regrettably obliged ICOMOS to propose a deferral. In addition, the fact that the area covered is a boundary area, which between States could be quite artificial, and in view of the way the population had spread over millennia and continued to spread up to this boundary, due consideration might be required in terms of how to determine the effective boundaries that reflect this interaction between the human and natural environment.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party of South Africa.

The **Delegation of South Africa** explained that the nomination of the †Khomani Cultural

Landscape had been developed over a long, painstaking process involving multiple stakeholders. The main drivers of the nomination itself, in terms of the process, were the #Khomani San who worked tirelessly to ensure that members of their community, young and old, contributed to a solid nomination that accurately reflected their relationship with the hard conditions of the landscape. The State Party had ensured that it complied with the prescribed and supporting processes for the nomination, submitting the nomination for a completeness check after valuable inputs were received from the World Heritage Centre. The final submitted dossier was the subject of this session. Subsequently, the evaluation mission where members of the #Khomani community actively participated, led South Africa to submit additional information. The involvement of the #Khomani community in this process presented many opportunities for capacity-building and brought about various aspects necessary for the management of the cultural landscape. The delegation further explained that the #Khomani is a unique group only found in South Africa, a subgroup of the broader San community. The nomination dossier is about the unique #Khomani San group. In its evaluation of the dossier, ICOMOS misunderstood some of the issues and those had now been clarified, hence document INF.8B4 where ICOMOS acknowledged those misunderstandings and recognized the clarification provided. The nomination of this important cultural landscape would thus contribute very significant cultural heritage to the rich and diverse World Heritage List. [Different speaker] With regard to the issue of maps, the delegation explained that the ICOMOS evaluation looked at the San who are spread beyond the nominated property, leading to serious confusion, and hence the issues of integrity and authenticity. The delegation added that as much as it appreciated the recommendation to carry out further comparative analysis with the sites on the Tentative List, in fact the dossier already contained a comparative analysis with sites on the World Heritage List whose parameters should provide the Committee with the information it required. Thus, the delegation felt that the information relating to further research on cultural heritage features were demonstrated, as indicated in the maps provided with the nomination, and submitted again as further information. Moreover, research was ongoing within the State Party albeit it could always be enhanced in an ongoing process. The delegation appealed to the Committee to consider inscribing this property, adding that the recommendations would be implemented thereafter.

The **delegation of Portugal** remarked that having heard ICOMOS and the State Party, it would join the other delegations to propose the inscription of the property.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Angola. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified, which would now read, 'Inscribes the #Khomani Cultural Landscape, South Africa, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (v) and (vi). Paragraph 2.a), b), c) and d) was deleted. Paragraphs 3 and 4 were also deleted, and a new paragraph 3 was added, which would read, 'Takes note of the following provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value'.

The **Delegation of Peru** believed that this was indeed a complex file that required clarifications in parts, adding that there had been factual errors in the nomination and therefore it was very important to listen to the State Party and also to ICOMOS in that regard. Peru now fully supported the amendment put forward by Angola and therefore supported inscription.

The **Delegation of Finland** noted that there appeared to be an error in the cited criterion, as the English version mentioned criterion (ii), while the the French cited criterion (iii), noting that the State Party had put forward criterion (iii).

The **Chairperson** concurred with Finland's observation and it was duly corrected. He then turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

Regarding paragraph 3, the **Delegation of Finland** had an issue with the cited criterion (iii) in this case. The delegation explained that in nominating a site based on criterion (iii), the site

had to 'bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared'. It was the delegation's understanding that the archaeological evidence of San persons within this property was not discussed in the nomination dossier. It thus wished to hear from ICOMOS on criterion (iii) in this case.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** conceded that Finland had highlighted an aspect that had been discussed at length by the ICOMOS Panel, agreeing that it was a matter of evidence but also interchanges and modifications that had occurred and that had impacted on the possibility to support this criterion. This was why ICOMOS considered that the property might not have the potential to satisfy criterion (iii) and instead it focused more on criterion (v), which looked at landuse, while criterion (vi), as the important associative dimension of this landscape, was apparent. Finland had thus pointed out a legitimate concern that ICOMOS had had in its discussions, as criterion (iii) had not been fully demonstrated at this stage.

The **Delegation of Finland** suggested deleting criterion (iii) from the amendment.

The **Delegation of Portugal** suggested that Angola be given an opportunity to speak.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** est d'accord pour supprimer le critère (iii).

The Chairperson declared Decision 41.COM.8B.12 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of South Africa** thanked the Chairperson and the Government of Poland for their great hospitality, adding that it was an honour to start by congratulating Angola and Eritrea for their first nominations to the World Heritage List. South Africa welcomed the inscription of this important and unique site that added to the diversity of sites in the country. It also thanked the #Khomani community for its initiative, patience, dedication and their role throughout the nomination process. Their continued efforts to protect and nurture their heritage was acknowledged. This inscription marked a very noteworthy moment for the #Khomani community, which had survived the extreme conditions of the desert landscape despite their significant low numbers over a very long period of time. While South Africa was delighted to add another site to the World Heritage List, it acknowledged the consequent responsibility and commitment to ensure that the integrity and OUV was not only sustained but also strengthened. The delegation also acknowledged the participation of the communities as the custodians of this World Heritage, while ensuring that they benefitted from the property in many ways, including through capacity-building and their contribution to economic development in the area. The delegation spoke of having learned a lot from the Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, and would continue to ensure that those lessons were not in vain. The delegation assured the Committee that South Africa would spare no effort in ensuring that these World Heritage properties continue to be managed in accordance with the highest standards, consistent with the provisions of the Convention.

A Member of the #Khomani community thanked the Committee, the South African delegation and all other States Parties and stakeholders who ensured the inscription of the #Khomani Cultural Landscape initiated by his community. The decision marked a long awaited historical moment for the #Khomani San and for all other San and Bushmen communities. As one of the most researched and documented cultures in the world, it was finally acknowledged for its universal value and importance. This listing would provide the #Khomani with a foundation to continue and preserve, protect and practise this ancient culture and traditions with a minimum threat of extinction within the current society. On behalf of the community, he promised that they would never stop to respect and nurture the ecosystem services embedded within their culture to ensure that it provide for future generations. Conservation for the #Khomani is not a planned action or a buzzword but a way of life that had been instilled in all San people from a very young age. Nature and culture and the atmosphere is never distinguished in the ecosystem but considered part of humanity, as part of man within #Khomani culture. The #Khomani fully welcomed the inclusion of the site and thanked all the stakeholders who had worked with them to make this possible, including NGOs, researchers, BMZ Germany, Peace Box Foundation, and other individuals. Last but

not least, he thanked his community back in the Kalahari, conveying a very special thanks to all the elderly who have died in the process of acknowledging the universal value of their culture.

ARAB STATES

As-Salt Eclectic Architecture (1865-1925), Origins and Evolution of an Architectural Language in the Levant (Jordan)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.13](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on As-Salt Eclectic Architecture (1865–1925), Origins and Evolution of an Architectural Language in the Levant.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation to not inscribe it on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated the Jordanian authorities for the careful and consistent preparation of this nomination, which had initially been presented to the Committee in 1994. Its congratulations were twofold. Firstly, it believed that the nomination deserved careful attention for its quality, uniqueness and original hybrid nature, and thus it co-sponsored the revised draft decision. Secondly, Jordan had decided to accept the deferral, notwithstanding its conviction of the relevance of this candidature, but to allow the State Party more time to further consolidate the dossier and articulate its different components in a consistent way. The delegation described this attitude as exemplary and one that should be commended. As-Salt is in fact a unique property for different reasons, and its origin and history were worth studying. The originality of As-Salt lie in its indigenous contemporary architectural language based on ancient geometry. The delegation noted that there were no architectural elements related to Art Nouveau, which was popular among the European elites at the time, or the gothic or neo-classical revival widespread in Europe and European colonies. But this was not the issue, quite the contrary. It was obvious that the wealthy people who built the new town ordered a specific urban drawing, a pragmatic and original one, as well as buildings adapted to its business needs and the conviviality of different social and cultural strata. So the absence of the influence of the European setting did not diminish the exceptional value of this property, in fact, it gave it increased relevance and significance. As-Salt contributes to a nominative expression of building new towns by indigenous masters. These masters married geometrical precision and the proportions of ancient architecture with modern language and materials in a harmonious way. It was indeed eclectic in the best sense of the word. Portugal congratulated Jordan for its commitment to work further on this dossier, adding that it was sure of the integrity and authenticity of the property. It thus co-sponsored the nomination for deferral.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** noted that ICOMOS had considered this nomination as a deferred file, whereas Jordan had submitted a new Tentative List form in 2015. Therefore, the file should be considered a new nomination and should thus be attributed a new reference number. In addition, the main point of criticism by ICOMOS was related to the comparative analysis and how integrity and the criteria were demonstrated. Consequently, the justification of the OUV seemed to be, at least partially, confused with the 1994 nomination process [when it was first submitted]. In light of the above, it proposed to defer the nomination, as per the amendment submitted.

The **Delegation of Turkey** commended the efforts of Jordan in improving the protection of

the property, which was the main reason behind its referral in 1994, and for its efforts in the preparation of the nomination file. It also thanked ICOMOS for the extensive and lucid briefing on this dossier, and it supported the remarks by Lebanon. It was noted that As-Salt benefitted from its position on the pilgrimage and trade routes and developed economically and demographically until the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 and the subsequent opening of the Hijaz Railway in 1898. The dossier emphasized two main arguments for the OUV. One was the transformation of a small settlement into a city, and the other was the emergence and evolution of a spatial architecture. The delegation agreed that the site demonstrated OUV. However, the dossier needed to be expanded to bring forth its real potential in a more thorough way. For instance, a type of modernity is commonly used in literature to refer to the Ottoman experience of modernity in architecture and urbanization. As such, comparison with former Ottoman cities in the vicinity under similar influences of modernization would very much contribute towards this justification. The delegation considered that the OUV, integrity and authenticity [of the property] was preserved, but the problem encountered was related to documentation and further articulation of the city's uniqueness. It therefore recommended that the nomination be deferred to the State Party so that certain aspects could be reformulated, like the boundaries, and that the criteria be based on the outcomes of the comparative analysis to be made.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** fully recognized the importance of the current nomination dossier and welcomed the efforts implemented by the State Party, adding that there was no doubt that this outstanding property would be on the World Heritage List in the near future following some modifications in the nomination file, namely, the comparative analysis, boundary clarifications, and the elaboration in the definition of the OUV. The delegation thus supported the amendment for a deferral of the As-Salt Eclectic Architecture nomination.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** congratulated Jordan on this very important genre of World Heritage, a form of heritage that originated and evolved during the late Ottoman era, a period of high importance as it marked the birth of Jordan as a nation and a modern state. It joined the previous speakers in supporting the proposal to defer the nomination to the State Party to allow it more time to reflect on the proposed OUV, and to respond to the other suggestions made by ICOMOS.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** fully recognized the significance and cultural values that As-Salt Eclectic Architecture demonstrated through its modern architectural style from the late 19th century to the 20th century of the Ottoman Empire. It highly commended the endeavors of the State Party to identify new values of the property from a new point of view. The delegation also respected the expert opinion of ICOMOS in its evaluation that concluded that more evidence was needed to support the justification of the property in its eclectic characteristics to the standards of demonstrating its OUV. Although, the OUV was not fully demonstrated at this stage, it strongly encouraged the State Party to continue its efforts. The significance of the eclectic architecture, especially in the Levant, and its meaning in an open landscape should be explored in-depth, adding that the process of As-Salt evolving from a small rural settlement to a prominent urban city could be found in this property. The delegation gladly supported the amended draft decision.

The **Delegation of Philippines** remarked that this new nomination was totally different to the deferred nomination submitted by Jordan in 1994. It also wished to commend ICOMOS for its extensive evaluation report, however, it was based on a totally different nomination on the City of As-Salt, which Jordan did not revive and therefore was based on a different premise. The nomination under consideration is the Eclectic Architecture of As-Salt, now a serial nomination. The nominated serial properties were houses of the wealthy merchants from Nablus, Syria and Egypt who built their fortunes on trade, banking and farming in the city of As-Salt; their wealthy commissions allowed skilled craftsmen to build their family mansions. The delegation understood that various influences and styles were carried from outside influences brought about by the wealthy merchants who may have been exposed to gothic, Greek and Roman influences during their travels, and were later adopted and merged

in ingenious ways by the craftsmen working with the yellow stone in a unique style of architecture. It supported the amendment submitted to defer this important nomination, while highly commending Jordan for its position to gain further time to consolidate and strengthen its nomination. The delegation believed that this positive attitude should be emulated by all States Parties and it was greatly respected by the Committee.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that this nomination was deferred in 1994 to enable the State Party to put in place and implement appropriate protective measures. The State Party had been able to do this and it was congratulated for this achievement. Unfortunately, at this point, the nomination file could not argue that the property has OUV, rather it showed the site's national and sub-regional value. The centre of the city is fragmented and therefore it had been put forward as a serial nomination, which might not necessarily have been the best solution. However, in order to make it possible for the State Party to try a different approach, under the guidance of the Advisory Body, the delegation could go along with the Committee's consensus proposal to defer. It encouraged the State Party to enhance cooperation between the Ministries of Municipal and Rural Affairs, the Higher City of Planning of Jordan, and As-Salt Greater Municipality.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** noted that As-Salt Eclectic Architecture was inserted on the Tentative List by the State Party in 2015 as an historical city. However, the current nomination was presented as a nomination of eclectic architecture. It was noted that ICOMOS had assessed the property based on the city instead of its eclectic architecture, and that it had considered this property as not having met the OUV. However, it also noted that ICOMOS in its report acknowledged that As-Salt had inherited a diverse legacy of styles and types of domestic buildings, construction techniques, stonemasonry and handicraft skills dating to different historical periods together with more modern elements, such as the metal I-beam, sawed timber and industrialized tiles. This signified a cultural interchange within the Levant, the Ottoman Empire and Europe. Therefore, the delegation viewed the property as reflecting a mixed culture between the architectural sector, local materials and eclectic styles, and was thus considered a shared heritage of various nations of the Middle East and Europe and the result of acculturation among nations. In the midst of the many contradictions that exist today, the property demonstrated the importance of coexistence and harmony. The delegation was of the view that this perspective needed to be emphasized so that the OUV might be justified. Indonesia proposed to give Jordan the chance to improve this nomination with the assistance of the Advisory Body and it therefore supported the amendment put forth by Turkey and other Committee Members.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** apprécie le rapport d'évaluation de l'ICOMOS, félicite la Jordanie pour ses efforts de conservation de ce bien, soutient l'amendement différé de ce dossier et encourage l'État partie à consolider ce dossier pour l'inscription à l'avenir.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** congratulated Jordan for bringing this property before the Committee and it appreciated the comments made by the Advisory Body, which noted that the property had authenticity and potential OUV. It therefore accepted that the State Party needed to conduct further work on the nomination with the assistance of the Advisory Body, particularly in redefining the criteria, modifying the boundaries and further refining and demonstrating the OUV. In view of this, Zimbabwe supported the revised draft decision proposed by Turkey and other Members to defer the nomination to enable Jordan to work further on the dossier. It also commended the State Party for taking this position.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** remarque que l'architecture éclectique d'As-Salt, est la synthèse d'échanges commerciaux et ethnoculturels multiples pendant l'ère ottomane et comprend que l'État partie, conscient de sa valeur, lui a donné un grand intérêt. Cet intérêt se révèle à travers globalement un bon état de conservation des 22 maisons objets du bien, sauvegardant ainsi en gros son intégrité, mais aussi son authenticité, pour autant que l'on veuille bien considérer les formes architecturales, les styles, les éléments décoratifs et le matériau en tant que tels. La délégation est sûrs que l'État partie veillera dans le futur à en

faire bon usage et pense par conséquent qu'il n'y a pas lieu de s'inquiéter, comme le laisse entendre l'ICOMOS. En outre, la Tunisie relève que les délimitations, la protection, la conservation et le suivi sont globalement appropriés, ce qui augure de très bonnes dispositions de l'État partie à approfondir certains volets, notamment l'analyse comparative, et celui d'approfondir la VUE. C'est pour cette raison que la délégation tunisienne appuie la proposition de différer l'examen de son inscription et termine en remerciant et félicitant l'État partie pour l'effort et sa bonne volonté de vouloir étoffer le dossier.

The **Delegation of Cuba** wished to underscore the point made by Lebanon and supported by the Philippines, Portugal, Finland and Indonesia in that this was a new nomination that arose on the basis of the updating of the Tentative List. Logically, it was therefore a serial nomination, and it supported the proposal to defer the nomination.

The **Delegation of Poland** supported the amendment in the draft decision, adding that it recognized the property as an interesting, unique and eclectic urban space influenced by an architectural style emanating from different regions and cultures. It observed the potential of OUV of the site on the condition of actual limited development. The delegation congratulated the State Party for preparing this nomination, encouraging it to take into account and implement the recommendations of the Advisory Body that would improve the file.

The **Delegation of Republic of Tanzania** supported the proposal to defer the nomination of the property, which would enable the State Party to elaborate on the justification of the OUV, especially by broadening the comparative analysis to encompass other similar historic towns and heritage sites within the Ottoman sphere of influence. Further, it commended the efforts of the State Party for the plans initiated for the conservation management of this heritage, as highlighted in the ICOMOS evaluation. In light of the above, it supported the proposal to defer the nomination of this property, as proposed by Turkey.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** félicite également la Jordanie pour les efforts et le travail complémentaires qui ont été menés pour la proposition d'inscription du site d'As-Salt. Elle note que le panel d'ICOMOS a considéré que les éléments manquent pour justifier les critères (ii) et (iii) permettant de reconnaître une valeur universelle du bien. La délégation pense que l'authenticité et l'intégrité du bien, bien que vulnérables comme l'a indiqué l'ICOMOS, existent, mais avec un peu plus de temps certainement l'État partie pourrait bénéficier de toute l'assistance requise pour améliorer le dossier. C'est dans cette approche d'amélioration que la délégation soutient la proposition d'amendement qui a été faite par la Turquie pour différer l'inscription du bien.

The **Delegation of Croatia** was adamant that the As-Salt Eclectic Architecture would add value to the diversity of World Heritage once the additional work was carried out. It congratulated the State Party for its excellent work, as well as ICOMOS for the fruitful dialogue. The delegation joined the previous speakers in supporting the draft amendment.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked ICOMOS for its hard work, adding that in this case it supported the State Party because the property – in this style of architecture – could also be evaluated for its artistic merits and not only from an architectural point of view. It fully agreed with the remarks by Portugal that the nomination should be deferred, and fully supported the amendment by Turkey that the criteria should be redefined.

The **Delegation of Peru** noted that the general agreement on ICOMOS' evaluation and the explanations provided by the State Party all pointed to very specific aspects in that the OUV of the property had not been proven in the file, so therefore criteria (ii) and (iii) must be reconsidered. From ICOMOS's point of view, there were some problems with the authenticity and integrity of the property. The delegation concluded that all could agree with certain nuances on the conclusions by ICOMOS, but the divergences appeared to be in the recommendations. The delegation had the impression that the Committee tended to clearly favour the amendment by which Jordan – in cooperation with ICOMOS – be given the opportunity to redraft the file to provide more solid justification for the OUV. It was nevertheless noted that all the Members recognized that the property had potential for OUV.

However, the State Party should perhaps redefine the criteria and then provide justification based on the authenticity and integrity of the property. It was in that context that Peru agreed with the Committee to support the draft amendment by Turkey.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended the State Party for its efforts in presenting this nomination, and the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Body for their reports and recommendations. Although the World Heritage and ICOMOS recognized As-Salt's national importance, the site as presented in the nomination was not regarded as meeting the requirements of OUV. Jamaica supported the amended draft decision with the understanding that the components added were adhered to in the shortest timeframe possible, including refining the criteria to demonstrate how this architectural heritage was important or exceptional among other historic cities, as well as modifying the boundaries of the property.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** thanked all the Committee Members who spoke on this issue and made many useful and informative points moving forward, as well as the delegation of Jordan for the useful and serious exchanges that took place during the present session in Krakow. The Representative assured the Committee that ICOMOS was quite capable of shifting its orientation between the focus on the historic city centre of settlement and the eclectic architectural arguments put forward, adding that both directions had been looked into in depth, and it would continue to do so in cooperation with the State Party, as requested. With regard to the amended draft decision, and with the Committee's permission, ICOMOS wished to suggest one very minor amendment relating to paragraph 2.d) where it asked for further work on how such architecture could be both eclectic and indigenous at the same time, which was one key area of difference between the ICOMOS Panel and the State Party. It wondered whether this might be a little too specific and constraining to discussions in the future with the State Party about the further development of this file, as it suggested one possibility of orientation, whereas the Committee might like to leave the State Party with other options.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party of Jordan to respond.

The **Delegation of Jordan** wished to see the suggestion made by ICOMOS in writing so that it could better understand what was being proposed and so that it might give its response. On behalf of the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the delegation expressed sincere thanks and deep gratitude to the Committee for its continued support and efforts to safeguard cultural and natural heritage for the benefit of humankind. It reiterated Jordan's firm commitment to safeguarding its heritage, both tangible and intangible, and to serve as a driver of cultural and socio-economic development, peace and stability. In view of this, the delegation reaffirmed the reasons behind the decision of Jordan to seek the Committee's approval for the deferral of As-Salt Eclectic Architecture nomination aimed at a future inscription on the World Heritage List. The delegation explained that the story of the eclectic architecture of As-Salt is unique in the Arab region if one considers the movement led by the Nablus stonemasters as it shaped the image of As-Salt as it is known today. Its future inscription shall shed light on the pivotal period in the history of this city, giving insights into its heritage while creating virtuous academic and professional ties between Jordan and its neighboring countries. The authenticity of As-Salt architectural heritage is unaffected and undisputable, as acknowledged by ICOMOS in its evaluation. Jordan today has five sites listed on the World Heritage List. None of them is part of a living city. In this way, the nomination of As-Salt Eclectic Architecture is significant in displaying architectural heritage within a living historical urban landscape and would thus play a strategic role to convey the message of heritage preservation to younger generations. Finally, in its work of heritage preservation and conservation, Jordan was keen to send out a message of peace and harmony to the world, and the As-Salt nomination was no exception. Today, As-Salt is shown to be a unique model of religious harmony in a city that exists in a volatile region that is witnessing sectarian, ethnic-religious conflicts with all the negative impacts we are seeing on many heritage and archaeological sites. In light of the above, Jordan was pleased to continue the work on the nomination of the As-Salt file through a deferral in order to

nominate it for inscription in a future Committee session.

The **Chairperson** remarked that all the interventions had led to a better understanding of the wealth of this heritage.

The **Delegation of Turkey** appreciated the recommendation by ICOMOS with regard to paragraph 2.d), adding that the Committee should provide the State Party with more room for further improvements and thus not limit the explanation in the file. Thus, it proposed to delete the part after 'modernization', if that was acceptable to the co-sponsors.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment in paragraph 2 from Turkey, Kuwait, Lebanon, Tunisia, Portugal, Croatia and Kazakhstan. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified and would start with, 'Defers the examination of the nomination of As-Salt Eclectic Architecture (1865-1925), Origins and Evolution of an Architectural Language in the Levant, Jordan, to the World Heritage List in order to allow the State Party, with the advice of the Advisory Body and the World Heritage Centre if requested, to: a) Develop a comparative analysis including similar properties in the Levant and in the area of influence of the Ottoman Empire, b) Redefine the criteria, in order to demonstrate what makes this architectural heritage important or exceptional among other historic cities in the region, as the cradle of a new amalgamated expression of different styles, c) Modify the boundaries of the nominated property, in order to be read as parts of a coherent whole, d) Further elaborate on the definition of the Outstanding Universal Value of this architectural heritage, in order to be considered an exceptional case in the process of modernisation'. Paragraph 3 had just been modified by Turkey and would read, 'Considers that any revised nomination would need to be considered by an expert mission to the site'. Paragraph 4 would read, 'Encourages the State Party to consider seeking ICOMOS' advice to address the above-mentioned recommendations'. The Rapporteur suggested in paragraph 2 to change 'Advisory Body' to 'ICOMOS' to remain consistent with the language used in the draft decisions.

The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraph 1 adopted.

The **Delegation of Portugal** referred to sub-paragraph 2.d) and the mention of 'eclectic', which was in the title of the property, and its indigenous character that had also been strongly underlined. Thus, it sought to keep the reference, 'and further demonstrates how such architecture could be both eclectic and indigenous at the same time'.

The **Delegation of Peru** appreciated the remarks by Portugal, however, by leaving the phrase in the sentence it would subordinate the existence of OUV in the future to proof that the architecture was both eclectic and indigenous, which would compromise the nomination from the outset. Hence, the delegation felt that it was better to leave the paragraph open-ended without any preconditions, as this would only make it difficult to prove OUV.

The **Delegation of Finland** noted that it had been credited as co-sponsor of the French version of the draft decision when it hadn't contributed to the text and sought its deletion.

The **Delegation of Turkey** recalled that the recommendation [in 2.d)] had come from ICOMOS. In addition to being respectful of ICOMOS' expertise, it also supported the State Party in its further analysis and reformulation of the nomination in the future, and hence its deletion.

La **Délégation du Liban** veut intervenir sur la question de comment cette architecture peut être à la fois éclectique et indigène. Lorsqu'elle propose de supprimer le dossier, cela entend qu'il faut retravailler sur l'ensemble de la conception de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle (VUE) du bien. Il est possible qu'en retravaillant l'ensemble de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, on ne parle plus d'éclectique, on ne parle plus d'indigène, et que ça soit tout à fait une autre façon d'aborder le problème de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Dans ces conditions, elle rejoint la Turquie et le Pérou pour supprimer la dernière partie du

programme, parce qu'il est tout à fait possible que le nouveau dossier supprime complètement ces notions-là et se base sur tout à fait autre chose.

The **Delegation of Portugal** recognized the arguments put forward and accepted the deletion.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.13 adopted as amended.

Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour (United Arab Emirates)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.14](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination from the United Arab Emirates, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation that Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** remarked that the pace of transformation in the Gulf and the phenomena of organization, stretching continuously from the vernacular to the modern that starts from the late 1940s until today's contemporary planning and architecture, is a unique case that calls for careful consideration and thematic studies to be conducted, as well as more sympathetic comprehension to analyze the added value that the Gulf region could contribute to World Heritage globally. It was important to note that the sudden boom of urbanization was not after all too sudden in that cosmopolitan society and modern façades were preceded by communities that settled around harbours, and Khor Dubai was today one of the most intact, authentic and alive harbours of the Gulf region. From a regional perspective, the delegation considered that Khor Dubai was preserved to a remarkable degree. Its traditional relationship with the Creek and the original spatial relationship of its historic neighbourhoods marked its banks and harbour infrastructure. This nomination was said to be tightly linked to the sustainability of activities that were intimately connected to trade. While the ICOMOS 2017 report again questioned the impact of dredging of the Khor on the integrity of the property, as well as the narrowing of the natural Creek as a result of land reclamation and road construction, the delegation found that the Advisory Mission also underlined in the report that dredging should be considered a normal maintenance activity necessary for the Creek to exist and to maintain trade activities and marine functions. It therefore considered this nomination to demonstrate both the relevance and the continuity of traditional commerce in Dubai Creek, and the material persistence of a cultural tradition based on the morphological ensemble of the Creek, the quays and the souks. Therefore, the delegation supported the inscription of Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour on the World Heritage List. The amendment proposed, together with other Committee Members, expressed the belief that this nomination did not deserve the status of non-inscription.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** listened attentively to ICOMOS' report on the new Khor Dubai nomination and noted that its final recommendation reiterated the comments made on the earlier 2014 nomination. Indeed, in 2014, the Committee had the opportunity to visit the site and to appreciate the incredible vitality of the traditional commercial harbour of Khor Dubai, in which an unexpected Dubai was discovered with a distinct character in the harbour and a commercial function that had not been fully acknowledged by the expert analysis. ICOMOS' comments in the Evaluation Report mentioned that the new port facilities of Jebel Ali, Port Rashid and the Dubai Maritime City allowed Dubai Harbour to function at a much reduced scale. In the same paragraph (on page 81), the report mentioned that as a result of

land reclamations, new infrastructure, and the demolition of the housing development, the link between the Creek and its market had been obscured. In this regard, the delegation requested the State Party to comment on the observations made by ICOMOS.

The **Delegation of Finland** recalled that this nomination had been evaluated and presented to the Committee during its 38th session in Doha, which had a recommendation of non-inscription. The Committee, however, decided to give it a deferral and since then the State Party had put a lot of effort into the nomination file, all this to face another recommendation not to inscribe the property. It was noted that ICOMOS had been quite consistent in its assessment of the property, while the Committee had not. The delegation found the situation unfortunate in that the State Party had been given too much hope on the future of its nomination. Moreover, there was an interesting reflection by ICOMOS in the evaluation concerning trade port cities on the World Heritage List, which stated “it is striking that many of these cities apply very similar arguments to exceptionality including the influences of multicultural merchants on their urban structure and architecture”. Important harbour cities can indeed be categorized in many ways by location, setting, use and function, and so on, and Finland would be happy to see a thematic study of ports or harbours in the future.

Noting the long list of speakers, the **Chairperson** would continue after the lunch break.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** thanked the State Party for putting forward this property that was a uniquely active and thriving commercial hub. Undoubtedly, this is a significant property that pays testimony to a free trade cultural tradition. It recalled that the nomination was originally deferred and it noted the clear gaps in the analysis surrounding the present or revised nomination on the conditions of integrity and authenticity. ICOMOS felt that criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi), under which the property was nominated, were not adequately demonstrated. However, the delegation was of the view that criterion (iii) was indeed justified. Further, it noted that urban infrastructure development continued to be a major threat to the property. It is the view of the Advisory Body that several of the development projects would further alter the urban characteristics and setting of Khor Dubai. Although the delegation saw merits in the amended draft decision put forward by Kuwait and other States Parties, it asked how the Committee could reconcile with ICOMOS’ view that the nominated property, as quoted, “suffers from weaknesses that are difficult to overcome and do hinder its ability to project the history and use of the property and the important culture exchanges it promoted in a way that could be seen as exceptional”. The delegation thus wished to hear from both the Advisory Body and the State Party at this point.

The **Delegation of Croatia** appreciated the extensive comparative analysis proposed in the nomination that situated the Khor Dubai Traditional Harbour in the larger framework of port cities, and it considered Khor Dubai as likely one of the best preserved and most complete traditional ports dedicated to wooden boats at the global level. The delegation found it very interesting to see a traditional working port in the very heart of the modern metropolis. However, it sought to hear from the State about the role of the traditional souks in the nominated property, the goods sold on the market, and how they connected with the core and history of the mercantile past of Dubai.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** souhaite pointer une contradiction, ou plutôt une incompréhension, dans le rapport entre l’État partie et les instances qui le représentent d’un côté, et l’ICOMOS de l’autre. En effet, il y a trois ans, lors de sa session de Doha, le Comité du patrimoine mondial a demandé qu’une mission consultative de l’ICOMOS soit envoyée à Dubaï pour évaluer avec l’État partie s’il pouvait ou non présenter une nouvelle candidature d’inscription. Le rapport de la mission consultative d’octobre 2014 a établi clairement que le bien pouvait aspirer à faire prévaloir sa VUE sur la base du nouveau critère et de limites nouvelles. Dans son rapport suivant l’ICOMOS reconnaît que l’État partie, « a préparé un dossier très complet qui suit la plupart des recommandations faites par les missions consultatives d’octobre 2014 ». Néanmoins, l’ICOMOS continue de considérer que le site ne possède pas de VUE. La délégation s’est efforcée de comprendre ces deux positions

contradictoires, du moins en apparence, mais n'y est pas parvenu. Cela d'autant plus que l'État partie, depuis 2014, semble avoir entretenu avec l'ICOMOS des échanges réguliers sur ce site, dégagant une bonne ambiance de travail avec l'organisme consultatif qui aurait laissé entendre que le site possédait les attributs de la VUE et qu'il pouvait par conséquent proposer une candidature pour inscription. Pour autant, la délégation est aujourd'hui dans une situation de ne pas inscrire ce bien, ce que propose l'ICOMOS, comme s'il n'y avait pas eu d'échanges utiles et constructifs entre les deux parties. Il y aurait, à la lumière des discussions que nous avons eues avec les représentants de l'État partie, une contradiction entre le contenu des rapports de l'ICOMOS et ses conclusions. Si tel est le cas, et que la délégation se tienne non à la conclusion mais au contenu des rapports de l'ICOMOS, elle propose d'inscrire Khor Dubaï sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** understood that the State Party had worked extensively on this nomination and it recognized that the State Party had cooperated closely with ICOMOS through multiple channels, even utilizing upstream processes, for which it commended its dedication. However, considering ICOMOS' evaluation, it seemed that there were differences between the State Party and the Advisory Body regarding construction, and it sought to hear from the State Party on the matter of reconstruction in the Gulf region.

The **Chairperson** closed the discussion, inviting the Secretariat to present the side events.

The **Secretariat** presented the three side events taking place over the lunch period. The Natural World Heritage Analyses IUCN (UNEP-WCMC), Towards strengthened governance of the shared transboundary natural and cultural heritage of the Lake Ohrid Region, and ICCROM-ATHAR contribution to the conservation of World Heritage in the Arab region by ICCROM.

[Close of morning session]

SIXTH DAY – Saturday 8 July 2017

TWELFTH SESSION

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 8B [Continuation]: NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour (United Arab Emirates) [Continuation.]

The **Chairperson** continued with the discussion on Khor Dubai, inviting Portugal to take the floor.

The **Delegation of Portugal** recalled its comments at the 38th Committee session in which it recommended that the unique features of this property be considered and that the State Party be allowed to come back with a revised nomination in the future, this was supported by Germany, Finland, the Philippines and Malaysia, among others. The delegation stood by those comments and did not dispute the merits of this nomination, adding that it was a remarkable property and the authorities of Dubai and the State Party should be commended for the very professional and comprehensive way in which they prepared this dossier. The question at this stage, however, was solely one of method and precedent. In other words, by inscribing this property at the present session, the Committee would for the first time in the life of this Committee be taking the huge step of recommending an actual inscription from a recommendation of non-inscription. Other countries confronted by the same recommendation had opted for a more prudent approach, allowing themselves more time and wider latitude to strengthen their nominations. The delegation was thus concerned by the precedent that the Committee would be establishing, and thus the possibility and risk of opening up to future situations where the temptation would be to push through nominations without ensuring their indispensable consistency and careful preparation. The delegation cautioned the Committee to proceed carefully and prudently in this matter. It also wished to give the floor to the State Party so that it may clarify the reasons that justify this unprecedented procedure. ICOMOS should also be given an opportunity to comment on the same issue.

The **Chairperson** concurred that this was indeed a very unusual situation.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** acknowledged that Khor Dubai is an important step in the history of Dubai, displaying major growth and economic development in the region's history. Indonesia also learned that the State Party had collaborated with the Advisory Body to re-submit its dossier after its deferral decision in 2014. The State Party followed the recommendations of the Advisory Body and facilitated ICOMOS' site visit. The delegation also took note that despite these efforts, Khor Dubai had been recommended for non-inscription. Taking all the above into account, it believed that there might be differences in perception between the Advisory Body and the State Party in interpreting the value, authenticity and integrity of the property. In this regard, the delegation suggested that the State Party and the Advisory Body conduct further discussions in order to reach a common understanding in view of the re-examination of the dossier in 2018. The State Party should therefore be given the opportunity to prove the OUV of the nominated site.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that Khor Dubai is the core part of the city of Dubai in relation to urban trade and development, and functions as a unique harbour in an historical sense. Turkey examined the nomination dossier and Advisory Body's Report carefully and wished to hear more from the State Party regarding the reconstruction process and the urban development projects, and about their potential impacts to the nominated property.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that the Committee needed to arrive at a balance between the will of Member States and the experts' recommendations. It was noted

that the Committee had just praised Jordan for accepting to take the time needed to strengthen its nomination. The delegation recognized the potential of this nomination, but as stated by Jamaica and Portugal, as a matter of principle, it would not be wise to immediately move from a recommendation of non-inscription to inscription without first ensuring that a nomination met the minimum standard. The Committee should thus take a self-critical look at its own procedures.

The **Delegation of Peru** returned to the issue raised by Portugal concerning the overall appraisal of the Committee's working methodologies and proceedings when taking these important decisions. In compliance with the Operational Guidelines and as stipulated in the Convention and the Committee's working methods, these Advisory Bodies are given a period of time to study, assess and appraise sites to come up with recommendations to determine whether the OUV is met, bearing in mind all the various and different factors, such as management, authenticity and integrity. The delegation added that it was normal that the Committee makes a collective appraisal, and occasionally it decided to defer or refer back to the State Party when the nomination based on the Advisory Body's report recommended a more solid nomination. However, as noted by Portugal, the Committee was setting a precedent of moving directly from a recommendation of non-inscription to an inscription, which would imply that in as little as 20 or 30 minutes of discussions, the Committee was able to ascertain the OUV, authenticity and integrity of a site based on which it would pronounce its decision. The delegation believed that this called into question the Committee's procedural techniques and decision-making processes, and therefore it sought to hear more from the State and from ICOMOS before moving ahead with the decision.

The **Delegation of Poland** spoke of the important question raised by Portugal with regard to the principles of the Convention. It thus supported Portugal's remarks, but it also appreciated the great work and commitment of the State Party. The delegation recognized the values of the site, but to keep consistent with the sequence of steps, proposed to refer this inscription for better future conservation and management of the site.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked that the the historic city of Khor Dubai was a nucleus, the core of one of the biggest and most developed cities in the world, which made it difficult to preserve the historical part of a city. In this case, the State Party already clarified the boundaries of the property and the buffer zone. Thanks to the State Party in preserving the property, there were no serious problems with management, preservation, protection or monitoring. Nevertheless, conservation policies and maintenance were required to meet international standards, and the delegation hoped that urban and infrastructure development, which would increase visitor numbers, would not affect the preservation of the nominated property. The property has real OUV and it was hoped that the State Party would preserve the property for humanity and would consider ICOMOS's recommendation.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** invited the State Party to respond to the questions.

The **Delegation of United Arab Emirates** perfectly understood the explanations and positions expressed by the Committee, adding that when it put forward this nomination dossier it was based on a very deep-seated belief that the dossier had not in fact been subject to a balanced assessment. It was quite confident in the Committee's competence but naturally, it was human to make mistakes. The delegation felt that the dossier could actually have received a different recommendation, and if so it would have been easier to understand its rejection. Nevertheless, it understood all the endeavors undertaken by the Advisory Bodies, adding that it had discussed with ICOMOS the reasons why the United Arab Emirates was insisting on this particular property. ICOMOS had taken on board these observations, but the decision had already been taken and there was no way of deciding differently. Thus, the State Party chose to present it to the Committee, albeit with the recommendation not to inscribe. Through this proposed amendment, the State Party was in the Committee's hands, but the delegation hoped that the initial errors undertaken in the

assessment of the site could be overcome. [Different speaker] The delegation responded to the question about reconstruction posed by the Republic of Korea, explaining that following the comments by ICOMOS on the first nomination, the State Party had organized an international seminar on reconstruction in the Gulf region with the participation of the ICOMOS president and many international experts from different regions of the world. The seminar provided a very interesting opportunity for debate and permitted notably to underline the link between tangible and intangible values, and the importance of perception and the need to have the support from the local community for reconstruction plans. The seminar also confirmed that reconstruction of the palaces of Shindagha, including the former residence, was carried out in an exemplary manner through a participatory approach. For the Emiratis, these houses connected them with history and they considered them part of their heritage. The delegation was very surprised to hear for the first time from ICOMOS during this present session that the reconstruction of Shindagha was not based on scientific evidence. The ICOMOS 2017 evaluation did not state this, while the ICOMOS 2014 evaluation actually praised its technical quality and acknowledged that the reconstruction was based on serious preliminary work and research.

On the question on the port and infrastructure of Khor raised by Kazakhstan, the delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** further explained that the new harbour for different trades and boats did not create competition with the traditional harbour of Khor Dubai. On the contrary, in the past fifty years, Khor Dubai's traditional harbour continued to develop, thanks to the regular dredging of the Creek and the continuous upgrading of the harbour facilities for dhows provided by the Dubai Municipality and Port Authorities. There had been an incredible growth in the number of dhows entering the Creek in the past year, reaching 20,000 dhows in 2009 and 25,000 in 2011, more than 65 boats per day. Concerning the link between the Creek and the market, the delegation pointed out that the changes in the banks, souks buildings, housing above the souks, and so on, were typical elements and traditional characteristics of the emergent organization of the site. The function and symbolic relationship between the Creek and the historic souks had been entirely preserved, as noted by the ICOMOS Advisory Mission. The State Party considered that the Creek and its banks was a living place that naturally evolved with continuing trade in the same place and in a traditional way. In answer to the question of the souks raised by Croatia, the delegation replied that Dubai's traditional souks along the Creek continued to thrive, connecting global trade to the local economy. Their significance to World Heritage lies in this resilient accommodation of the global economy, restructuring technological change with a diverse population. From wooden dhows moored along the Creek, spices, food, cotton and hardware were still traded in the souks of Bur Dubai and Deira. Dubai's traditional souks constituted an extraordinary example of a living heritage, vital and active, which still provided a relevant share of income to Dubai's overall commercial balance. The souks and the harbour along the Dubai Creek demonstrate the network of international exchange typical of the lower Gulf and Dubai with shops, warehouses, boat building yards owned by Emirati, Arabs and other nations from neighbouring countries attracted by the city's unique political and physical environment.

The **Chairperson** was convinced that the State Party had made enormous efforts to improve the quality of the proposal, but there were still a number of issues that needed to be clarified. The Chairperson then invited ICOMOS to respond.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** wished to underline how ICOMOS reached its decisions, explaining that it has a panel of experts who consider each of the sites and the documentation provided, and was thus not solely based on the mission but also on many expert desk reviews. In considering a property, ICOMOS, first and foremost, considers whether the OUV put forward has been justified. As OUV is in some way cumulative, ICOMOS looks at how it applies to the whole property, not just individual factors or individual areas, to see whether the totality of the site adds up to something that has OUV and which is supported by attributes and a combination of physical evidence and associations. This

process was applied to Khor Dubai and the Creek. There may be some vulnerabilities in individual areas, which were highlighted and mentioned, but overall ICOMOS balanced whether the nominated area as a whole could reflect OUV. Regarding the justifications proposed by the State Party under the various criteria, ICOMOS explained that criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) were put forward. Under criterion (ii), the burden of the justification was in relation to the architectural aspects of Khor Dubai, which was said to reflect a synthesis of Arab, Persian and Indian traditions that have influenced the architectural and urban development of the city. Although these influences and traditions were well understood, the issue was whether there were a sufficient number of these remaining to justify that criterion. It was ICOMOS' view that the authentic remains reflecting such influences were too limited and too fragmented to be considered exceptional when looking at it in a regional and wider scale. Thus, it was a question of balance and whether there were still enough attributes to justify the values put forward. Under criterion (iii), this was justified by the State Party on the notion of the continuity of free trade, a tradition based on a permanent commercial organization that involves the ruler and the merchant community, as well as shipments. Free trade was thus the concept. ICOMOS had to identify how the structures in the Khor Dubai could be said to reflect that concept of free trade. ICOMOS' conclusion was that the architectural structures, the layout of the port, the former resident merchants' quarters, and all the other aspects of the port did not in a clear way resonant the idea of free trade sufficiently clearly to be able to justify that criterion. Criterion (vi) was put forward for the fact that Khor Dubai is tangibly associated with a set of political and economic principles that attracted leading merchants to settle in the city and establish the free port as it is known. Criterion (vi) had to be justified in connection with ideas that are of outstanding universal significance, and ICOMOS did not consider that the idea of free trade as applied in Dubai could be said to be an idea of outstanding universal significance. These were the sorts of issues that came up in the ICOMOS Panel discussions. ICOMOS appreciated the efforts put forward by the State Party to find OUV in this property, but it concluded that despite the extensive efforts, the tangible attributes and the intangible associations as a whole did not reflect in a coherent way what might be seen as OUV, and could not be seen to justify the criteria as proposed.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from the United Republic of Tanzania, Tunisia, Kazakhstan and Lebanon. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified, and would read, 'Inscribes Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour, United Arab Emirates, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (ii), (iii) and (iv)'. Paragraph 3 would read, 'Takes note of the following provisions implemented of Outstanding Universal Value'. Paragraph 4 would read, 'Commends the State Party and all stakeholders involved for their commitment to the protection and conservation of attributes of Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour'. Paragraph 5 would read, 'Recommends the State Party to a) focus on monitoring and management action on threats with a high potential impact in Outstanding Universal Value, b) Undertake further research and documentation on the traditional commercial attributes in Khor Dubai, c) Keep the World Heritage Committee updated about all modifications to the immediate setting of the nominated property that could impact on it, d) Implement the monitoring procedures presented in the nomination'.

The **Delegation of Portugal** noted that there were two different proposals in the room, one for a direct inscription, and the other one for a referral, and thus it would be useful to know which had the widest consensus. If the consensus went in the direction of a referral, then a totally different text would be required. The delegation therefore suggested suspending this item to allow perhaps ICOMOS, the State Party and some Members of the Committee to propose a revision in the sense of a referral, as there was no point discussing the present paragraphs if the position of the Committee was unclear on the basic premise.

The **Chairperson** concurred with the wise comment in that only five Members appeared to support inscription among the majority of the Members taking part in the discussion, which tended towards a referral. He recalled that inscription would be a big step from a

recommended non-inscription.

The **Delegation of Peru** agreed with Portugal that there were clearly two different opinions at play. However, the Committee was not necessarily in a position to make a judgment about hypothetical votes on the basis of opinions that appeared contradictory. Having heard the explanations from the State Party, the delegation surmised that there was a clear vision that would allow Members to work towards a constructive consensus. The delegation therefore suggested suspending the item for consultations with ICOMOS and the State Party, after which the Committee would propose a solution that would allow the State Party to have enough time to re-work or perfect its nomination with the help of the Advisory Bodies, and thus arrive at an alternative form of consensus before anything is put to a vote.

The **Delegation of Portugal** fully agreed with Peru, adding that it was not an issue of knowing the for and against positions, as all believed that ICOMOS and the State Party working together was the best way forward. The delegation suggested that one of the co-sponsors of the original amendment could present the revised amendment once it is ready.

The **Chairperson** moved to suspend this item, and proposed a small drafting group comprising the State Party, ICOMOS, Kuwait and Portugal.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** accepted to participate, as it was an important issue for Kuwait, and it thanked Portugal and Peru for their proposals. Nevertheless, the port of Khor Dubai was clearly a part of trade and creation, and a gateway between the different regions with more than 200 nationalities living in Dubai with their many different forms of cultural expression. The delegation therefore considered the property as very important to UNESCO and it was convinced that the United Arab Emirates would put forward a good file.

The **Chairperson** was convinced of the significance of Khor Dubai but that the credibility of the Committee was also at stake. The item was suspended to allow the small drafting group to come back to this item later in the session.

ASIA-PACIFIC

Temple Zone of Sambor Prei Kuk, Archaeological Site of Ancient Ishanapura (Cambodia)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.15](#)

The **Chairperson** then turned to the next item on Sambor Prei Kuk, Archaeological Site representing the cultural landscape of ancient Ishanapura.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation that the examination of the nomination of Sambor Prei Kuk be deferred.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** tient à féliciter l'ICOMOS pour son évaluation très approfondie et souhaite féliciter les efforts inlassables du Cambodge pour la conservation de Sambor Prei Kuk, site archéologique de l'ancienne Ishanapura, et pour la nomination de ce site merveilleux. La délégation se rappelle des deux options suggérées par l'ICOMOS. Si l'on veut faire inscrire la cité de Sambor Prei Kuk dans son ensemble, il s'impose d'entreprendre des fouilles et des recherches pour étoffer la documentation et justifier la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de cette cité. Mais il est possible de limiter la proposition d'inscription à la zone des temples seule, or pour cette zone des temples l'ICOMOS considère que les conditions d'intégrité et authenticité sont appropriées. La protection légale et les mesures de protection ainsi que le plan de conservation et les actions du plan de gestion sont également

appropriées. Autant dire que la zone des temples du site Sambor Prei Kuk remplit les conditions pour être inscrite sur la Liste. Le Cambodge a grandement apprécié les arguments de l'ICOMOS et les suit. Il opte ainsi pour la proposition de limiter l'inscription à la zone des temples seule. En cela il adopte la recommandation de l'ICOMOS qui conseille de retarder les fouilles jusqu'à ce que tous les temples debout soient sécurisés et de conserver les moyens disponibles à la protection et la conservation. Le Cambodge s'est aussi déclaré prêt à coopérer étroitement avec l'ICOMOS et à suivre toutes les recommandations de l'ICOMOS. Il est également tenu de fournir, d'ici le 1^{er} décembre 2017, une nouvelle carte des limites du bien et, d'ici le 1^{er} décembre 2018, un rapport sur la mise en œuvre des recommandations. En fait, le Cambodge a informé que les limites du bien ont été indiquées par le décret royal et la carte est en phase finale de préparation. Sur la base des analyses et recommandations de l'ICOMOS et des engagements du Cambodge, et en concertation avec plusieurs pays, la délégation du Viet Nam a l'honneur de proposer au Comité l'amendement du projet de décision pour l'inscription sur la Liste de la zone des temples seule sur la base des critères (ii), (iii) et (vi), et d'intégrer dans le nouveau projet de décision toutes les recommandations faites par l'ICOMOS.

La **Délégation du Portugal** remarque sa sympathie pour les propos de la délégation du Viet Nam, mais désire tout de même attendre la réponse du Cambodge s'il accepte la séparation telle qu'envisagée par l'ICOMOS avant de se prononcer. La délégation remarque qu'en fonction de la réponse du Cambodge beaucoup de questions théoriques restent présentes.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** noted with satisfaction the property proposed for inscription as it was indeed a significant archaeological site whose architectural origins and history date back as far as the 6th and 7th centuries. It was remarkable that the temples had demonstrated origins from the Indian subcontinent that were still practising the religious concept dating back to the early periods. It was noted that the nomination of the property was being made on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi). In the opinion of the Advisory Body, the nomination could not be inscribed at this session because the State Party would still need to support justification of the total property's OUV. Zimbabwe understood that the State Party had responded to suggestions by the Advisory Body that the area targeted for inscription be limited to the temple zone. The delegation was of the understanding that the State Party agreed to this recommendation that was addressed in the amended decision, which it supported, urging Cambodia to take into account the recommendations made by ICOMOS and to work closely with ICOMOS in addressing some of the issues raised. Zimbabwe looked forward to considering other elements of the larger property at a later date.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** welcomed the endeavors undertaken in the preparation of this nomination concerning the archaeological site of Sambor Prei Kuk with a view to inscribing it on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iii) and (v). The delegation noted that this site had met the originality and authenticity criteria, as well as having all the safeguarding measures in place for the site. Endeavors had also been deployed to protect the site, and the delegation wished to see it inscribed on the World Heritage List, keeping in mind the recommendations in the draft decision.

La **Délégation du Liban** soutient la proposition du Viet Nam, à condition d'entendre la position de l'État partie sur la proposition initiale de l'ICOMOS.

The **Delegation of Poland** had no doubts regarding the OUV of the nominated site, and thus supported the proposal by Viet Nam to inscribe part of the temple zone of Sambor Prei Kuk on the World Heritage List at this session. At the same time, it proposed to leave for further consideration by the State Party the possibility of the future extension once the wider property has been studied, documented and assessed in a proper way. The delegation wished to hear from the State Party.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** défend le dossier pour le proposer à l'inscription en se fondant sur l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS. En effet, cet organe consultatif considère que l'analyse

comparative est très positive, que les conditions d'intégrité et d'authenticité sont appropriées, s'agissant de la zone des temples, pour laquelle les critères (ii), (iii) et (xi) sont justifiés. Ajoutant à cela que les mesures de protection sont appropriées aussi, de même que la gestion, sauf peut-être quelque peu le traitement du tourisme. Autrement dit, les conditions nécessaires à l'inscription sont assurées pour la zone des temples. Cette zone des temples est la seconde proposition de l'ICOMOS que l'État partie a fini par choisir plutôt que ce soit la cité dans son ensemble. C'est pourquoi la délégation propose d'inscrire le bien plutôt que de différer cette décision, d'autant plus que le site est menacé par les activités de la population rurale avoisinante qui cherche à s'y fixer. Par conséquent, inscrire le bien au patrimoine mondial empêcherait ces menaces de porter atteinte au bien. C'est pourquoi la Tunisie souscrit à la proposition d'inscrire le bien au cours de cette session.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked that according to ICOMOS' evaluation, the comparative analysis of this property justified its consideration to the World Heritage List. The conditions of the integrity and the authenticity of the temple zone were adequate, while the property as a whole could meet criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi) for the temple zone alone, and legal protection was also in place as well as the protective measures for the property. The conservation plan was deemed adequate, and all actions of the management plan were adequate, except in the treatment of tourism. Thus, it was evident that this property, namely the temple zone, deserved to be inscribed on the List and it supported the idea of limiting the nomination to the temple zone alone. It encouraged the State Party to consider extending the nominated property once the wider property had been better studied, documented and assessed, and it also encouraged the State Party to work closely with ICOMOS to identify the attributes of the potential OUV in relation to the boundaries of the nominated property. It therefore supported the draft amendment by Viet Nam.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** noted that the ancient capital of the Chenla Empire, which Sambor Prei Kuk is believed to be part, was well known for its mixed complex planning, giving the world its unique iconography, the Sambor Prei Kuk style that might be the oldest consolidation of the Khmer artistic style. It is the place where octagonal temples were first built in the wider region, and it is valued also for making Khmer a universal language, attracting diplomatic missions and leading to the establishment of the Angkor Empire. As suggested in the ICOMOS report, the nominated temple zones met the proposed criteria, and legal protection and conservation was adequate with the boundaries corresponding to the functions. It was noteworthy that the nomination was prepared with international assistance from the World Heritage Fund. The delegation thus supported Sambor Prei Kuk to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that among the cultural nominations [in 2017] with a recommended deferral from ICOMOS, this was the strongest nomination. The comparative analysis was good despite some weaknesses, but the integrity of the whole nominated property was difficult to analyse and would therefore require more work. Nevertheless, the integrity and authenticity of the temple zone alone was established, even if not for the surrounding ancient city, and the entire site could at a later date fulfil the two criteria. For the temple zone, all the requirements were in place, whereas the ancient city would need more archaeological and historical work to be justified for an inscription. ICOMOS provided two alternatives in order to proceed with the nomination, and a strong will among the Committee Members to inscribe the temple zone on the List at this session was noted. However, Finland was concerned that if the Committee was to go ahead and inscribe the temple zone, the surrounding ancient city site might not be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The State Party had however assured the Committee that the work would continue in order to also include the ancient city in the property in the future.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** thanked ICOMOS for its report and the valuable recommendations given to the State Party, particularly the division of the property and the concession of the temple zone only. The temple zone has 105 temples and covers the surface area of 570 hectares. It commended the State Party for demonstrating a strong

commitment to carry out ICOMOS' recommendations, and it would go in line with the nomination of the temple zone alone, but would definitely be guided by ICOMOS, particularly on the possibility of inscribing the temple zone with a later extension of the site. The delegation requested that the State Party be allowed to speak to ask about the possibility of moving ahead with this separation.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** concurred with the Advisory Body's view that the property holds certain uniqueness with regard to the complexity of the city planning with its elaborate hydraulic engineering works, religious roots from India, and the development of Sambor Prei Kuk's art style that was the basis for the later development of Angkor Wat. The delegation agreed that the property signified an important state in the history of state formation in Southeast Asia, and was of the view that this property had a high possibility to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Indonesia took note of the Advisory Body's evaluation that a management plan was needed in order to be able to meet the conservation challenges faced by the property. In this regard, it encouraged the State Party to continue its close consultation with the Secretariat and the Advisory Body, and to consider extending the boundary of the property in the future. The delegation supported the draft amendment submitted by Viet Nam.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that Cambodia's nomination dossier for Sambor Prei Kuk presented the archaeological site as an urban system consisting of a settlement area developed under Indian influence, a religious centre featuring the unique octagonal temples fitting the descriptions of ancient Indian manuals of architecture, evidenced in India itself, and a water management system possibly connected to a now lost harbour. The sculptural decorations also depicted so-called flying palaces, medallions with mythical scenes and decorated architectural elements, which constituted the complementary stylistic aspects of the early Khmer religious architecture uniquely developed and preserved at Sambor Prei Kuk. Turkey commended the State Party's initial effort to nominate these three complementary areas as a single ensemble despite differences in the state of knowledge on each, and the respective states of preservation and management. On the other hand, documents provided by the State Party and the Advisory Body reports revealed the possibility of inscribing the temple zone alone at this stage and extending the property later on the basis of better studies, documentation and assessment of the adjacent areas. The delegation hoped that the landscape elements, such as the causeways and canals from which result this very geometrical definition of the property, would enable a clear demarcation of the boundary of this narrower area in response to a major criticism from the Advisory Body on the property's boundaries. The delegation also wished to hear from the Advisory Body on this aspect of the new proposal, and it trusted that the State Party's commitment would continue to respond in the shortest possible time to the remaining Advisory Body recommendations on improvements on the conservation, management and tourism accommodation plans, all of which should be retained in the final Committee decision on this nomination. The delegation therefore supported the inscription of the temple zone of Sambor Prei Kuk under criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi).

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** supported the amendment to inscribe the temple zone of Sambor Prei Kuk on the World Heritage List. The site was originally nominated as a cultural landscape with serial components, but as pointed out by the Advisory Body, the temple zone alone demonstrated ample values. The delegation hoped that the property could be extended in the near future after further research, documentation and assessment on the wider area of the property. In this regard, once the property is inscribed, the delegation suggested that the State Party submit a revised management plan reflecting the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre so as to assure the completeness and integrity of the modified boundaries.

The **Delegation of Peru** did not wish to repeat all the different elements from ICOMOS' evaluation nor all the reasons why the temples were apt for inscription. However, before moving ahead with the inscription, the delegation wished to hear from the State Party.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that ICOMOS had found adequate the conditions of the integrity and authenticity of the boundaries, buffer zone, legal protection and protected measures of the property, as well as the conservation plan of the temple zone. However, it recommended to propose a nomination of the temple zone alone, as it justified the proposed criteria, and then consider extending the nominated property once the wider property had been suitably documented and assessed. The Philippines agreed that the temple area of the nomination met criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi), and it supported the amendment for its inscription.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended the State Party on the submission of this nomination. Based on ICOMOS' recommendation, the nomination file was more justifiable when focused on the temple zone instead of the entire ancient city. It was noted that the State Party had taken on board ICOMOS' recommendations to focus the nomination on the temple zone, which would now adequately support criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi), as indicated in the amended draft decision. The delegation urged the State Party to focus its attention on such critical areas as the conservation manual and revision of the tourism management plan, which required a more dynamic and efficient approach to include carrying capacities. It also welcomed hearing from the State Party.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that it would have preferred to take the floor after having heard from the State Party, even though it seemed that there was a consensus already in the Committee to go ahead with the temple zone inscribed as World Heritage, which it would be happy to see. The delegation added that inscription would offer greater protection to the area, with the possibility of including the ancient city and the remainder of the site at a later date.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Cambodia to respond to the questions.

La **Délégation du Cambodge**, prenant la parole pour la première fois, rend hommage aux autorités de Pologne ainsi qu'à la ville de Cracovie, pour le remarquable accueil qu'elles lui ont réservé et félicite le Président du Comité de sa sagesse qui assure le bon déroulement de cette 41^e session. À la suggestion et recommandation des représentants des États membres du Comité, elle insiste que le Cambodge a choisi de suivre l'avis de l'ICOMOS dans ses recommandations ainsi que les États membres du Comité pour le choix de la zone des temples à inscrire dans un premier temps, et prend note de l'extension à l'avenir des zones adjacentes. Elle remarque aussi qu'elle va suivre la recommandation de travailler étroitement avec l'ICOMOS pour que les moyens financiers et les ressources humaines que le Gouvernement royal du Cambodge accordera à l'autorité nationale gestionnaire du site de Sambor Prei Kuk soient consacrés à la protection et à la conservation des monuments de la zone des temples. Il s'agit là d'un engagement ferme de la part du Ministère de la culture et des beaux-arts, que le délégué a l'honneur de diriger. Il précise que le suivi de la recommandation de l'ICOMOS sur les temples sera assuré par le secrétaire général de l'ICOMOS au Cambodge, M. Pranadi, qui est en même temps le directeur général national de Sambor Prei Kuk, établissement public créé pour gérer ce bien.

La **Délégation du Portugal**, après avoir écouté l'État partie, est convaincu de l'engagement ferme du Cambodge pour aller à la rencontre des questions suscitées par l'ICOMOS l'encourage à poursuivre les efforts dans le sens de l'élargissement de la propriété. Pour ces raisons, le Portugal se rallie à la position de ceux qui ont défendu l'inscription du bien pendant cette séance du Comité.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Viet Nam, Tunisia, Kuwait, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Finland and Poland. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified and would now read, 'Inscribes the Temple Zone of Sambor Prei Kuk, Archaeological Site of Ancient Ishanapura, Cambodia, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi)'. The second part of paragraph 2 had a sub-paragraph a) with two options, the first option in 2.a) was deleted. Sub-paragraphs 2.b) –2.e) were deleted.

Paragraph 3 was deleted and replaced with a new proposal, which would read, 'Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value'. The English translation was not yet available, but would be proposed later. Paragraph 4 was also amended, and would read, 'Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by December 2017, an updated map of the boundaries of the inscribed property and the buffer zone'. A new paragraph 5 would read, 'Recommends the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to: a) Identify more clearly the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value with regards to the boundaries of the temples zone and the buffer zone, b) Augment the Conservation Plan with a conservation manual to set out the parameters within which conservation is carried out and develop details of necessary resources to address the urgent conservation of the temple buildings that are in danger of collapse, c) Refine the Management Plan by addressing more effectively the need for a Risk Response and Management Plan and by identifying adequate resources for all planned actions, d) Revise the Tourism Management Plan by using a more dynamic and efficient approach that includes weather conditions, seasonal industry variations and monument conditions and their carrying capacities. Part 4.e) was taken from the original paragraph 2. A new paragraph 6 was added, which would read, 'Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by December 2018, a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019'. Original paragraph 5 would become 7.

The **Delegation of Poland** wished to place paragraph 6 as the last paragraph 7, and would thus start with, 'Further recommends the State Party [...]'.

The **Chairperson** suggested that ICOMOS take the floor to explain the key paragraph 4 on the matter of borders.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** explained that the boundaries of the temple zone were defined by Royal Decree and ICOMOS wondered whether the boundaries suggested by the State Party were likely to follow those boundaries. With regard to the buffer zone, ICOMOS suggested to add an extra paragraph to encourage the State Party to continue with its research to further a future nomination of the wider city area, and in order to ensure that the wider area and its buffer zone are protected in the meantime. ICOMOS also asked that consideration be given to the buffer zone of the temple area to coincide with the buffer zone proposed in the nomination. With regard to the issue of tourism, which was considered quite urgent, the Representative explained that ICOMOS had based its recommendations on a later nomination, and as the temple zone is near the main road, the newly inscribed World Heritage Site would likely receive more visitors. As a result, ICOMOS placed stress on the timeframe, adding that the conclusion of a tourism management plan was required and that additional advice could be provided by the good tourism team at Angkor Wat who could offer support.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted.

The **Representative of ICOMOS**, referring to paragraph 4 where the State Party is requested to submit a new map with new boundaries, ICOMOS wished to know how and when those boundaries would be assessed.

The **Chairperson** returned to paragraphs 2 and 3, which were duly adopted.

The **Rapporteur** noted that ICOMOS had made a suggestion and asked that a proposal be brought into the draft decision.

The **Chairperson** noted that this referred to paragraph 4 on the issue of the boundaries.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that ICOMOS' recommendations were very soundly based and could be incorporated into paragraph 5.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** clarified that the only way for ICOMOS to assess the new

boundaries was through a mission, adding that it was unsure whether it could consider a new mission to the property once the new boundaries were submitted.

The **Chairperson** understood that this was the reason this item had not been initially proposed for inscription. However, it was noted that the vast majority of the Members were for inscription. Returning to the draft decision, paragraphs 4–7 were duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.15 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Cambodia on behalf of the entire Committee for the inscription of this property, and gave the floor to Cambodia.

La **Délégation du Cambodge** exprime, au nom du Gouvernement royal du Cambodge et de sa délégation, ses sincères remerciements, sa profonde appréciation et sa joie à la suite de la décision du Comité d'inscrire sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial la zone des temples du site archéologique de Sambor Prei Kuk. Elle tient à exprimer sa haute appréciation pour le travail remarquable d'analyse et d'évaluation mené par les experts de l'ICOMOS et évoque ses émotions quant à l'hommage émouvant qui a été rendu au regretté Vice-Premier Ministre, Samdech Vibol Panha Sok An. Ce dernier a été Président du Comité en 2013 et sa contribution à la défense du patrimoine restera inoubliable. Pour la délégation, aujourd'hui est un jour historique de plus, qui prend place dans l'histoire de son pays et de son peuple. Le Cambodge est un pays en voie de développement, mais il est riche par sa culture aussi bien tangible qu'intangible. Le Cambodge a deux biens inscrits sur la Liste : le célèbre Angkor, depuis 1992, et depuis 2008 l'autre joyau qui est le temple de Preah Vihear. La délégation est fière d'avoir été un membre actif du Comité du patrimoine mondial, qu'elle a accueilli à Phnom Penh en juillet 2013, à la 37^e session. Le Gouvernement royal du Cambodge s'est engagé à préserver et à protéger l'ensemble du patrimoine culturel de son pays, et spécifiquement les sites dotés du label du patrimoine mondial. De plus, la délégation rappelle que depuis un quart de siècle, elle a développé une grande expérience de la protection et de la gestion du patrimoine mondial avec Angkor. L'expérience d'Angkor profitera grandement au nouveau site de Sambor Prei Kuk. De plus, la délégation a une excellente relation avec les experts internationaux déjà présents à Angkor et en particulier avec l'ICOMOS. Elle est consciente qu'avec l'appui de la communauté internationale et du Centre du patrimoine mondial elle assurera la sauvegarde de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce site, et elle veillera à le faire respecter par les jeunes générations aussi bien au Cambodge qu'à travers le monde. Elle exprime sa profonde gratitude à tous les délégués de la 41^e session du Comité et les quatre meilleurs vœux du peuple du Cambodge de longévité, beauté, santé et énergie.

Kulangsu, a Historic International Settlement (China)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.16](#)

The **Chairperson** then turned to the next item on Kulangasu, a Historic International Settlement.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation that Kulangasu, a Historic International Settlement be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv).

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Koweït**, après avoir attentivement étudié le dossier, a été convaincu que la culture de Kulangsu ne connaît pas de frontières, parce qu'il s'agit d'un regroupement de

cultures locales d'Asie du Sud-Est et de cultures européennes, valorisé par la contribution des chinois d'outre-mer. C'est un point de rencontre entre l'Ouest et l'Est. L'État partie s'active depuis longtemps pour protéger son architecture historique. Ce qui distingue Kulangsu, c'est qu'il s'agit d'une création, d'un mélange, d'art, d'architecture et d'idées suite aux mouvements transfrontaliers de ses habitants. C'est un site qui mérite d'être inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** congratulated the State Party for the successful inscription of the Kulangasu, a Historic International Settlement. Kulangasu is an outstanding example of international settlement in Asia, exhibiting cultural exchanges in different architectural styles. It was noted that a great deal of effort had been made to establish protective measures, not only for the individual structures but also covering the complete Island and its attributes. It hoped that an effective way to control tourism pressure could be found.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** congratulated the State Party and commended the conservation of the property to successfully fulfil the OUV, as reported by ICOMOS. Indonesia trusted that China would continue working with ICOMOS to fully implement ICOMOS' recommendations that include controlling public access to the property, developing and implementing a seismic retrofitting plan for brick and stone historic buildings, and extending the focus of conservation measures that included the interior of the buildings. It also commended the comprehensive report by ICOMOS.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** congratulated the State Party for bringing this property to the Committee, adding that it fully supported the inscription of this site under criteria (ii) and (iv). It also congratulated the State Party for its work in preparing this dossier and the preparation in the conservation area that had already taken place. The delegation acknowledged the importance of the island in terms of its interactions between different cultures seen in the architectural mix of the island between the historical buildings and those of national character. The fusion of these different styles and architectural traditions produced the Amoy Deco Style that was clearly demonstrated and articulated by the Advisory Body. The delegation was pleased that the State Party had already started to make management arrangements, and it urged the State Party to implement the other recommendations made by ICOMOS, particularly related to visitor management and assessment systems and controls so as to protect the property's OUV.

The **Delegation of Portugal** was extremely glad to support the inscription of Kulangasu in the World Heritage List, adding that it was an excellent example of the spirit of the Convention on the benefits of dialogue and cultural exchange whose modern buildings were under-represented on the World Heritage List. It believed that recognizing and attesting the OUV of a property that integrated diverse cultural references was an exceptional testimony of the fusion of various stylistic influences that underlined how the integration of different cultural influences may give birth to a new and vibrant heritage and ultimately a new local architectural movement, in this case the Amoy Deco Style. The delegation congratulated China for this nomination, adding that diversity, inclusion and respect for others' cultures and tastes are at the core of UNESCO's principles, and this nomination perfectly aligned with those aims.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that Kulangasu is a unique, modern settlement representing diverse cultural traces with its historical fabric grounded in this period in the Asia Pacific region. The nominated property did not only reflect built heritage examples and an historic network of roads, but also natural landscape and historic gardens that represented an exceptional example of the cultural exchanges of Southeast Asia. The delegation felt confident that the well-know threats of typhoons and increasing tourism activity would be duly addressed by the State Party. There was also no doubt that the site had OUV, integrity and authenticity. These criteria were thus justified and it gladly supported the draft decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria

(ii) and (iv).

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** commended ICOMOS for the support, guidance and the foregoing concerns on the assessment of visitor controls, updating studies and research, control for the protection of OUV and the forecast on conservation measures. Tanzania supported the inscription of Kulangasu, a Historic International Settlement, China on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (vi).

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** supported the property to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Kulangasu is an Historic International Settlement, but also an important window for China's foreign exchanges in history. The property justified all the criteria on integrity and authenticity. It commended the work of ICOMOS and the State Party.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the State Party on the submission of the outstanding Kulangasu property, which represented a melting pot of cultures that had given rise to an inherent architectural style that influenced building design and construction across Asia. It encouraged the State Party to maintain the carrying capacity of the site, as recommended by ICOMOS, and the development of further conservation measures.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** expressed gratitude to ICOMOS for the comprehensive report and its mission to this site. It fully supported the recommendation to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List, and it congratulated China for the inscription of this property.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** congratulated the State Party for the inscription of Kulangasu to the World Heritage List, adding that the property was an outstanding and tangible testimony of Sino-foreign cultural exchanges during the turn of the 20th century. The Amoy Deco Style, a hybrid architectural style and typology that was heavily influenced by settlers exerted influences beyond China and throughout Southeast Asia, including the Philippines. It commended the State Party for its excellent efforts in conserving the property and it recognized the State Party's effective development controls of buildings, as well as the preservation of the natural scenery surrounding the settlement. However, the delegation urged the State Party to closely monitor visitor controls and effectively implement its tourism management strategy. It was noted that a huge part of the Philippine population hailed from the greater Fujian Province of China where Kulangasu is located. Hence, it was an honour to be part of the Committee that today inscribed the Island of Kulangasu on the List of World Heritage. As its urban scape is a confluence of several distinct cultures, the delegation was grateful to China for yet another exceptional dossier and for ensuring the continued conservation of this historic and highly syncretic settlement.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** congratulated China for its successful nomination and inscription of the exceptional site of Kulangasu, an example of the cultural fusion that emerged from the cultural and religious exchanges that remain visible in an organic, urban fabric over the decades of constantly integrating diverse cultural references. Kulangasu Island also represented architectural features and styles, and the interchange of Chinese Southeast Asian and European architectural and cultural values and traditions. Azerbaijan fully supported the site's inscription.

The **Delegation of Croatia** agreed with the congratulations of the Members and welcomed the inscription of this nomination. It was happy to see still under-represented types of monuments on the List and hoped that the whole island would help in the management process of protection.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** félicite l'État partie de la Chine pour la proposition d'inscription du site de Kulangsu sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. L'île de Kulangsu telle que présentée par l'ICOMOS traduit l'authenticité et l'intégrité d'un site dont la conservation constante a été assurée par la population locale ayant bénéficié d'un accompagnement des autorités. Ce caractère démontre la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, qui bénéficie quotidiennement d'un flux touristique de près de 35 000 visiteurs mais dont il faut mesurer et

maîtriser les impacts. Compte tenu des aspects énumérés, la délégation soutient la décision de l'ICOMOS d'inscrire l'île de Kulangsu sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that the site of Kulangasu was first and foremost a monument to living together and cultural diversity. It congratulated the State Party for proposing this site in an impeccable way, adding that the nomination contained all the prerequisites to be accepted. The delegation noted the correct interpretation by ICOMOS on the OUV of the property. Cuba firmly supported inscription of this site on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Poland** fully shared the view expressed by many Members that the historic international settlement in Kulangasu deserved inscription on the List, adding that there was no doubt that the property has OUV. It is an exceptional example of heritage, reflecting the nature of modern settlement and cultural exchange. The delegation congratulated China on its inscription.

The **Delegation of Peru** expressed congratulations to China for the presentation of this nomination, as well as gratitude to ICOMOS for the very serious analytic work performed in order to justify the OUV and the conditions of integrity and authenticity. It was noted that the entire Committee agreed with this nomination.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** remercie et félicite l'État partie d'avoir présenté ce site pour inscription au patrimoine mondial, et le remercie aussi pour la parfaite préparation du dossier en concertation avec l'ICOMOS. Un dossier qui est à la hauteur de cet extraordinaire site de Kulangsu, qui mérite parfaitement d'être inscrit au patrimoine mondial. Il est clair qu'il y a une unanimité de l'ensemble des membres du Comité pour qu'il figure sur cette Liste.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.16 adopted.

The **Delegation of China** thanked the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies for its recognition of the OUV of the International Settlement of Kulangasu and its conservation and management practices. The delegation was very pleased to see the property officially join the family of World Heritage sites. Comparing the great wealth of historic buildings and archaeological sites in China, Kulangasu is a young and unique property that bears witness to the process of modernization and multicultural exchanges and integration in the early stage of globalization that occurred in China. The property embodied the deep and solid roots of Chinese traditional culture that has in the meantime absorbed elements of diverse foreign cultures for common development. The values and cultural position that features inclusiveness, sharing and progressiveness, as demonstrated by the property, had enabled it to remain inspiring and dynamic today. The delegation highly appreciated the valuable recommendations on visitor management and risk prevention proposed by the Committee and the Advisory Bodies. The Chinese Government would continue to strictly abide by the Convention and its Operational Guidelines to govern its practices in order to protect, manage, present and utilize the property in a sustainable manner so as to deliver a more beautiful Kulangasu to the world. The nomination of the property marked the process of disseminating the Convention and its ideals on conservation, and the process of understanding and protecting the value of the international settlement of Kulangasu. The delegation added that the broad involvement and common efforts by local residents and all sectors of the society were key to the successful inscription of the property.

A **Representative of Kulangasu town** and resident of Kulangasu, spoke of his great joy, pride and gratitude for the inscription of Kulangasu. At the same time, he was aware of the new responsibility he would shoulder and promised to protect Kulangasu Island, a crown jewel, with full commitment and energy.

Historic City of Ahmadabad (India)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.17](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Historic City of Ahmadabad.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination of the Historic City of Ahmadabad India to the World Heritage List be deferred.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that the property comprised an urban historic settlement representative of the regional kingdoms of north India under Mughal rule, a unique expression of a multicultural community network. The *po/s*, the beautiful unique type of settlements, are places where the influences of local Hindu culture to Islamic architecture was exceptionally reflected. As pointed out in the ICOMOS report, the justification is appropriate, particularly with regard to the city's architecture, urban planning and wooden houses, and the way the city functions was clearly articulated in the file. The well-structured and in depth comparative analysis also clearly justified the property's uniqueness, even though an analysis limited to cities within an Indian geography was enough. The delegation believed that the integrity and authenticity of the property was also preserved. The rationale for excluding associated districts and buildings was clearly depicted in the supplementary information. The property boundaries recommended for nomination were adequate to reflect the justified OUV, and the inclusion of the river bank in the nomination was not really necessary as there was no direct historical relation of the property with the river banks. Many of the recommendations related to conservation and management of the property were either ongoing or would be completed within the deadline of 2019 or 2020. It was not a coincidence that India was at the forefront of efforts to increase the efficiency of implementation of this very Convention. Considering the discussion of criterion (vi), it was noted that India had clarified (at ICOMOS' request) that no tangible remains exist from the libraries and educational institutions nor were there any tangible attributes within the nominated property associated with Gandhi's ashram and nationalist movement. As acknowledged by India, criterion (vi) was not demonstrated in the file. Having considered these issues together, the delegation supported the immediate inscription of the property under criteria (ii) and (v), and congratulated the State Party for the elaborate preparedness of the nomination.

La **Délégation du Liban** remarque que le rapport de l'ICOMOS suggère clairement que le bien possède de très forts potentiels pour justifier d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle mais que les problèmes qui se posent semblent être principalement liés au contrôle des projets de développement sur la partie ouest du bien et de sa zone tampon, ainsi que la mise en œuvre effective du plan de gestion et des réglementations permettant le contrôle du développement. Elle recommande d'inscrire le bien compte tenu de sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle, tout en demandant à l'État partie de confirmer son engagement à finaliser le plan de gestion et les réglementations qui assurent le contrôle du développement.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** rappelle que l'importante ville historique d'Ahmedabad a été fondée au début du XV^e siècle et que son histoire a été véhiculée par son patrimoine, sans discontinuité. Ce patrimoine est représenté par les magnifiques monuments de la période des sultans qui montre un cachet architectural hindou-musulman, exprimant ainsi une architecture universelle multiculturelle. Le bien renferme 28 monuments de valeur nationale, dont particulièrement des maisons avec une architecture en bois, ce qui est exceptionnel et porteur de valeur universelle, transmettant ainsi un savoir-faire et des traditions artisanales. Mais au-delà de ses 28 monuments la ville compte au total 3,000 autres bâtiments, qui ont

une valeur patrimoniale indéniable, ajoutant la planification traditionnelle bien ordonnée de la ville historique avec ses 600 quartiers convergeant harmonieusement vers la place de la ville et dégagant de la sorte des lieux saints, son système de collecte des eaux, etc., donnant un cadre idéal de vie à la communauté et dégagant par là même les attributs de valeur universelle unique. En réponse aux observations de l'ICOMOS, l'État partie a clarifié sa position et donné son engagement clair à résoudre toutes les questions relatives à l'intégrité et à l'authenticité à des dates qui sont concertées avec l'ICOMOS. Pour ces raisons, au vu des nombreux documents mis à notre disposition par l'État partie et le contact fait avec les responsables du patrimoine, la délégation pense que la ville d'Ahmedabad est bien dotée de VUE et devrait être inscrite au patrimoine mondial selon les critères (ii) et (v) au cours de cette session.

La **Délégation du Portugal** félicite l'État partie pour sa préparation soignée de ce dossier et des informations et précisions complémentaires qui ont été amenées concernant l'authenticité et l'intégrité de la ville. La ville historique d'Ahmedabad, comme cela a déjà été mentionné, est une ville vivante et dynamique fondée au XV^e siècle, possédant un riche patrimoine architectural de l'époque des sultans, notamment la citadelle de Bhadra, les murs et les portes de la ville fortifiée et les nombreuses mosquées et sépultures, ainsi que d'importants temples hindous et jardins d'époques ultérieures. Il s'agit d'un des plus magnifiques exemples d'architecture indo-islamique et de l'art indo-musulman. L'architecture, la structure urbaine et les maisons en bois illustrent le caractère véritablement exceptionnel de la ville fortifiée d'Ahmedabad. L'État partie s'est engagé à mettre en œuvre des mesures et des règlements concernant le suivi des édifices patrimoniaux. À cet égard, le ministre de la coopération a conclu la création d'un 'heritage class' dans le but d'appliquer le plan de protection de la ville historique. La délégation ne doute pas de l'intégrité et l'authenticité du bien et fait confiance à l'Inde pour suivre les recommandations de l'ICOMOS. Plus personnellement, le délégué tient à rappeler que ce fut à Ahmedabad que le Mahatma Gandhi a initié son chemin qui conduira l'Inde à l'indépendance.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** was pleased to support the nomination of the old town of Ahmadabad, adding that Mahatma Gandhi had gone to Ahmadabad on 12 March 1930 on the Salt March of non-violence. Ahmadabad is a unique region of Hindu and Muslim architecture covering a 600-year period and beyond, and the city of Ahmadabad was committed to maintaining its beautiful heritage and OUV. There were strong reasons to ensure that the city be inscribed, and the delegation noted that there existed a heritage conservation committee, appointed by the Gujarat State government that functioned since January 2010 to help Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation on heritage conservation of the old city. Kuwait believed that the city deserved to be inscribed.

The **Delegation of Peru** referred to the analysis and evaluation by the Advisory Body that spoke of the Historic City of Ahmadabad as representing a pluralistic expression of cultural interchanges, as well as a synthesis of Hindu and Muslim architecture and several aesthetic and artistic expressions that reflect centrism. The inscription of the property would be compatible with the evaluation by ICOMOS regarding OUV on the basis of criteria (ii) and (v), as well as the elements that guarantee the existence of authenticity and integrity. The delegation also believed that the Committee should consider how the State Party had taken on a series of measures and shown a firm political will to take account of ICOMOS' recommendations. At the same time, the municipal authorities and various municipal institutions had set up a system to provide a secure source of funds, as well as a civic committee to preserve the property. The delegation therefore supported the inscription of the Historic City of Ahmadabad on the basis of criteria (ii) and (v).

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** thanked ICOMOS for its report before remarking on the magnificence of the Sultanate period monuments, mosques and tombs erected in sandstone with intricate stone carvings and motifs, which exhibited a unique fusion of Hindu-Muslim art and architecture universally acknowledged as the finest example of Hindu-Muslim architecture. It was noted that India, in response to ICOMOS' observations, had also amply

clarified its position and given its commitment to address issues concerning the integrity and authenticity in a time-bound manner. It was also important to note that even in the face of development pressures, the city administration and the State Party had made serious efforts to conserve and promote this priceless heritage. The delegation thus supported the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** concurred that the Historic City of Ahmadabad should justify OUV, adding that it was a unique settlement of multicultural patterns and homogeneity of community living. Its urban archaeological value, in the form of a medieval town plan and settlement patterns, hold historic significance on the basis of remains from the Pre-Sultanate and Sultanate periods. The timber-based architecture was the most unique aspect of the city. The coexistence of many religions on much of the urban structure of the city was an exceptional example of multicultural coexistence. The delegation commended the commitment and effort of the State Party to the conservation work to preserve the rich urban heritage of the city, and for enforcing strict development control regulations with strict monitoring and punitive action against violence. It also commended the commitment and effort of the State Party to constructively respond to the recommendation by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre in providing additional information related to the documentation of historic buildings and detailed assessments of new construction. With this in mind, Viet Nam supported the inscription of the Historic City of Ahmadabad on the World Heritage List and co-sponsored the draft amendment.

The **Delegation of Finland** congratulate the State Party on its excellent work, namely with the extensive comparative analysis. The justification of the OUV was also well argued and highlighted the possible uniqueness of the city's architecture, urban planning and wooden houses. It especially encouraged the State Party to conduct documentation of the historic buildings in the near future.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked that the Historic City of Ahmadabad was known for its urban archaeology and historic significance on the basis of remains from the Pre-Sultanate and Sultanate periods. The urban structure of the historic city, as represented by its discrete plots of land, was testimony to its heritage in the form of the medieval town plan and its settlement patterns that had been retained through the ages. The architectural monuments of the Sultanate period exhibit a unique fusion of multicultural forms and attributes in the building arts employed for the various types of buildings during the different phases of the historic city. This historic city also represented a unique value in the city's settlement formation and basic constituents, the traditional house with characteristic wooden façades was a very fine example of the intricate craft tradition and traditional living patterns with an open central courtyard as the main element of each house. Also important in this city was the presence of institutions belonging to many religions: Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, Jainism, Christianity, Judaism and Zoroastrianism, making this historic urban structure of the city an exceptional and even unique example of multicultural existence, which very much resonates with the spirit of the Convention and UNESCO. Ahmadabad is also the city of Mahatma Gandhi whose teachings and ideas are so relevant today. Azerbaijan therefore fully supported the proposal of inscription of this site and encouraged the State Party to make additional efforts to implement the Heritage Management Plan and the Heritage Conservation Plan with a special focus on the conservation of the historic wooden houses.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** thanked the Advisory Body for its work in evaluating this nomination, and India for putting forward yet another dynamic dossier. The Historic City demonstrated a seamless connectivity between tangible and intangible heritage assets with, for example, the 28 magnificent period monuments deemed of national importance and the nearly 3,000 listed buildings and structures of heritage value. It was appropriate that this site was also nominated under criterion (v) because of the traditional human settlement of the city, which has mass intangible appeal with its local shops, crafts, religious groupings and other traditional characteristics. The delegation congratulated the local authorities that – in the face of urban development pressures – remained focus on preserving and safeguarding

the legacy of the historic fabric of the city. Jamaica fully supported the amended draft decision for inscription to the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (v), and it encouraged the State Party to continue its research into the distinctive tangible and intangible assets of the property, and to ensure clear provisions for the urgent implementation of a Heritage Management Plan and Visitor Management Plan.

The **Delegation of Poland** noted the long history and importance of Ahmadabad, which was visible in its architectural urban layout, the defensive walls and gates, but especially in the traditional houses known as *polis*. During the ages, Ahmadabad was also a place of coexistence of Muslim, Jain and Hindu inhabitants who shared common traditions of commercial enterprise and philanthropy, regardless of their confessions. Poland therefore supported the amendment to the draft decision and inscription of the property on the World Heritage List. However, it strongly encouraged India to develop a long-term conservation plan, especially in relation to urban planning.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended the Advisory Body for the presentation of this property and congratulated the State Party for presenting this property to the Committee. It recommended the inscription of the property under criteria (ii) and (v), adding that it was convinced that the property has OUV together with equally commendable integrity and authenticity. It acknowledged the challenges caused by the property's continuing use as a vibrant and developing city, and the commitment of the State Party towards tightening the legal and management frameworks to reduce negative impacts on the historic city's OUV, while recognizing the enhanced management system. The delegation was convinced that inscription would boost India's commitment to see the historic city of Ahmadabad take its rightful place among the heritage properties of the world.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** noted that the historic city of Ahmadabad represented over 600 years of unbroken history, evolution and heritage. The magnificent Sultanate period monuments of mosques and tombs erected in sandstone with intricate stone carvings exhibited a unique fusion of Hindu and Muslim art and architecture universally acknowledged as the finest example of Hindu-Islamic architecture. The archaeological survey of India identified these moments of national importance. The Ahmadabad Municipal Corporation had identified nearly 3,000 buildings and architecture with heritage value for conservation. In addition, traditional human settlement planning of the historic city comprised over 600 neighbourhoods, which were indeed unique and had OUV. In response to ICOMOS' observations, the State Party had clarified its position and addressed the issues concerning the integrity and authenticity in time-bound fashion. In addition, it was important to note that the city administration and India were employing serious effort to conserve and promote this priceless heritage. Tanzania thus supported inscription of the Historic City of Ahmadabad to the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (v).

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** remarked that the Historic City of Ahmadabad, built in the 15th century and covering about 600 years, stood out in the history of Indian cities and the development of Islamic cities. The delegation believed that the wooden architecture of the walled city best represented the beauty of Asian architecture and its sophisticated building techniques. In this regard, the delegation found the Historic City of Ahmadabad significant enough to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. It was also noted that India had made great strides towards tackling the issues of tourism raised by the Advisory Body during the nomination process. The delegation wished to see India continue its efforts to implement the Committee's recommendations

The **Delegation of Croatia** was pleased to support the draft amendment in favour of inscribing the historical city, representing the multilayered culture of India, adding that inscribing living cities was one of the best ways to move further along the path towards preserving World Heritage.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** est confiante que les autorités de l'Inde prendront toutes les dispositions pour répondre de manière consistante aux revendications, aux observations

faites par l'ICOMOS. Compte tenu de cette garantie offerte par l'État membre, elle accepte la proposition d'inscription de ce site à cette session, selon les critères (ii) et (v).

The **Delegation of Cuba** was convinced of the OUV of this site and agreed with the Members who advocated inscription with the recommendation to strengthen conservation actions.

The **Delegation of Portugal** supported Ahmadabad's inscription on the World Heritage List.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment proposed by Turkey, Azerbaijan, Cuba, Croatia, Kazakhstan, Viet Nam, Kuwait, Zimbabwe, Tunisia, Jamaica, Lebanon and the United Republic of Tanzania. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. A new paragraph 2 would read, 'Inscribes the Historic City of Ahmadabad, India, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (v)'. Also in paragraph 2: part a) was deleted; part b) was deleted in this paragraph but retained in paragraph 4; part c) was also deleted; d), e) and f) were retained in other paragraphs; part g) was also deleted; and part h) was inserted in paragraph 4. Paragraph 3 was also modified, and would now read, 'Takes note of the provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value', which was followed by the statement. A new paragraph 4 would read, 'Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following', and the addition of part f) in paragraph 4, which would read, 'Enrich the Heritage Department at Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation with capacity building and technical capacity relevant to the challenging size and extent of responsibilities of the documentation, conservation and monitoring of the property and its buffer zone'. Finally, paragraph 5 would read, 'Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by December 2019, a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020'. The Rapporteur noted that the draft had moved from a deferral to inscription for which there was a standard language to be included in the new paragraph 4, parts 4.a) and 4.b), to be presented by ICOMOS.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** proposed in paragraphs 4.a) to delete the phrase 'with the aim of meeting the conditions of authenticity', and in 4.b) very similarly, to delete the phrase, 'with the aim of meeting the conditions of integrity', as these items should already be met with the decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** returned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.17 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of India** spoke of the honour to witness the inscription of a city with over 600 years of unbroken history, recalling that the journey to inscribe Ahmadabad started in 2010 when the Prime Minister Narendra Modi proffered this dossier to UNESCO. Ahmadabad's is where the Indian heritage speaks for itself. For over six centuries it has stood for peace as a landmark city where Mahatma Gandhi began India's freedom struggle. It has stood for unity with its elegant carvings and its Hindi-Jain temples, as well as standing as one of the finest examples of Indo-Islamic architecture and Hindu-Muslim art. Beyond this, it epitomized the United Nations' objective of sustainable development. Chosen to be one of India's first smart cities, while preserving its ancient heritage, giving light to the minds of brilliance of those who crafted the city from its roots. As a UNESCO World Heritage site, Ahmadabad would continue to grow and flourish. Its evolution would embolden through simultaneous conservation and development efforts. Under criteria (ii) and (v) the inscription of Ahmadabad would allow for the preservation of an historic city, which has harbored India's dynamism and vibrancy. The delegation thanked the Committee Members who supported this inscription and who were able to see the beauty of the city.

Historic City of Yazd (Islamic Republic of Iran)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.18](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Historic City of Yazd.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The Representative of ICOMOS presented the evaluation of the site and recommended that the examination of the nomination be deferred.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked that the nominated property covered almost 700 hectares, comprising three main components accommodating almost 50,000 inhabitants among Zoroastrian, Jews and Muslim communities with their own quarters and living side-by-side, a tradition that was hundreds of years old. Yazd is an ancient earthen city still striving and developing, and navigating its way through modern life yet astonishingly preserving its historic identity and characteristics, including its old bazaar, old city quarters, and unique *qanat* underground water tunnel system, beautiful skylines, mosques, and so on. This unique property clearly demonstrated OUV. The delegation commended the detailed examination carried out by ICOMOS. However, it was of the opinion that the historic city of Yazd had undeniably met all the requirements to qualify for inscription. It had OUV beyond doubt, and its integrity and authenticity was explicitly demonstrated. Although it fully understood the concerns of ICOMOS with regard to the boundaries of the components, the delegation also understood the limitations faced by the State Party to protect this vast property and the need to adapt to the new patterns of life. Part of this were the streets, crossing the central component of the heritage property, which themselves represented an old and indivisible part of living heritage. Today Yazd possessed a large number of excellent examples of traditional desert architecture with a range of houses, from modest ones to very large and highly decorated properties. In addition to the main mosque and bazaar, which were in a very good state of conservation, as reflected in the ICOMOS report, eight districts of the historic city still possessed all its specific features, such as water cisterns, hammams, mosques, mausoleums, and so on. In the nominated property, there were still many streets and alleys retaining their original pattern with partial or entirely covered alleys and a series of arches crossing them, offering protection from the sun. The skyline of the city is punctuated with wind catchers, minarets and domes of the monuments and mosques, offering an outstanding panorama visible from far away. Being a living dynamic city, Yazd had evolved gradually with some inevitable changes. However, Yazd had many qualities to meet the conditions of authenticity, including those related to the continuity of its intangible heritage. This historic site was said to be truly authentic, and the historic city of Yazd had an exceptionally elaborate construction system in earthen architecture with an adaptation to the hostile environment spanning several million years. Yazd was thus an outstanding example of homogenous architecture and urban planning and human settlement, representing the interaction of man and nature in the desert environment resulting in the optimal use and clever management of the limited resources. The ICOMOS report noted that the conservation and management plan was also in place. With this in mind, Azerbaijan supported inscription of this site on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv) and (v), and had submitted an amendment to the Secretariat in this regard.

La **Délégation du Koweït** partage avec l'Iran de nombreuses pages d'histoire. Dans ces conditions il lui est facile d'affirmer que la ville de Yazd est véritablement un bien tout à fait remarquable. Il s'agit d'un exemple particulièrement exceptionnel d'architecture, reconnue mondialement, développée à partir d'un système simple basé sur la culture du qanat, qui apporte dans la ville l'eau permettant de mettre en œuvre la terre prise sur place pour la

transformer en divers édifices complémentaires, publics et privés, développés dans un climat particulièrement aride. Ces développements architecturaux et urbains sont reconnus mondialement comme exemple éminents d'architecture bioclimatique, dont nous avons tous besoin aujourd'hui, ce qui est d'autant plus intéressant. En termes techniques, il apparaît que la documentation produite par l'ICHHTO, c'est-à-dire l'Organisation du patrimoine culturel, de l'artisanat et du tourisme en Iran, est particulièrement bien élaborée, précise et basée sur des analyses historiques approfondies, notamment en termes de délimitations. Elle met aussi bien en avant tous les éléments techniques, comme les tours à vent, les cours intérieures et sous-sols et la circulation de souterrains qui apportent au bâti toutes ses qualités, et les raisons techniques d'usage d'enduit de terre et de paille sur diverses portes qui apportent des compléments d'isolation. De façon globale, la délégation est convaincue par la démonstration faite par l'Iran, non seulement de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de la ville de Yazd mais aussi de sa capacité à la partager et à la conserver dans de bonnes conditions. Pour ces raisons, elle désire procéder à l'inscription du bien non seulement au titre du critère (v) mais aussi des critères (iii) et (iv).

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that the very old city of Yazd located in the central desert of Iran was a manifestation of endurance and struggle for survival with its traditional districts, the canals system, traditional houses, bazaars, hammams, water systems, mosques, synagogues, Zoroastrian temples and the historic garden of Dolat-abad, and enjoyed the coexistence of three religions: Islam, Judaism and Zoroastrianism. Yazd was also a city made of earth, representing one of its most particular achievements in that it was realized not against nature but with the help of nature. The evolutionary phases of the city were also well presented in the dossier whose traditional culture provided the continuity of its uniqueness by also adding other new values to it. The current level of authenticity and integrity of the property helped to understand this uniqueness today. With regard to the criterion of authenticity, it was noted that Yazd is a living city where all development and rehabilitation work was undertaken by traditional methods and knowledge. The delegation conceded that it might be difficult in such circumstances to distinguish later additions made to the structures, but from the dossier, it was clearly a very authentic property. The delegation was sure that the State Party would take into account the formulation of future conservation policies. Efforts made by Iran to provide additional information to clarify some of the issues within the context of justification of the OUV should also be commended. The clarifications given to discrepancies between the maps and the site, with the accurate documentation and management plan, were all considered important but also relatively minor issues in the delegation's opinion and should not dissuade the decision to inscribe. The delegation agreed with ICOMOS' argument that criterion (ii) was not justified by the State Party as a result of the comparative analysis. On the other hand, criteria (iii), (iv) and (v) were relevant for inscription, as the property surely represented a stage in human history, unique architectural type of settlement in the Iranian desert geography, and a high level of adaptation to nature. Turkey therefore joined Azerbaijan and Kuwait in supporting inscription. The nomination file and the additional information provided clearly demonstrated integrity and authenticity, and consequently its OUV. A very effective management plan was also provided. The delegation added that the earthen heritage of Yazd was one of the finer examples of interaction between man and the desert environment.

The **Chairperson** suggested to close the item and resume the discussion in the following session.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** congratulated the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their incredible work, and it congratulated the State Party for the excellent example of a living historical city, which had arisen in a harmonious, multicultural context that included Zoroastrianism, Islam and Judaism, as well as for its exceptional conservation. It took note of the recommendation by ICOMOS concerning the extension of the buffer area, but it understood the difficulties faced by the historical city with a population of 500,000 inhabitants to further extend the buffer zone. Nevertheless, the protection of the city required a

commitment by all parties concerned. The delegation encouraged the State Party to continue in its efforts to conserve the city of Yazd by ensuring the preservation of historic monuments, capacity-building for the staff to manage tourism, and support to local communities in the development of guidelines of good practices for the conservation and maintenance of the earthen homes. It supported the inscription of this historic city of Yazd.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** relève l'attitude constructive de l'État partie par rapport aux recommandations et/ou réserves de l'ICOMOS, dégageant par là même les éléments plaisant pour l'inscription du bien au patrimoine mondial. L'État partie assure en effet que le tissu urbain sera sauvegardé pour la zone tampon et délimité selon les normes reconnues. Quant à la délimitation du quartier zoroastrien, elle coïncidera, assure-t-il, exactement avec les limites historiques renfermant les 19 quartiers historiques sélectionnés pour l'inscription. Toutes ces données prouvent clairement son intégrité. Au plan de l'authenticité, et réagissant aux demandes de l'ICOMOS, l'État partie a fourni les documents cartographiques distinguant clairement le nouveau tissu de l'ancien. Pour ce qui est de l'usage de l'enduit de terre-paille, il s'agit là d'un mode de construction traditionnelle et, comme nous le savons, il est bioclimatique. Sont aussi traditionnelles les briques cuites et les briques séchées. Toutes ces considérations ainsi présentées confortent largement les attributs de la VUE du bien. Pour finir, la question de la gestion et de la conservation ne semble pas poser de problème. Au contraire, la délégation est raisonnablement assurée, au vu de la longue expérience de l'Iran, qu'il saura aussi s'en acquitter de façon satisfaisante. Pour toutes ces raisons, la délégation de la Tunisie appuie l'inscription de la ville historique de Yazd au cours de cette session.

The **Chairperson** noted the list of Members still wishing to speak and thus closed the item until the next session. He also recalled the still pending item on Khor Dubai, for which a small drafting group had successfully completed a proposed draft decision. It was noted that the Committee had inscribed six new properties. However, given the time constraints, and with 18 items still remaining, the Chairperson appealed to Committee Members to keep their statements brief.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** proposed that Members congratulating States Parties keep their interventions to one minute, with more substantive interventions limited to 1½ or two minutes.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to make some public announcements.

The Secretariat announced one side event for the evening, 'Training for Success: Developing Complete World Heritage Nominations organized by UNITAR, ICCROM, IUCN, ICOMOS, WHC, as well as a reception event organized by Angola.

[Close of afternoon session]

SEVENTH DAY – Sunday 9 July 2017

THIRTEENTH SESSION

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

Vice-Chairperson: Mr José Filipe Mendes Moraes Cabral (Portugal)

ITEM 8B [Continuation]: NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour (United Arab Emirates) [Continuation.]

The **Chairperson** opened the session by reminding the Committee of the limited time allocated to each nomination, by limiting Members' interventions to opposing inscriptions or providing amendments to the draft decision. Otherwise, the examination of the draft decision would follow immediately after the presentation by the Advisory Bodies. There were two remaining items: Khor Dubai (United Arab Emirates) and the Historic City of Yazd (Islamic Republic of Iran).

Le **Délégation du Koweït** a participé au groupe de travail et remet le projet de décision.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by the drafting group. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was amended and would now read, 'Refers the nomination of Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants' Harbour, United Arab Emirates, back to the State Party in order to further clarify: a) The attributes that justify the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property, b) The ongoing revitalization plan in Shindagha, c) The nominated property limits in Shindagha'. The new additional paragraphs 3 and 4 were projected onto the screen.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.14 adopted as amended.

Historic City of Yazd (Islamic Republic of Iran) [Continuation.]

The **Chairperson** then returned to the item on Historic City of Yazd, noting that there was a general understanding that the Committee wished to inscribe this property.

La **Délégation du Liban** interrompt pour expliquer qu'il a un problème avec cette évaluation. Ayant lu le rapport d'ICOMOS, il est noté qu'il est écrit clairement à la page 124 sous la partie 'analyse comparative', "L'ICOMOS considère que même si certains aspects pourraient être encore renforcés, l'analyse comparative justifie d'envisager l'inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial". Sous la partie 'Intégrité et authenticité', il est également écrit, "L'ICOMOS considère que la sélection des éléments de la proposition d'inscription en série est appropriée car elle représente les attributs de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle proposées qui sont tous gérés par la même agence (l'Organisation iranienne du patrimoine culturel, de l'artisanat et du tourisme (ICHHTO))". La délégation considère qu'après une telle analyse l'ICOMOS allait certainement proposer l'inscription du bien, au pire de cas de le refaire pour de raisons de gestion. Sur la partie gestion il est noté, "L'ICOMOS considère que le système de gestion est globalement approprié [...]" et "que les mesures de suivi du bien sont appropriées". Mais, malgré ces observations, l'ICOMOS recommande que l'inscription soit différée. L'évaluation montre donc une contradiction réelle dans ce texte et dans cette analyse. La délégation comprend que le patrimoine n'est pas une formule mathématique mais il est évident que des avis et idées différentes existait au sein du rapport, et que le texte reflète ces contradictions. À ce moment-là, la délégation demande à

l'ICOMOS d'être davantage transparent pour empêcher ce type de contradictions dans un texte finale d'inscription.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** explained that ICOMOS' recommendation resulted from the fact that the number of issues dealing with the conditions of authenticity and integrity had not actually been met at the time, therefore the recommendation was a deferral, which implied that a mission would be required, and hence the recommendation.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Azerbaijan, Kuwait, Kazakhstan and Turkey. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified, which would now read 'Inscribes the Historic City of Yazd, Islamic Republic of Iran, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv) and (v)'. For consistency, paragraph 3 would read, 'Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value', followed by the brief synthesis. The original paragraph 2 was thus deleted. Paragraph 4 took some elements from paragraph 2 such that paragraph 4.a) is intact, 4.b) was deleted. Point 4.c) would become 4.b), and point 4.d) and 4.e) remained unchanged.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that in its evaluation, ICOMOS found no key elements [in the nomination file] to justify criterion (iii). The issue of the coexistence of communities from multiple religions did not contribute justification for this criterion, even in the amendment.

The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee would agree to remove criterion (iii).

The **Delegation of Finland** found that only criterion (v) would be appropriate for the property, as it would not require further study and documentation. However, should the Committee decide to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List, the delegation wished to leave the recommendation [on criterion (iii)] in the decision. In addition, the delegation did not think criterion (iv) was appropriate either and sought to hear from ICOMOS in this regard.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that ICOMOS considered that while Yazd is considered the best surviving example of this urban planning and architecture, it could not be understood as representing a significant stage in human history, and therefore ICOMOS did not support criterion (iv).

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** referred back to the recommendation of ICOMOS, namely, to the explanation of criterion (iii) where ICOMOS agreed that Yazd demonstrated the use of construction systems and techniques to cope with the environmental conditions. In addition, Yazd associated with the tradition of social organization that benefitted communal facilities, such as water cisterns, hammams and mosques. It also associated with intangible traditions of commerce and crafts, multiculturalism and the peaceful cohabitation of followers of different religions. Given these facts, the delegation believed that criterion (iii) should be retained.

La **délégation du Koweït** soutient la demande et la proposition d'Azerbaïdjan.

The **Delegation of Turkey** supported the recommendation proposed by Azerbaijan that criterion (iii) should be added to the Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** noted agreement on criteria (iii) and (v), but not criterion (iv).

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** supported the proposal by Azerbaijan.

The **Rapporteur** returned to the amendment proposed by Azerbaijan, Kuwait, Kazakhstan and Turkey in paragraph 2 which read, 'Inscribes the Historic City of Yazd, Islamic Republic of Iran, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria', with a proposal from Finland to delete criterion (ii) and keep criterion (iii) and (iv). Paragraph 3 would then read, 'Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value'.

The **Chairperson** noted in paragraph 2 the consensus to retain criterion (iii) and criterion (v), and delete criterion (iv), which was duly adopted. Paragraph 3 was also adopted.

The **Delegation of Finland** wished to put in a recommendation in paragraph 4, which would read, 'Continue further studies and documentation in relation to the justification of criteria (iii) and (v)'.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.18 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran** congratulated the Committee on its achievements at its 41st session in Krakow. It delegation thanked the Committee Members for their detailed examination of the file and their support for the inscription of the Historic City of Yazd. The delegation thanked ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for their cooperation in this regard. Gratitude was also expressed to the members of the Iranian delegation and the people of Yazd who helped throughout the process of preparing this nomination file. The historic city of Yazd attested to the ongoing efforts of the hardworking people of the desert over the course of its long history. In order to overcome the harsh nature of the desert, locals resorted to ingenious innovations resulting in the magnificent architectural and urban planning that were masterpieces to the world. The residents of Yazd extracted water from the heart of the central desert of the Iranian plateau, mixing it with the soil to artistically create the richest mud brick architecture possible, such as high portals, wind-catchers harnessing violent winds, turquoise-colored tiles in the courtyard against the mountains and desert landscapes, each manifesting the rich architectural identity of houses, mosques, hammams, and other historic urban structures. Although Yazd is one of the most important cities in terms of art, its residents were fully skilled in the art of life, living and struggling through their interactions with the merciless desert environment. Residents were also receptive to the values of diverse religions with a patience that is characteristic of desert dwellers. Peaceful coexistence of the followers of Judaism, Zoroastrianism and Islam in the passage of time served as a good example of humankind. The delegation believed that inscription would lead to the realization of this great objective. It concluded by extending heartfelt gratitude to the people of the Government of Poland for their great hospitality and for this magnificent event.

Sacred Island of Okinoshima and Associated Sites in the Munakata Region (Japan)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.19](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Sacred Island of Okinoshima and Associated Sites in the Munakata Region.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and recommended that only Okinoshima with its three islets be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii).

Noting the long list of speakers, the **Chairperson** appealed to the Committee Members to be brief.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** warmly welcomed the presence of His Excellency Mr Ryohei Miyata, Commissioner for Cultural Affairs of Japan at the Committee's session, but was sorry to learn that the Governor of Fukuoka, Mr Hiroshi Ogawa had to return to Japan due to the serious flooding caused by heavy rain in the region. Having carefully read ICOMOS' report the delegation fully supported its evaluation, particularly the conclusions regarding the composition of property components and the justification of the serial nomination. The delegation believed that the Committee should respect the recommendations by the Advisory Bodies such as ICOMOS. It was recalled that the Republic of Korea had withdrawn two previous nominations so as to accept the expertise and views of

the Advisory Body, as this would ultimately contribute to the authority and credibility of the Committee. As ICOMOS explained, the evidence of rituals could be found extensively on the island of Okinoshima and its three islets, four among the entire eight components. The delegation believed that the other four components also had very strong potential OUV, as mentioned in ICOMOS' report. However, the Committee should consider ICOMOS' evaluation that stated how a clear link between all eight of the components was not an essential requirement for a serial property, as defined in paragraph 137 of the Operational Guidelines. In this regard, the delegation wished to ask ICOMOS to provide the background of its recommendation of inscribing only four out of the eight components.

La **Délégation du Liban** explique que le bien en série présenté par l'État partie reflète une tradition de vénération continue, qui a évolué dans un processus d'échange dynamique avec l'étranger, et s'est transmise jusqu'à nos jours par une tradition vivante et d'offrandes pour assurer la sécurité de la navigation maritime. L'ICOMOS considère que seule l'île d'Okinoshima avec ses îlots voisins justifie d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Pourtant, la valeur universelle exceptionnelle doit être jugée à travers le contexte historico-politique et culturel en relation avec les routes maritimes au fil des siècles et les échanges entre les pouvoirs japonais, chinois et coréens. Dans ce cadre, c'est bien l'ensemble de la série qui doit être considéré, et non seulement quatre éléments comme le propose le rapport de l'ICOMOS. La délégation pense qu'il est important d'inscrire la série dans son ensemble afin de témoigner de la profondeur des échanges entre les différentes entités de la région et la complexité des pratiques rituelles dédiées à la protection de la navigation, qui se manifeste dans un système particulier d'îles et de sites sacrés liés entre eux par une tradition culturelle de vénération.

The **Delegation of Peru** considered that the sacred islands associated with the region, presented as a series of rituals for maritime safety, were especially linked to (iv) and (ix) and via the traditions of worship had been handed down to the present day. It was noted that the Committee was faced with ICOMOS presenting the possibility of only considering the Sacred Island of Okinoshima as representative of the OUV of the property, rather than the eight elements that had been presented together by Japan. The delegation aligned with the remarks by Lebanon in that the expression of the centuries-old tradition of worship represented a unity from the viewpoint of the routes and historical and cultural exchanges in the eight different components, and thus it embodied a functional, historical and traditional relationship between the diverse parts of the serial proposal. In this regard, the whole property represented a centuries-old tradition of worship, as supported by archaeological proof, and should thus be inscribed with its eight components.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that the proposed property was a testament to and recognition of the rich maritime heritage of Asia to which the Philippines' archipelagic country was intricately linked. The property is an exceptional example of cultural tradition associated with the worship of a sacred island that had evolved over time. The Philippines recognized the significance of the eight component parts to the totality of the religious heritage of Okinoshima Island whose OUV was enforced and could thus not be separated from the associated sites in this serial nomination. The delegation strongly believed that all eight components should be inscribed under criteria (ii) and (iii). It therefore joined other Committee Members in presenting amendments to the draft decision. However, notwithstanding its support for the inscription, the delegation spoke of the fact that women were not able, and still not able to enter the Island. Thus, without clarification on this matter, inscription of the property may send an unclear message with regard to gender issues.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** commended ICOMOS for its report, adding that it shared ICOMOS' acknowledgement of the historical and spiritual values of the property as attributes to its potential OUV. The Sacred Island of Okinoshima is an exceptional example of the cultural tradition of worshipping a sacred island as it evolved and been passed down from ancient times to the present. Remarkably, archaeological sites preserved on the Island were virtually intact and provided a chronological record of how the rituals performed on the island

changed over a period of five hundred years. In these rituals, vast quantities of precious votive objects were deposited as offerings at different sites on the Island, attesting to changes in rituals. While direct offerings on Okinoshima Island ceased in the 9th century, members of the Munakata Clan played an instrumental role in establishing and safeguarding the worship of the island by worshipping the Three Female Deities of Munakata at three distinct worship sites of Munakata Taisha: Okitsu-miya on Okinoshima, Nakatsu-miya on Oshima, and Hetsu-miya, along with 'distant worship' exemplified by the open views from Oshima and the main island of Kyushu towards Okinoshima. This worshipping tradition had been passed down by the people of Munakata over the centuries. Indonesia was of the view that the whole series of Okinoshima was integral and indispensable parts with close and mutual, cultural and functional links to each other, which together contributed to the spiritual attributes of the OUV of the property. Taking this into consideration, the delegation fully supported that all the components of the Sacred Island of Okinoshima and Associated Sites in the Munakata Region be inscribed on the World Heritage List, and proposed a draft amendment in this regard.

For the sake of providing concise remarks, the **Chairperson** asked Members to state whether they were for the inscription of the four components or for the eight components.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** extended thanks to Japan for submitting this significant serial nomination, as well as ICOMOS for its evaluation and recommendation. The delegation explained that the level of interrelatedness in a serial submission of this nature must be presented and viewed as a whole to include the presence of intangible cultural heritage, which enriched the overall OUV of the series. Moreover, paragraph 137 of the Operational Guidelines provided guidance in this regard. The delegation believed that the State Party had sufficiently demonstrated that the serial nomination must be inscribed as a whole, and it supported the amended draft decision to reflect the inclusion of all eight components as part of the inscribed nomination under criteria (ii) and (iii).

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** commended ICOMOS for the evaluation, although [on a personal basis] she would be unable to visit the property as no women were allowed. The delegation thanked Japan for bringing forward this property, adding that it supported inscription of the eight components that represented a combination of tangible and intangible heritage. The worship aspect was also similar in that it was important to inscribe the property as it was seen by the local community who view it as a unit and not as different parts of their worship.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** est en accord avec l'ICOMOS sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle d'Okinoshima, mais considère qu'il s'agit d'une nomination en série dont chaque composante contribue par sa fonction à cette valeur. L'île sacrée d'Okinoshima elle-même ne peut pas conserver toute sa valeur si elle est considérée, spirituellement et pratiquement, séparément des sites d'Oshima et de Kyushu où les traces archéologiques prouvent que les gens ont vénéré de loin l'île sacrée, et qu'ils pratiquent et perpétuent jusqu'à nos jours pour la sécurité maritime. Ainsi, la délégation co-parraine l'amendement du projet de décision en vue d'inscrire l'île sacrée d'Okinoshima et sites associés de la région de Munakata dans la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of Turkey** congratulated the State Party for the high quality of its dossier. The nomination composed of eight components was testimony to the processes and stages of the evolution of religious rituals as a whole within a process of dynamic overseas exchange in East Asia from the 4th century to the present day. The inclusion of Okinoshima Island together with only three islets did not seem to display a wholesome approach, while the file together with the supplementary documents adequately demonstrated each of the component's contribution to the evolution of Okinoshima rituals and OUV. Hence, fragmenting the series and inscribing only the early remains would impair the historical ties between Okinoshima, Oshima and Kyushu islands. Therefore, the delegation recommended inscription of all eight components on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi), as proposed by the

State Party.

The **Chairperson** asked the remaining speakers if they could pronounce on whether they agreed to inscription based on the eight elements.

The **Delegation of Portugal** did not agree with this rubber-stamping exercise in that delegations had studied the files and had a responsibility to pronounce their opinions so as to avoid any perceived political dimension to the exercise. The delegation suggested that Members instead refrain from reading out long prepared statements and underline the essence of their observations.

The **Chairperson** concurred and asked the Members to continue in the spirit of the advice given.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** supported the remarks by Portugal, and having gone through the necessary documents, was of the view that the nomination was an outstanding example of the cultural tradition of worshipping at this important site of Okinoshima and associated sites, while recognizing that this tradition had been supported over many centuries by the local community. The delegation was convinced that all the nominated component parts were strongly connected with each other by the spiritual aspect derived from animism and nature worship. Indeed, this property vividly demonstrated how people surrounded by the sea coped with the natural forces, living by maritime exchanges and praying for maritime safety. The delegation supported the amendment to the draft decision to inscribe *all* eight components.

The **Delegation of Angola** believed that the State Party had provided enough information to attest to the continuity of the ritual practices in Okinoshima as well as the worshipping of the Munakata divinities. It thus supported the inscription of all eight elements.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** s'aligne avec les remarques des autres Membres de la Comité sur la connexion entre l'île d'Okinoshima et les trois îles voisines. Elle est convaincus qu'il n'est pas possible de comprendre le caractère sacré de cette île et de ce bien si les autre îles ne sont pas inscrites à la fois, ce qui mettrait peut-être en cause sa valeur universelle. Par conséquent, la Tunisie soutient l'inscription des huit éléments.

The **Delegation of Poland** stressed that inscription of the entire complex of nominated islands would have a positive effect on the integrity as well as the enrichment of attributes of the site, it thus supported the amendment to the draft decision and inscription of all eight nominated components. In addition, it seemed reasonable to leave the original name of the nominated site.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that the seafaring aspect of this site conferred additional value, falling into the category 'routes for people and goods', which is one of the under-represented categories identified by the 1994 Gap Analysis. It was noted that the property had been presented as a *serial* nomination and was thus the cause of the problems. With a serial nomination, all components should contribute to the OUV in the same way, and this was not the case for all of the presented components. If the series had been presented as a single site, the Committee could have avoided the majority of the criticism. Therefore, the delegation agreed with the other Committee Members that the whole series should be inscribed. The additional information sent by the State Party revealed that there were a number of islands where ritual sites related to maritime safety existed both in the Japanese Archipelago and along the Korean Peninsula. The delegation hoped that future research on this subject would not overlook this aspect and that the State Party could take a leading role in exploring and deepening the understanding of the movement of people and goods along this sea route. This wish had also been reflected in the amended draft decision.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** subscribed to the comments expressed by Members of the Committee who supported the nomination in its integrity with all eight components. It believed that the property as a whole reflected the tradition of continued worship of the Sacred Island of Okinoshima as it evolved in the process of dynamic oversea exchanges

passed on to the present day, and linked with the living tradition of offering prayers for maritime safety. Moreover, the delegation believed that this site was a gateway from continental Asia to Japan through the Okinoshima, Oshima and Munakata regions, and many archaeological findings and excavations proved this theory. Therefore, Azerbaijan supported the inscription of this site in its totality.

The **Delegation of Cuba** expressed its solidarity with the State Party, adding that there was no doubt that the attributes for OUV in the thematic presentation were present in the eight elements.

La **Délégation du Koweït** exprime sa gratitude à l'État partie pour les efforts déployés pour répondre aux recommandations de l'ICOMOS. À propos du site d'Okinoshima et les sites associés, la délégation croit que les huit éléments et leurs fonctions sont interdépendants et que cette série contribue à enrichir l'aspect spirituel d'un bien d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The **Delegation of Portugal** expressed solidarity with the people of Japan at this very difficult time. The delegation had sympathy with Japan's desire to preserve the integrity of all eight elements and their close links, adding that this position was consistent with the historical and religious context of this property and it would thus not make sense to separate it into different items. The delegation therefore supported inscription of all the eight components.

The **Delegation of Croatia** supported the amendment, adding that all eight components were developed as an inseparable system of maritime belief. It was thus of the opinion that taking components out of the system, regardless of how material remains were preserved, would decrease and not increase the OUV, particularly regarding the integrity of the serial sites. The delegation also aligned with the remarks by Lebanon regarding the opening of a serious discussion on the logic of the recommendations formulated by ICOMOS.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** was of the opinion that the criteria chosen for the nominated property of the Sacred Island of Okinoshima and Associated Sites comprised of a series of eight component parts were justified and applicable to the whole series.

The **Chairperson** returned to the important question on gender made by the Philippines, inviting Japan to respond on this particular issue.

The **Delegation of Japan** clarified that as a matter of principle the access to the Island of Okinoshima had been restricted to the Priest of the Munakata Grand Shrine and the priests were – by tradition – male. However, many women of course were actively involved in activities related to the conservation and management of the property, including ritual practices.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that gender equality was a priority for UNESCO, but she also wished to inform the Committee that it had taken other decisions where women had no access to sites, for example, in Mount Athos in Greece. In addition, there were many World Heritage Sites where men could not access certain parts of the site. The Director added that much had been written on this issue and she could provide further information.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** reiterated that it was supportive of the inscription of this Japanese ritual and ceremony, adding that the property demonstrated full historic evidence of traditional rituals carried out in the sacred site, such as praying for maritime safety and security for travel between the Japanese Archipelago and the Korean Peninsula and onwards to mainland China. However, the delegation noted that the ritual covered the time span between the 4th and 9th centuries, yet the flag shown in the projected photo was the flag adopted by Japan's Imperial Army during WWII, which was seen as inappropriate and would give the wrong impression to neighbouring countries. The delegation urged Japan to exercise caution in accompanying photos. Returning to the nomination, it was noted that the component Shimbaru-Nuyama Mounded Tombs focused on

the people who associated with the worship and who had contributed to the development of the heritage and thus created the site's value, as explained in the nomination dossier. The delegation believed that Japan should further emphasize the efforts of the people in the conservation and implementation process, as well as in other heritage sites in Japan. It appreciated the continuous endeavours of the State Party to enhance the completeness of this nomination, and it hoped that Japan would make every effort to implement the recommendations made by the Committee.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that most Members co-sponsored the amendment to the draft decision. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was amended by Indonesia, Philippines, Turkey, Viet Nam, Tunisia, Azerbaijan, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Burkina Faso and Kazakhstan, which would read, 'Inscribes the Sacred Island of Okinoshima and Associated Sites in the Munakata Region, Japan, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii)'. Paragraph 3 was amended and would read, 'Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value'. Paragraph 4 was deleted, following the logic of name changes, and paragraphs 5 and 6 were amended, following the logic of the amendment in paragraph 2.

The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–4 were duly adopted.

The Chairperson Declared Decision 41 COM 8B.19 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Japan** expressed sincere appreciation to all Members of the Committee and the experts of ICOMOS who took part in the process of evaluation, and thanked the Government and people of Poland for their warm hospitality. It truly appreciated the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. The delegation reaffirmed its commitment to the conservation of this living tradition to share with the rest of the world and future generations.

The **Commissioner of the Agency for Cultural Affairs**, Mr Ryohei Miyata, was grateful for the honour to take part in the evaluation and inscription of this property, which showed how people living with the sea had established a spiritual world that was now acknowledged as a treasure among humankind, adding that this precious property would be conserved for future generations.

Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace (Azerbaijan)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.20](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace.

Noting the limited time, the **Delegation of Lebanon** pronounced a point of order, proposing to shorten the speaking time to two minutes and not three.

The **Chairperson** concurred with the point of order.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and recommended that the property not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Poland** remarked that the main elements contributing to the value of this property was the fusion between the location and the administrative division in the 18th

century, the industrial silk production in the 19th century, and the urban landscape. The nomination of Sheki was not about listing important monuments and palaces but understanding the historic urban landscape as a whole, which had survived exceptionally well through time. The value of the site was therefore a combination of several elements all together. The separate comparative analysis with similar sites that neglected the historic and geographical context and the fusion of elements and their interconnection was not the proper approach in this case. The delegation shared partly the position of ICOMOS in that only criteria (ii) and (iii) were the most relevant for the nomination. In reference to the justification of criterion (ii), the 19th century city of Sheki should be understood as an interchange of Persian, Russian and Caucasian influences, which together provided its particular character in terms of its heritage and traditions. In reference to criterion (iii), Sheki bears an exceptional testimony to the cultural and economic traditions that have now become part of the history of the place. The delegation believed that within the region, Sheki was particularly significant for having maintained its overall character and integrity as an urban example. The historic urban landscape of Sheki included not only the historic urban area, but also the surrounding mountain slopes that form an environmentally protected wider setting. This contributed to its exceptional significance, taking into account the scale and general visual integrity of Sheki. Relatively few modern constructions, such as the hotel and the municipality as a part of a process for social and economic development, could not be considered as having interrupted the continuity of the landscape. Nevertheless, the delegation shared the concerns of ICOMOS regarding the fact that the site had certain problems with conservation. There is existing legislation regarding the preservation of this site, however part of the implementation mechanism should be further advanced. The State Party should implement measures advised by ICOMOS in close cooperation with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. In line with these arguments, the delegation believed that the referral decision on this site would recognize its OUV and provide additional time for the State Party to eliminate all the existing concerns through the preservation and conservation clearly outlined by ICOMOS. In this regard, it would present amendments on the relevant draft decision.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that more than its great architecture and important monuments surrounded by mountain slopes, Sheki bore an exceptional testimony to the cultural and economic traditions that had become part of its everyday life. It reflected an understanding of the historic landscape of Sheki as a whole, which had survived exceptionally through the ages. The delegation believed its unique attributes required the Committee to look closer at this nomination and reconsider ICOMOS' recommendations. At the same time, it noted that the construction of hotels and municipal development was a growing concern. The delegation requested the State Party to ensure that proper documentation was carried out and that protection management systems be effectively implemented. It also considered that the legal protection of the property was adequate but more protective measures for the core and buffer zones were needed to ensure the long-term protection of the site. The amendments also invited the State Party to address the issues identified by ICOMOS, especially on how to enhance management systems. The delegation was confident that the State Party would in due course provide the requisite adjustments to bolster this nomination to meet the standards of the Convention.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** took note of the evaluation by the Advisory Body, adding that it was confident that the State Party was capable of strengthening the mandate and resources of the management team and would adopt a management plan to further ensure the long-term protection of the wider landscape in close consultation with the Advisory Body. The delegation thus supported the amended draft proposal by Poland.

The **Delegation of Finland** considered that instead of a referral, the nomination should be given a deferral so that the State Party could strengthen the comparative analysis and carry out with ICOMOS a more in-depth assessment of the nomination. A deferral would also allow the State Party to consider inviting an Advisory Mission to the property. However, noting the amendments by Poland and supported by ten other Committee Members, the delegation

would go along with the consensus in this case.

The **Delegation of Portugal** joined the remarks made by Poland and the Philippines in that the State Party be given the opportunity to improve its nomination dossier and work with ICOMOS in clarifying the different perceptions, thereby strengthening the nomination of this remarkable property. The delegation thus believed that the nomination should be referred to the State Party.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** noted that the historic town of Sheki with its traditional architectural ensemble of houses reflected building traditions of Safavid, Qajar and Russian origin, as well as wealth originating from silkworm breeding and the silk trade. According to the delegation's experts the legal protection in place was sufficient and the management system was of the right quality. The integrity and authenticity of the property was clearly shown by the State Party as adequate, and the protected area contained all the attributes related to the stated OUV. However, some problems related to conservation and preservation was recognized by the State Party and should be resolved in the near future. From the delegation's point of view, the relatively modern construction that was part of the urban development and recognized by ICOMOS as a threat should not be identified as interruptive elements in the continuity of the landscape given the size of the territory. Therefore, it supported the amendment by Poland for the referral of the historic town of Sheki nomination in order to give the State Party additional time to take into consideration and implement ICOMOS' recommendation concerning conservation and preservation.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** a bien examiné les erreurs factuelles relevées par l'État partie et pense que ces corrections apportées sont globalement acceptables, si bien que les réserves relevées par l'ICOMOS devraient être effectivement revues. Convaincu de la justesse de ces erreurs relevées, la Tunisie propose de renvoyer l'inscription de ce bien afin de donner le temps à l'État partie de revoir le dossier afin de mieux l'améliorer et le présenter à une session prochaine.

La **Délégation du Koweït** note que Sheki est une ville très riche sur le croisement multiculturel. Le Koweït appuie l'amendement présenté par la Pologne afin de donner la possibilité et le temps suffisant à l'État partie pour améliorer son dossier.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** also noted the significance of the historic town of Sheki built as a reconstruction of an earlier town after the mudflow of 1772, and its unique importance associated with the culture and farming of silkworms. It also recognized the effort of the State Party to work closely with all the stakeholders to maintain the authenticity of the property. The delegation believed that this property had enormous potential and value to merit its place on the World Heritage List and should thus be given time to revise [its nomination]. Thus, it supported the amendment put forward by Poland to have the property referred.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** remarque que la recommandation de l'ICOMOS est de ne pas inscrire le bien mais ajoute que la signification d'un monument ou d'un site dépend de son contexte, comme l'a reconnu l'ICOMOS dans sa déclaration de 2005. Ceci est particulièrement vrai dans le cas de Sheki, un centre historique avec les sites associés. La délégation soutient donc la proposition de renvoi et pour l'octroi d'un calendrier supplémentaire pour lui permettre de trouver des solutions aux problèmes qui ont été recensés.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** remarque sur la prédisposition de l'État partie à collaborer avec l'ICOMOS et de s'investir dans l'effort d'amélioration des aspects qui ont besoin d'être améliorés. De ce fait, la délégation porte en faveur de la proposition d'amendement présentée par la Pologne à différer la décision d'inscription de ce site.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** took note of the Evaluation Report by ICOMOS, but at the same time recognized the historic centre of Sheki with the Khan Palace as inclusive of all elements regarding its historic significance. It thus supported the referral of the property for

further information, and looked forward to the cooperation between the State Party and ICOMOS.

The **Delegation of Turkey** agreed with all the points raised by Poland and the proposed amendments. Sheki is one of the important centres along the historic trade routes in the region and bears an exceptional testimony to cultural and economic traditions. It is notable that urban morphology, building typology and materials are the result of such traditions and various historic buildings still remain in Sheki. One of the most important examples is the Khan Palace, which represented outstanding value with its architectural features and ornamentations. However, the nominated property faced some challenges in terms of conservation practices and policies. Special attention should be especially paid to the ongoing restoration works. Conservation guidelines were deemed essential in order to provide the necessary standards for the nominated property that should also be integrated in a conservation master plan. Developing a monitoring system for the conservation conditions and implementation of the management plan would also be required. Considering the fact that the site has OUV and that there was no need for a clarification of the boundaries or buffer zone, the delegation proposed a referral on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii), adding that the existing concerns related to the management and conservation of the nominated property would soon be tackled by the State Party.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** supported the amendment proposed by Poland.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** agreed with the referral of the nomination.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Poland, Kuwait, Tunisia, Philippines, Cuba, Turkey, Kazakhstan, Croatia, Burkina Faso, Republic of Korea and Zimbabwe. Paragraph 2 was amended and would now read, 'Refers the nomination of the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace, Azerbaijan, back to the State Party in order to further advance conservation and preservation mechanisms with a view for their better implementation'. The additional paragraphs 3 and 4 were projected onto the screen.

The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision, pronouncing paragraphs 1–4 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.20 adopted as amended.

Venetian Works of Defence between the 16th and 17th Centuries: Stato da Terra – Western Stato da Mar (Croatia, Italy, Montenegro)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](https://whc.unesco.org/en/inf/8B1)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.21](https://whc.unesco.org/en/dec/41COM8B21)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Venetian Works of Defence between the 16th and 17th centuries.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and recommended that these six components of the nominated series of the Venetian Works of Defence between 15th and 17th centuries: Stato da Terra and to the western Stato da Mar, Italy, Croatia and Montenegro be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv).

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that the site and the different elements presented for nomination were clearly relevant, and it recognized the coordination necessary to work on such a nomination. The delegation spoke of the enormous impact these elements had on the defence system, which was not simply implemented in Europe but also in the Americas. These criteria of defence formed the basis of development of new technologies, weaponry

and war in general, of which the List already comprised many examples of later stages of development of the ideas borne from that time. Cuba therefore supported the inclusion of this site on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** noted that the history of the expansion of the Republic of Venice was clearly traced in this incredible component site, which contained the spirit of history that was the basis of a flourishing culture. It was thus a valuable addition to the World Heritage mosaic, and the delegation congratulated the efforts of the States Parties concerned for the management and protection of this property.

The **Delegation of Turkey** was gratified by this nomination, adding that Turkey probably had the longest standing relations with the former Republic of Venice going back no less than 500 years, having exchanged ambassadors since the 1600s until the unification of Italy. This relationship was based on close trade and human relations, but it was also political at times. The Palace of the Doges has large and beautiful paintings describing the conflict during earlier centuries owing to issues arising from domination in the Eastern Mediterranean. Nevertheless, the real driving force had always been the ever enriching cultural and trade relations. It therefore strongly supported the inscription of this dossier as recommended by ICOMOS, and it congratulated the States Parties.

The **Delegation of Portugal** supported the inscription of the property based on the proposal by ICOMOS, noting that only six of the proposed 15 components were considered to have OUV, which did not detract from the importance or significance of the property as a whole that was part of European and world history. The delegation was well aware of the difficulty of developing serial nominations among different countries and it therefore congratulated Italy, Croatia and Montenegro for preparing and presenting this very successful nomination.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** noted that this was an impressive file, and it congratulated Croatia, Italy and Montenegro for the inscription of Venetian Works of Defence between 15th and 17th centuries, which was undoubtedly an outstanding example of *alla moderna* military culture. It commended the States Parties for their relentless efforts in providing cross-cutting legal protection for the site, and requested the States Parties to work closely with ICOMOS in the development of a report that contains adequate documentation of all maps and reconstruction work within the site.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** supported the decision to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List, and congratulated the States Parties on the inscription of this important site and fully supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Poland** congratulated the States Parties for the fruitful, international cooperation, adding that this nomination presented an important phase in the history of defensive architecture. It also presented exchanging influences in the different areas of its life, trade but also its impact on the architecture. It hoped that this cooperation would continue successfully in the future regarding the management of this site.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the States for submitting an intriguing serial nomination and it fully supported the draft decision to inscribe the property under criteria (iii) and (vi).

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** congratulated the States Parties for this serial nomination, commending them for the legal, administrative and management instruments that had been put in place since 2015. It urged the States Parties to continue its coordination and work with ICOMOS in strengthening the management and protection of this site, particularly in the areas vulnerable to tourism pressure.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** happily added its voice to congratulate the States Parties on their successful inscription.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.21 adopted.

The **Delegation of Italy** acknowledged the presence of the Mayor of Bergamo who represented all the communities involved, as well as the other community representatives, the Mayor of Palmanova, the Mayor of Peschiera del Garda, and the Minister of Culture of Lombardy. Addressing the Committee and the Advisory Bodies, the delegation spoke of Italy's happiness and pride to see the results of the fruitful cooperation that had been ongoing for years with Croatia and Montenegro. The Venetian Works of Defence between 15th and 17th centuries: Stato da Terra western Stato da Mar bore testimony to the state-of-the-art strategic and technical accomplishments of the *Serenissima* that made it possible to build complex architectural works in perfect harmony with the natural landscapes. These accomplishments go hand-in-hand with the historical and artistic expansion of the Republic of Venice towards the east. Extraordinary minds and energies were necessary to plan such innovative defence works, which later became standard models in Europe and other parts of the world.

The **Delegation of Croatia** remarked that beyond the original defence purpose of these works, the creation of a network of small multicultural communities based on trade and economic exchange was fostered, which was way ahead of its time. These towns are a living testimony to this multicultural project. The delegation spoke of the complexity of transnational candidatures that sometimes tempted States Parties to stay within their national boundaries when planning new future projects. However, this nomination proved that together, countries could indeed be stronger.

The **Mayor of Zadar** expressed heartfelt thanks for the warm welcome in Krakow, adding that she and her colleagues were committed to pursuing close cooperation in order to preserve this precious site for future generations in the spirit of the Convention. She invited the Mayor of Bergamo who represented all the communities, including Korčula and Herceg Novi, as well as promoting this nomination and who worked actively and professionally throughout the process.

The **Mayor of Bergamo** thanked the Committee and the Advisory Bodies for the prestigious award, adding that it was a source of great pride and responsibility for all. With this transnational candidacy, shared by each of the communities concerned, it aimed to express the values of peace and international cooperation that had always inspired the work of UNESCO. From today, these efforts to preserve and enhance this new treasure of World Heritage would be even greater.

Kujataa Greenland: Norse and Inuit Farming at the Edge of the Ice Cap (Denmark)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.22](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Kujataa Greenland: Norse and Inuit Farming at the Edge of the Ice Cap.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and recommended that this nomination be referred back to the State Party.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted that Kujataa was another unique representation of humankind's use and adaptation to the nature and formation of the environment, which

resulted in the emergence and evolution of a distinctive landscape and farming tradition. As acknowledged by ICOMOS, the serial approach on the selected components had already demonstrated OUV. The delegation understood from the evaluation report that mining activities within the buffer zone were considered as having a potential to pose a negative impact on the integrity and authenticity of the property. However, the delegation was confident that the State Party had already shown its willingness to commit to the recommendations of ICOMOS by defining the buffer zone and was already initiating the process recommended by the draft decision. This position of the State Party should be commended. Having considered this nomination, together with the English Lake District file that had similar potential threats in terms of quarrying activities, the delegation recommended the inscription of this property on the basis of criterion (v), while recommending that the State Party take necessary the measures to further improve the protection of the property.

The **Delegation of Poland** was convinced that the Kujataa serial property is an outstanding example of human activity in terms of landuse and settlement in the Arctic based on two distinctive types of farming: animal husbandry and marine mammal hunting cultures. It expressed cultures of Norse, Greenlandic and Inuit. The delegation underlined that the Norse-Greenlandic culture in this area represented the earliest introduction of farming to the demanding climatic conditions of the Arctic. At the same time, it was the first European settlement in the New World. As mentioned by Turkey on the assessment of cultural landscape as being very demanding, the delegation even more so wished to congratulate the State Party for the preparation of this very complicated nomination. It believed that the site deserved inscription during this session and that the people of Greenland, with the support of the Danish government, took into account the recommendations of the Advisory Body and would carefully monitor the state of conservation of the wider surroundings.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** noted that the cultural landscape represented an outstanding example of human adaptation to and interaction with the extreme natural environment of South Greenland, demonstrating the unique landuse and settlement patterns based on agro-pastoral farming and hunting during two major but disconnected historic periods, resulting in the creation of a distinctive landscape with impressive archaeological remains with modern farmsteads, fields and pastures. Nevertheless, this landscape is vulnerable under the impact of modern industrial development and other irreversible economic and socio-political changes brought to Greenland's peaceful agro-pastoral life from the modern world. Despite the lack of information on some periods of its history, and the need to increase preparedness for future potential risks, the delegation was strongly convinced that the property was managed adequately and deserved inscription on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (v), as proposed and justified by the State Party. The delegation also believed that a referral of this nomination for further research and the improvement of the protection and management systems would entail delays. Taking into account the vulnerability of the property and the ongoing preparatory process for the separation of Greenland from Denmark as an independent state, which may take many years, this might result in irreversible changes that would make inscription impossible in the future. Thus, it would be much easier to continue and finalize the required improvements through the joint efforts of Denmark's national and Greenland's local authorities following inscription on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Finland** found that this sub-arctic cultural landscape would be a significant addition to the World Heritage List. The comparative analysis indicated that the property had a strong potential to demonstrate OUV. It met criterion (v) under requirements for authenticity and integrity for the whole series. However, there was one problem in the nomination that needed to be addressed, which was the mining concessions in the buffer zone. It was recalled that when the State Party nominated the property no buffer zones had been established for the component. This was justified on the basis that all the necessary attributes of the cultural landscape had been included. However, when ICOMOS asked for a buffer zone, the State Party immediately responded by establishing a buffer zone. At the

same time, the amount of mining exploration licenses throughout the buffer zone was revealed. The delegation wished to hear from the State Party about how they responded to the concerns raised by ICOMOS with regard to the mining concessions and possible infrastructure projects related to them.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** note l'engagement de l'État partie de s'en tenir aux recommandations de l'ICOMOS. Premièrement, pour ne pas accorder de nouvelles licences d'exploitation dans la zone tampon nouvellement créée et éviter ainsi l'impact négatif sur le patrimoine. Deuxièmement, pour ne pas autoriser des activités agricoles qui porteraient atteinte aux biens et pour veiller à la bonne conservation des attributs de la VUE, non seulement du bien en question mais de l'ensemble des autres biens du patrimoine mondial. La délégation pense qu'il faut bien croire l'État partie quant à sa bonne volonté de respecter les attributs de la VUE ainsi que la mise en œuvre des mesures de protection et de gestion. Et en ce sens, la Tunisie estime qu'inscrire ce bien maintenant, au cours de cette session, est une autre manière de le protéger. Elle rejoint la position d'inscrire le bien sur le critère (v).

The **Chairperson** invited Denmark to respond to Finland's question.

The **Delegation of Denmark** explained that after having received the Evaluation Report, Denmark and the Government of Greenland discussed the protection of the buffer zone, informing the Committee that with regard to the license for mineral exploration and related infrastructure projects, the activities covered by licenses granted under the Mineral Resource Act must be performed in accordance to acknowledged international practices. Activities must be performed appropriately and in a sound manner with regard to safety, health, the environment, resource utilization and social sustainability. Environmental protection rules under the Mineral Resource Act aim to prevent, limit and combat impacts on nature and the environment, which could cause damage to natural or cultural heritage values. A licensed infrastructure project must respect all existing rights of other parties in the area, and planned activities are submitted to a process of consultation with relevant authorities and other stakeholders before the activity can commence, among these the Steering Group for the heritage site. Moreover, the delegation informed the Committee that two mineral exploration licenses in the buffer zone had recently been relinquished. Following the recommendation of the report, the Government of Greenland was positively considering the possibility of not granting new exploration licenses in the buffer zones, including in the relinquished areas previously covered by exploration licenses. The Government of Greenland also started a process concerning developing and implementing Heritage Impact Assessment for the development proposals in general and in the nominated area and the buffer zone, as an addition to the Environmental Impact Assessment and Social Impact Assessment already implemented. Denmark was determined to communicate all major projects that could impact the OUV of the nominated area to the Committee and to seek solutions to any possible difficulties in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Kazakhstan, Poland, Finland and Turkey. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was amended, which would read, 'Inscribes Kujataa Greenland: Norse and Inuit Farming at the Edge of the Ice Cap, Denmark, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of criterion (v)'. Paragraph 3 would read, 'Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value'. There was a new paragraph 4, which would read, 'Recommends that the State Party further clarify the permitted land uses and provide specific protective mechanisms in the buffer zones (including protection from mining exploration and exploitation in these areas)'. The original paragraph 4 would become paragraph 5, and the new paragraph 6 would read, 'Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2018, a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations'. The Rapporteur noted that the outstanding statement of OUV was only available in English for the time being, but the French version would soon be available.

The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision, and pronounced paragraphs 1–6 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.22 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Denmark** spoke on behalf of Denmark and the Government of Greenland to thank the Committee for the inscription of Kujataa Greenland: Norse and Inuit Farming at the Edge of the Ice Cap to the World Heritage List. The delegation began by thanking the World Heritage Centre for the good cooperation throughout the entire nomination process, and expressed respect for ICOMOS' work, knowledge and professionalism. During the nomination process, Denmark's awareness of cultural values of the Norse and Inuit farming landscape was steadily increased and it hoped and believed that inclusion of this landscape on the World Heritage List would lead to a growing awareness of Greenland around the world of this valuable heritage. It was noted that the nomination was the result of a remarkable cooperation between officials in both Denmark and Greenland, the Greenland National Museum and Archives, politicians and authorities from the municipality of Kujataa, settlement councils, as well as other local stakeholders. The delegation was proud to take custody of this valuable landscape and would do its utmost to protect and safeguard Kujataa Greenland: Norse and Inuit Farming at the Edge of the Ice Cap. The delegation added that this was a very proud moment for Greenland in presenting a part of its culture to the whole world, which would inspire future generations to see and understand their rich culture and origins.

The **Representative of the Municipality of Kujataa** thanked the Committee for granting the Kujataa inscription, and the Greenland Government, the Danish Ministry of Culture, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for the excellent cooperation over the last few years. He added that the community was a small nation in a giant country living under difficult climatic conditions, but though it is rough, the beautiful country was deeply loved and he appreciated this global recognition of the Norse culture and Norse history, which was long awaited. It had been an extensive and long process of 15 years in which people on lonely farms, villages and in towns had participated. The Representative guaranteed that the local population of Kujataa would love and honour its heritage and ensure that the beauty of Kujataa is preserved for future generations. Further, he welcomed everyone to Kujataa to experience the Greenland adventure and Inuit language.

[The Vice-Chairperson (Portugal) took up the role of chairing the next session]

Taputapuātea (France) – 41 COM 8B.23

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.23](#)

The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next item and the nomination of Taputapuātea, France.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and the recommendation that Taputapuātea be inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi).

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Portugal** félicite chaleureusement la France et tout particulièrement la Polynésie française pour ce dossier de nomination très bien préparé sur ce site remarquable. En effet, beaucoup plus qu'un site ou un paysage, Taputapuātea est un exemple exceptionnel de la relation étroite entre le patrimoine matériel et immatériel et leur croisement harmonieux. Le Portugal est ainsi heureux de soutenir l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of Turkey** commended the State Party for nominating Taputapuātea, the ancient cultural and political centre for the *mā'ohi* civilization of eastern Polynesia, as an

exceptional cultural landscape with its sacred mountains, forests and archaeological remains in two valleys and a seascape consisting of the lagoon, coral reef and the ocean expanse. As such, the property was a remarkable demonstration of the interlinks of its natural and cultural attributes, including unique seafaring and oral traditions and values attributed to the living environment, which was very delicately expressed in the nomination dossier. Equally well demonstrated was the centrality to the modern revival of the way of life that produced this exceptional cultural landscape as an intersection of the world of the living and the dead of ancestors and gods for the *mā'ohi*. The spiritual aspect of the property and the millennial continuity of the use of the site to transformative changes were gentle reminders of the difficulties involved in the preservation of cultural landscapes. By taking all the necessary measures, all the attributes revealing their value for all humanity would thus be protected. However, the delegation expressed caution in the museumification of these landscapes, especially for visitors whose presence after inscription would present another challenge for the continuity of the traditional uses whose participatory management model would hopefully combat these challenges. Turkey thus supported inscription of Taputapuātea on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi).

La **Délégation du Koweït** soutient l'inscription de ce paysage culturel exceptionnel qui se caractérise par des vestiges archéologiques, en particulier des *marae* ouverts à ciel fabriqués avec des pierres et des coraux. Il s'agit d'un bien sacré de culture maori qui témoigne de la richesse et de la complexité des traditions de cette civilisation étonnante. Ce paysage mérite d'être inscrit et doit enrichir la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Le Koweït félicite la France.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** congratulated France on the inscription of the property to the World Heritage List, noting its outstanding value and associated cultural landscape and seascape under criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi). It hoped that the recommendations by ICOMOS would be taken into account to ensure the continuity of the OUV of the property.

La **Délégation des Philippines** remarque que Taputapuātea, dans la Polynésie française, est un monde maritime qui est complexe et inhabituel. Cette région historique peut avoir ses racines dans la culture austronésienne, donc avec l'Asie du Sud-Est même, à laquelle les Philippines appartiennent. Ce qui reste encore à Taputapuātea du point de vue archéologique est très important et doit certainement être protégé. La délégation recommande que le site soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et félicite la Polynésie française.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** congratulated the State Party for this exceptional nomination. The recommended inscription of the property on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi) had been adequately demonstrated, while the intangible values of the site, its archaeological sites in places associated with oral tradition, and the intangible features, i.e. origin stories, ceremonies and traditional knowledge make the property an exceptional example of the rare juxtaposition and continuity of the ancient (traditional) and modern (contemporary) values of the people. It was also noteworthy that the Advisory Body was satisfied with the boundaries of the property and the buffer zone, not showing evidence of any element that should be included within the property. Appropriate protective management systems were also in place where additional mechanisms to strengthen the existing systems were also being developed. Zimbabwe thus supported the draft decision to inscribe Taputapuātea on the World Heritage List during this session.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** thanked the State Party for bringing forth this nomination, an exceptional cultural landscape that is a political, ceremonial, funerary and religious centre demonstrating over 1,000 years of traditional use. Jamaica encouraged the State Party to follow through with ICOMOS' recommendations, especially related to management implementation and additional research on geomorphology. Jamaica congratulated France on this inscription.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** congratulated the State Party on this inscription. Taputapuātea is an outstanding example of *marae* built by the *mā'ohi* people from the 14th to the 18th centuries. The *marae* complex and the archaeological sites testify to the long history of the *mā'ohi* civilization with strong physical and archaeological evidence symbolizing the origins of Polynesian people connecting with their ancestors. The delegation believed that the State Party would continue its endeavors to preserve the sites of memory that give testimony to the ancient *mā'ohi* civilization, to protect the *marae*, and to preserve the terrestrial and marine environments.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked that his site made a major contribution to the representativeness and credibility of the World Heritage List, bearing in mind the region in which this site is located. The delegation congratulated the State Party for its excellent nomination both from a technical and content point of view.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** souscrit à ce jugement concerté de l'ensemble des membres du Comité, et donc félicite l'État partie pour ce projet d'inscription qui apparemment jouit.

La **Délégation du Poland** remarque que Taputapuātea illustre le développement exceptionnel d'une durée de mille ans de la civilisation maori, avec des exemples extraordinaires d'architectures. La Pologne appuie très fortement l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, en félicite fortement la France pour cette nomination.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.23 adopted.

La **Délégation de la France** remercie la Comité du patrimoine mondial et à tous ses États membres, en particulier ceux qui viennent de s'exprimer. Elle remercie également l'ICOMOS pour cette inscription d'un site sacré, mais que est aussi un site de rayonnement culturel et politique pour l'ensemble du Pacifique.

Le **Président de la Polynésie Française, Mr Édouard Fritch**, commence par s'exprimer en langue maori. Au nom des Polynésiens, des habitants de l'île sacrée de Raiatea, il exprime toute leur émotion, fierté, joie et gratitude pour la reconnaissance mondiale du paysage culturel Taputapuātea comme patrimoine de l'humanité. Cette reconnaissance est un moment historique qui consacre une civilisation polynésienne extraordinaire, celle de nos pères, ces navigateurs aux étoiles qui partirent de Taputapuātea, centre et terre mythique de haute spiritualité, en emportant une pierre de fondation, un *tapu*, sur le grand et vaste océan Pacifique. Le Président exprime ses pensées aux peuples frères du Pacifique, car ce paysage culturel est aussi le leur, tout comme cette reconnaissance mondiale est leur reconnaissance, et ils la partagent, tout comme la fraternité polynésienne, son accueil légendaire et leur souhait de faire triompher aujourd'hui les valeurs universelles de paix, de partage et de préservation de toutes les cultures premières sur tous les continents. Le prestigieux sésame qui vient d'être décerné est un signe fantastique, mais également un défi. La communauté s'engagera à préserver et transmettre aux générations futures, mais également au monde, ce bien ancestral, ce trésor. Le Président remercie la France pour y avoir cru, à la Pologne pour son accueil et son hospitalité, et aux membres du Comité, aux représentants des États membres pour leur confiance et, finalement, aux hommes et aux femmes qui ont fait aujourd'hui d'un rêve une réalité. [Nouvelles phrases en langue maori.]

Caves and Ice Age Art in the Swabian Jura (Germany)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.24](#)

The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next item on Caves and Ice Age Art.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination from Germany, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and recommended that Caves and Ice Age art in the Swabian Jura, Germany, be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii).

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** noted with satisfaction that the nomination to inscribe the caves of was supported by the Advisory Body, adding that the recommendation to inscribe the property on the basis of criterion (iii) was appropriate as it adequately supported the property's OUV. The facts that underpin the heritage was the product of modern humans who first arrived in Europe during the Ice Age, and the Swabian Jura in southern Germany was one area that these people made home. It was noted that the State Party had carried archaeological research at this property for many years and the delegation was satisfied that this property should join the World Heritage List. Zimbabwe therefore supported its inscription.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the State Party for the spectacular inscription of the Caves and Ice Age Art in the Swabian Jura under criterion (iii). It encouraged the State Party to consider ICOMOS' recommendations.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** joined other previous speakers in congratulating the State Party on the inscription of Caves and Ice Age Art on the World Heritage List. The delegation recognized that the property provided an exceptional testimony to Upper Paleolithic culture in Europe. Through the artifacts and the surrounding landscape, one could understand how the first modern humans settled in Europe, as well as the origins of human artistic development. With regard to site management, the delegation hoped that the State Party would continue its efforts to maintain a balance between research and conservation, as recommended by the Committee.

The **Delegation of Tanzania** noted the OUV of the property and its diverse expression of cultural heritage of more than 40 millennia, as demonstrated through the distinctive carved figurines, musical instruments and items of adornment on the property. It was on the basis under criterion (iii) that Tanzania supported the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. Furthermore, Tanzania agreed with the Advisory Body to recommend the development of a unified documentation database to include data on the caves, their findings and all excavations that have taken place as a measure to retain the OUV of the property. Tanzania had no doubt on the authenticity of the management regime of the property and therefore supported the inscription of this property, congratulating Germany on its inscription.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that Germany's dossier was impressive in terms of documentation and content given the range and scale of the archaeological research. The artefacts recovered from these caves were impressive and represented both symbolic art and a belief system of human behaviour dating back as far as 43,000 years. The artefacts, figurines and musical instruments recovered from these cave sites were of great historic importance and deserved international recognition. Hence, the Philippines fully supported inscription.

The **Delegation of Poland** also remarked on the exceptional testimony of the property to the culture of the first modern humans to settle in Europe with its unique concentration of archaeological sites with some of the oldest figurative art and musical instruments to be found in the world. The delegation thus strongly supported inscription on the World Heritage List and warmly congratulated the State Party for preparing this nomination.

La **Délégation du Koweït** félicite l'Allemagne pour ses efforts et pour ce magnifique site.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** congratulated Germany for the inscription of this property

and thanked the Advisory Bodies for their evaluation materials.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.24 adopted.

The **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated Germany on behalf of the entire Committee.

The **Delegation of Germany** was delighted and thanked the Committee for its decision. The Caves and Ice Age Art in the Swabian Jura region document an important phase in the early history of humankind with figurative representations and musical instruments from the period of 40,000 to 31,000 BC bearing witness to this era. Indeed, this site closed a gap on the World Heritage List. The delegation thanked the Committee, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for their support during the evaluation process, and expressed thanks to all those who conducted research and advocated for the recognition of the site over the course of many years with tireless passion, patience and great persistence.

The **Representative of the Federal State of Baden-Württemberg** was extremely happy with the decision to inscribe the Caves and Ice Age Art in the Swabian Jura on the World Heritage List, adding that this was the first World Heritage site in Germany dated to the Ice Age in the context of human evolution. The State highly valued this fact for which it was very proud. This property belonged to the most important place of prehistory, not only for Germany and Europe but for all humanity worldwide. Thanks to a long research tradition of over 100 years, the world had gained insights into the early development of what researchers call 'cultural modernity'. Caves and Ice Age Art in the Swabian Jura thus represented an exceptional testimony to the cultural tradition of early modern humans and an expression of the earliest art and music of humankind. The State guaranteed to do its very best to protect and preserve this outstanding heritage in the name of the worldwide community. In this context, the Representative was delighted to announce that the procedures for all planned wind farms near the property had all been rejected. He thanked all the parties involved in the nomination process as well as the Advisory Bodies, the members of the HEADS programme for their invaluable support, and the Committee for the inscription.

Tarnowskie Góry Lead-Silver-Zinc Mine and its Underground Water Management System (Poland)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.25](#)

The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the next item on Tarnowskie Góry Lead-Silver-Zinc Mine and its Underground Water Management System.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that there were still 10 nominations and 13 boundary modifications pending.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and recommended that the property be deferred.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Turkey** congratulated the State Party for the elaborate nomination dossier and for the well-prepared management plan. It also appreciated the State Party's approach to the category of the nomination, as it preferred to nominate a single property in order to avoid an artificial division for the sake of better presentation and management. Tarnowskie Góry is a unique example of industrial architecture and technology together with

its underground and aboveground components. The delegation did not agree with the view that the property should not be inscribed on the underground parts. Likewise, it found that the discussion dividing uniqueness from exceptionality was not superfluous at this stage. Poland had conducted a broad and systematic comparative analysis, and although the property was recommended for inscription as a system as a whole, proposals for further analysis focused on separate features, like the land of the adits, the functioning of the pumping system, use of steam engine, and so on. Also, considering that industrial heritage is one of the least represented categories on the World Heritage List, Poland's work on this analysis should be appreciated, as properties of similar characteristics were already limited. With this understanding, the delegation was of the view that the construction of a well-functioning mining system within a technically challenged flat terrain bore testimony to human genius and creativity. The property was thus a unique example of an industrial complex, and it recommended its inscription on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (i) and (iv).

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** recognized that the Tarnowskie Góry mine is a very unique type of underground mine, and its authenticity and integrity was also recognized. In particular, the property kept intact the largest underground water management system of the historic mine, which has the potential of OUV. Although ICOMOS expressed some concerns about the legal protective measures, the delegation appreciated the endeavours made by the State Party to achieve progress. Therefore, it strongly supported the amendment by Turkey, congratulating Poland and its people on the inscription of this very remarkable property.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that the property had yet to be inscribed.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** noted that the birthplace of ore mining and important industrial centre of Tarnowskie Góry Lead-Silver-Zinc Mine and its Underground Water Management System was truly of great historical significance in Upper Silesia, Central Europe and the world. It believed that the property satisfied criterion (i) on the grounds that it demonstrated human creative genius in turning the unwanted presence of water in the mines into an opportunity to supply water to towns and industries; criterion (ii) on the grounds that it exhibited pioneering technical interchanges and transfers of technology between this region and continental Europe and Great Britain; criterion (iii) on the grounds that it bore witness to the wider technological and industrial culture of Silesia and of the 500-year old multicultural mining tradition of the area; and criterion (iv) on the grounds that Tarnowskie Góry is a unique technical complex that combined mining operations and water supply development in the Silesian context between the 16th and 20th centuries. Hence, the delegation welcomed the amendments submitted to the draft decision, adding that inscription would no doubt further strengthen the protection of this valuable cultural heritage.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked that Tarnowskie Góry was a significant property that was representative of a much larger regional group of mines that exploited this European province. The comparative analysis was broad and multilevel with all important aspects taken into account, and strongly demonstrated the exceptional significance and unique character of this nominated property in its national and international context. Regarding authenticity, the delegation noted that the cultural value of the nominated property was reliably and credibly expressed, and made a significant contribution to OUV. Regarding protection and management of the property, the delegation remarked that a very specific site required a specific approach with the stakeholders declaring that a management plan submitted at the time of nomination had successfully and effectively managed the entire underground system to sustain its original function and high state of conservation over a considerable time. Protection came in the form of an effective mix of national and local legislation in the adopted plans and the property was under single State ownership and operational management. Boundaries were delineated to include all the essential attributes that support its historical and geographical integrity, as well as the structural and functional integrity of the system. The delegation strongly noted the OUV of the site in the underground and aboveground mining water management system dating from the late 18th to the early 20th

century. It was thus in favor of inscribing this property on the World Heritage List under criteria (i) and (iv).

The **Delegation of Croatia** supported inscription under criteria (i), (ii) and (iv), adding that it had observed critical flaws in the Advisory Body's recommendation, mostly based on the comparative analysis and its impact on the respective justification criteria that were said to not have been met. Poland had given a response to those requests and its diligent factual error report convinced the delegation that the comparative analysis was indeed conclusive as to the exceptionality of the property. Regarding the justification for criteria, the delegation was of the firm view that criteria (i), (ii) and (iv) had been met, but agreed with the Advisory Body that (iii) had not yet been met. It further agreed with the recommendations outlined, except for the unusual request for 3D scanning of the entire underground property, which it found prohibitively expensive and timely. The delegation noted the responses of the State Party in this regard and that it had already obtained full and accurate plans for the property. It therefore saw no valid reason for that recommendation. The delegation supported inscription under criteria (i), (ii) and (iv).

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended Poland for its nomination. Having reviewed the file carefully, it noted that the property was the largest of its kind in Poland with an underground and aboveground mining water supply system that represented a unique technical ensemble of metal mining and water management. This industrial nomination filled a gap in the World Heritage List and therefore Jamaica supported its inscription under criteria (i), (ii) and (iv), as indicated in the draft decision. It encouraged Poland to work with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in the recommendations provided.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** was confident that this nominated property had a high possibility to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. It recommended that the State Party conduct further consultations with the Secretariat and the Advisory Body to develop an archaeological investigation programme focusing on the mining landscape, and to consider the addition of the historic water tower to the property. Indonesia supported the draft decision proposed by Turkey.

The **Delegation of Angola** also supported the proposed amendment by Turkey, though it wished to ask the State Party on the reasoning and significance of adding the historic water tower, and it also wished to hear some information from ICOMOS on this matter.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** commended the work by the State Party in proposing the nominated property as well as its commitment in ensuring the management and conservation of the site. The delegation joined the speakers to support inscription of the Tarnowskie Góry on the World Heritage List. It also asked the State Party to work with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies on their recommendations.

La **Délégation du Koweït** note que le Gouvernement polonais a pris en considération la recommandation sur le site et a assuré l'accomplissement de toutes les conditions requises, ce qui rend ce site qualifié pour l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial selon les critères (i), (ii), (iii) et (iv). Ce site représente un exemple exceptionnel d'un réseau minier historique à grande échelle. Le Koweït félicite l'État partie pour ses efforts et soutient l'inscription de ce bien.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** recognized the importance and uniqueness of the property and supported the necessity for further capacity, as proposed by ICOMOS. At the same time, it underlined that the nominated property contained all the elements necessary to express its outstanding significance. The delegation considered that the justification of the OUV was fully applicable to the nominated property, and the management and monitoring systems were well developed. The Kazakh national experts seconded ICOMOS' positive evaluation on the defined boundaries and the buffer zones. In addition, it was noted that – for the most part – the site did not suffer from uncontrolled threats. The delegation thus believed that further careful documentation and investigation, as proposed by ICOMOS, would be implemented by the State Party to increase capacity to demonstrate and justify integrity and authenticity.

Kazakhstan thus proposed that the Committee consider the inscription of the site to the World Heritage List at this session.

The **Delegation of Cuba** wished to see this site inscribed, but it had one query concerning criterion (i) and wished to first ask the Advisory Body whether in its evaluation criterion (i) was deemed definitive, or whether there was a requirement for further information. It also sought further clarification from the State Party in this regard.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** believed that the property met criteria (i), (ii) and (iv) for its inscription. The boundaries of the property defined the area, providing a complete representation of the significant attributes of the mine, while its authenticity was equally credibly expressed. The State Party's legal instruments for the property's protection and management were considered appropriate, while the active involvement of other non-governmental stakeholders further enhanced protection and management. Zimbabwe considered that adoption of the revised draft decision recommending inscription would go a long way in encouraging the State Party and other stakeholders to do more to protect and conserve the property.

The **Delegation of Portugal** considered that not only the file but also the extensive factual error letter provided by the State Party addressed the many challenges identified by ICOMOS. As mentioned by many of the Members, the broad comparative analysis already demonstrated the great significance and unique character of this nominated property. The delegation understood that the State Party was fully committed to implementing the recommendations and it encouraged the State Party to work closely with ICOMOS in that regard. Portugal thus supported this amendment to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List at this session.

La **Délégation du Liban** soutient le projet d'amendement proposé par la Turquie.

The **Delegation of Tanzania** remarked that the nomination file, its evaluation, the factual errors submitted by the State Party, and the subsequent response of ICOMOS had been reviewed carefully. The delegation wished to congratulate the State Party for its efforts in conserving this unique mining. Thus, it supported the position of Turkey and other Committee Members to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** note que le dossier est bien présenté et élaboré. De surcroît elle considère les erreurs factuelles relevées par l'État partie à leur juste valeur ce qui pousse la Tunisie à soutenir l'inscription de ce bien unique suivant l'amendement proposé par la Turquie. La délégation est sûr que la Pologne est à même de répondre positivement à l'ensemble des recommandations, notamment en ce qui concerne la conservation et la protection du site.

The **Delegation of Finland**, like Cuba, wished to hear from ICOMOS on criterion (i) as it did not think the site could carry criterion (i), mainly in representing a masterpiece of human creative genius, as the analysis did not point towards the exceptionality of the mine. The delegation was however happy with the other criteria put forward.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted the questions from Angola, Cuba and Finland addressed to the State Party, as well as questions to ICOMOS, inviting Poland to respond.

The **Delegation of Poland** noted one of the questions referred to the reason behind adding the water tower, explaining that the water tower was above the Kaehler Shaft, one of the main shafts in the mine, which was proposed during the technical evaluation mission for the sake of integrity. As for criterion (i), the delegation was of the opinion, as stated in the nomination, that the principal values of the nominated property lay in the underground system, which manifested the integrated mining and water management network. In its opinion, the monumental underground mining and water management system Tarnowskie Góry is a masterpiece of hydraulic engineering and an exceptional expression of technical creativity.

With regard to the towers, the **Representative of ICOMOS** noted that Poland had replied consistently with ICOMOS' approach, adding that the context of the deferral was due to the fact that ICOMOS found the combination of attributes promising, but it didn't find sufficient attributes and hence the deferral. Moreover, the mission expert was of the view that other potential attributes were not investigated. With regard to criterion (i), ICOMOS understood that the proposal concerned the underground component, however, it was pointed out that it had been used for technologies and for mining, where the tangible evidence and the exceptionalities of this evidence, even underground, was much more significant. One of the mines proclaimed under criterion (i) was a Neolithic mine dating back 5,000-3,000 Before Present, so a long time ago when the technology available at that time was lesser compared to today and in the 18th and 19th centuries, while the other mining site awarded criterion (i) was the Harz Rammelsberg water management system where the extensiveness and interconnectedness and the expanse of the system were found to deserve criterion (i). In this particular case, it was not just the ICOMOS Panel that found criterion (i) inappropriate, but also a number of desk reviews that were shared by experts within the mining and technological sector.

The **Delegation of Turkey** agreed that this was a transfer of the British steam engine technology, but it did not stop there, it went beyond that and concerned the application of this very technology to a difficult terrain, and as such the system as a whole was tangible evidence.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted amendments by Turkey, Azerbaijan, Republic of Korea and Croatia. Paragraph remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified, which would now read, 'Inscribes the Tarnowskie Góry Lead-Silver-Zinc Mine and its Underground Water Management System, Poland, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv)'. Paragraph 3 was amended, and would read, 'Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value', followed by the statement. Paragraph 4 had a slight modification, 4.b) was deleted and 4. e) was added. A new paragraph 5 would read, 'Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2019, a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020'.

The **Delegation of Turkey** wished to add Kazakhstan as co-sponsor of the draft decision.

The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the draft decision, and pronounced paragraphs 1–5 adopted.

The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.25 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Poland** spoke of how happy the delegation was for the inscription, passing the microphone to the national expert.

The **Expert on the Tarnowskie Góry Lead-Silver-Zinc Mine and its Underground Water Management System** expressed profound gratitude to the Committee for the decision to inscribe the Tarnowskie Góry Lead-Silver-Zinc Mine and its Underground Water Management System on the World Heritage List. Sincere thanks were also expressed from the Tarnowskie Góry Land Lovers' Association, a group of people who had taken care of the mining heritage of the region for over 60 years, as well as Tarnowskie Góry Municipality, Katowice regional government, the National Heritage Board of Poland and all the parties involved and responsible for the protection, conservation and preservation of this World Heritage property. Water, the main feature of the property, is an obstacle in the development of mining and at the same time an essential condition for life and development. Through this nomination and inscription, the Committee paid tribute to the work and wisdom of past generations thanks to whom our and future generations could live and prosper.

The **Delegation of Poland** was grateful to all the Committee Members and the delegations.

The **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated Poland on behalf of everyone.

Assumption Cathedral and Monastery of the town-island of Sviyazhsk (Russian Federation)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.26](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next and final item for this session on Assumption Cathedral and Monastery of the town-island of Sviyazhsk.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination and recommended for inscription under proposed criteria (ii) and (iv).

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Liban** note que la cathédrale de l'Assomption située dans l'île-village de Svaijsk, au carrefour des routes de la soie et de la Volga, témoigne aujourd'hui du dialogue des religions. Cette cathédrale russe orthodoxe est située dans un environnement multiconfessionnel, marqué par une tradition islamique ainsi que par un type d'architecture et de décoration murale qui reflète les traditions byzantine et russe et intègre l'iconographie chrétienne d'occident. Le Liban multiculturel et pays de dialogue interreligieux appuie la recommandation d'inscription de ce site.

La **Délégation du Koweït** explique que le site remplit le critère (ii) puisqu'il ancre une valeur exceptionnelle dans le domaine de la culture et précisément dans l'évolution de l'architecture, ainsi que le critère (iv) où le site représente un témoignage unique en son genre au niveau de l'art architectural. La délégation soutient l'inscription de la cathédrale de l'Assomption située dans l'île-village de Svaijsk sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, conformément à la recommandation de l'organisation consultative, et elle félicite l'État partie pour ses efforts distingués.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** complimented the nomination of Sviyazhsk, noting that the initial nomination submitted in 2012 was considerably remodeled and now presented all the necessary component parts. The complete iconographic programme on the Assumption Cathedral assured the integrity of the site with the buffer zone designed to take into consideration the protection of the view towards the Cathedral, while authenticity was justified and approved by the Advisory Body. Kazakhstan supported the nomination of Sviyazhsk to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Tanzania** fully subscribed to the inscription of this property under criteria (ii) and (iv), as ICOMOS' analysis clearly indicated that the OUV of this particular property was well justified. Tanzania also noted that the conditions of integrity and authenticity, boundary and buffer zone, and the legal aid protective measure were also in good order. The delegation therefore supported the draft decision for inscription of this property on the World Heritage List and congratulated Russia on this inscription.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** congratulated the Russian Federation with its very successful nomination and property. Indeed, the Assumption Cathedral architecture and interior painting decoration were rare evidence of the Orthodox civilization that also illustrated the new stage of the development of Russian culture and art, which embodied the achievements of Byzantine classical heritage. The collective programme expressed by the mural paintings, themes and subjects also reflected their location in the church, while the craftsmanship expressed by its construction and decoration bore credible witness to the proposed OUV of the property. Along with this exceptional architecture and the cultural significance of this site, the delegation noted its spiritual intercultural and interreligious dimension, which was very important and resonated with the spirit of the Convention and UNESCO. Azerbaijan thus fully supported this inscription.

The **Delegation of Peru** fully supported all the analyses from ICOMOS and the work carried out by the State Party, and thus it supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated the Russian Federation for this very well prepared nomination. Assumption Cathedral of the town-island of Sviyazhsk founded by Ivan the Terrible in the mid-16th century was also historically linked with Peter the Great who modernized Russia and, as indicated by ICOMOS, opened a window to the West. This was indeed a very emblematic site that is part of world history and whose OUV fully justified its inscription on the World Heritage List. The delegation congratulated Russia for this remarkable property.

The **Delegation of Turkey** noted that the Assumption Monastery and its Cathedral was located in the town-island of Sviyazhsk, close to Kazan the capital of the Republic of Tartarstan. The nominated property marked historically important events in the life of Russia and Orthodox Christianity. The location and geopolitical framework of the nominated property were also notable in the historical sense. The unique property presented the interaction between the Christian Orthodox and Muslim cultures, and for this reason it was exceptional evidence of cultural diversity and OUV. The boundaries of the property and its buffer zone were adequate, and criteria (ii) and (iv) had been justified. The conditions of integrity and authenticity were also met. The management system was also adequate, and the nominated property was notably compatible with the UNESCO's Initiative on Heritage of Religious Interests. As stated in the ICOMOS report, the current name of the property focused on the Cathedral alone, and it agreed with the position of the Advisory Body to propose modifying the name as the Assumption Cathedral and Monastery of the town-island of Sviyazhsk. It supported the draft decision and inscription on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked on the wonderful nomination and it congratulated the State Party on its achievement, commending it for showing the exemplary way that perseverance was often needed in a nomination process. It was recalled that in 2012 this nomination had received a critical review from ICOMOS in that the cultural landscape could not be seen to manifest OUV. The State Party withdrew the nomination file, invited an Advisory Mission, and submitted a substantially re-scoped nomination. Everyone could now celebrate the results of that approach.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** congratulated the State Party for this nomination. Having had the privilege [on a personal note] of visiting the Cathedral, she attested to the OUV of this Cathedral, as well as its authenticity and integrity. Zimbabwe thus supported inscription of this property.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** spoke of the Assumption Cathedral and the Monastery as an outstanding religious property that bore witness to cultural exchange in the Eurasian region. The architecture and the mural paintings in the Cathedral also informed on how the Christian Orthodox and Muslim cultures had interchanged with Western Christianity. Once inscribed, the site would have even more visibility. The delegation hoped that the State Party could find a good solution to respond to increasing visits and a museum development strategy.

The **Delegation of Croatia** fully welcomed and congratulated the State Party for an inscription of this exceptional property on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Cuba** congratulated the State Party and also the process that had been undertaken between the different Advisory Bodies, and in this case a review of the nomination.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** noted that this was a spectacular site with many complex cultural influences. It commended the State Party for its comparative analysis that took into consideration inscribed properties both within and beyond the borders of the Russian Federation. Although the structural and physical condition of the beautiful frescoes remain

worrisome, the State Party's conservation efforts had been duly noted. In this regard, the delegation echoed the Advisory Body's recommendation to establish a permanent monitoring system for the frescoes, and to consider the impact of increased tourism to the microenvironment of the church. To this end, the delegation strongly supported inscription.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** souscrit à la bonne tenue, à la bonne conservation et à la VUE de ce magnifique patrimoine. Elle est sûr que l'État partie saura comment répondre aux recommandations de l'ICOMOS.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** fully supported the analysis of ICOMOS and the Committee, and congratulated the Russian Federation for the excellent and well prepared dossier. It welcomed the inscription of the Assumption Cathedral of the town-island of Sviyazhsk on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv).

The **Delegation of Poland** spoke of the Assumption Cathedral and Monastery as a perfect example of historical and geopolitical interchanges in Eurasia. It stressed the importance and beauty of the paintings in the Cathedral church, and supported the inscription of this site. The delegation congratulated its neighbouring country for the very well prepared nomination.

With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.26 adopted.

The **Delegation of the Russian Federation** expressed deep satisfaction and sincere thanks not only to Members of the Committee but also to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS who had provided support to the inscription of the Assumption Cathedral of the town-island of Sviyazhsk on the World Heritage List. This decision recognized the OUV of the artistic and cultural legacy of this area, and in particular its amazing 16th century frescoes in the Cathedral. Another aspect worth highlighting was the importance of this site in Sviyazhsk, which is in the territory of the Republic of Tatarstan, part of the Russian Federation. Over the centuries, this Republic had seen Christians and Muslims living hand-in-hand and side-by-side. It is one of three World Heritage Sites in this region. First, the Historic and Architectural Complex of the Kremlin of Kazan, which was the capital of the Republic, and a magnificent mosque beside the Christian temples. The second was Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex, where the first Islamic settlements set up in the country, and now these artistic frescoes inscribed on the List. This illustrated the wise leadership choices of Tatarstan who encouraged this cohabitation between the different religions. In this way, in a world marked by religious clashes, Tatarstan stood as an ideal flag bearer of UNESCO's values, of how multi-confessional people could continue to uphold the values of this noble institution. The delegation congratulated the representatives of Tatarstan who were here present at this session, commending them for their most professional endeavours in preparing this nomination.

The **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated the Russian Federation, give the Secretariat the floor.

The Secretariat announced two side events that was currently taking place. In addition, the Working Group on the Operational Guidelines had completed its work and therefore an informal discussion would be held instead on periodic reporting with the Secretariat and States Parties.

[Close of morning session]

SEVENTH DAY – Sunday 9 July 2017

FOURTEENTH SESSION

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 8B [Continuation]: NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Talayotic Minorca (Spain)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](http://whc.17/41.COM/INF.8B1)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.27](http://whc.41.COM/8B.27)

Reprising his role, the **Chairperson** expressed gratitude to the Vice-Chairperson from Portugal for the enormous progress. He took the opportunity to congratulate France, Germany, Poland and the Russian Federation for their inscriptions. He then turned to the next item on Talayotic Minorca.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the nomination and the recommendation that the examination of the nomination be deferred.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Cuba** remarked on the interesting proposal, adding that it would give visibility and recognition to ancient Mediterranean cultures. The delegation found that the analysis made by the Advisory Body with respect to this file was good and it agreed with the proposal to defer. However, for the sake of better understanding what the State Party was being asked to do, the delegation asked ICOMOS to provide more detail about the desired approach to work on this file, especially on 2.b) of the draft decision. It also sought to hear from the State Party.

The **Delegation of Turkey** commended the State Party for this nomination of Talayotic Minorca as another exceptional property exemplifying the variety and strategies of adaptation to specific environments since prehistory in the spirit of the now closed HEADS thematic programme. The delegation believed that in order for the State Party to be productive in the time allocated by the deferral decision, as proposed by the Advisory Body, with which it agreed, it would be good to clarify the model according to which this nomination could be developed. The proposal was a serial nomination and one option would be to enhance this model of nomination, while the other option was to prepare a new nomination as a relic cultural landscape. The delegation believed that the choice between the two options should be made based on management priorities in such a way as to ensure the highest level of protection and the most efficient management offered by the relevant national and provincial legal and administrative framework. In this regard, it wished to hear from the Advisory Body and the State Party.

La **Délégation du Koweït** remarque qu'il s'agit d'un site où a vécu la civilisation des anciens à partir du 1^{er} millénaire avant J.-C, et l'un des berceaux de l'humanité et son empreinte primaire. Ce bien exprime vivement la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. La délégation tient à remercier l'Espagne pour la préparation du dossier de ce bien et recommande son inscription.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** had studied this nomination with interest, adding that it would undoubtedly contribute towards filling the chronological gap of prehistoric culture as it was not yet represented on the World Heritage List. Minorca is an outstanding concentration of prehistoric sites that were exceptionally well preserved and that deserved to be further explored. The delegation appreciated the work that Spain had already done until now with

regard to research, education and the involvement of the local community in the nomination process. It therefore encouraged Spain to continue working on this nomination on the basis of the advice by the Advisory Bodies so that the exceptional universal value could clearly emerge. The delegation supported the draft decision and requested that the State Party be given the floor.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended the State Party for the work carried out in preparing this serial nomination under criteria (iii) and (iv). The examination of the file by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS was also appreciated. ICOMOS had concerns about the management system for the overall property, which it considered to be inadequate and it recommended the preparation of a management plan. Jamaica supported the draft decision, but welcomed hearing from Spain.

The **Delegation of Croatia** analysed this nomination and also supported the opinion of Turkey on the need for clearer and more precise recommendations by the Advisory Body in order to help to the State Party move the nomination towards inscription on the List.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to take the floor.

The **Delegation of Spain** recognized the analysis carried out by the Advisory Body in that the ICOMOS Evaluation Report stated that this property had clear potential for inscription. One of the most important aspects is the impact on the territory. More than 1,200 deposits in an extensive area, many of them monumental constructions that had been kept in an exceptional state of conservation to this day, have a definitive bearing on the configuration of the whole island. The proposal was to continue working in close cooperation with the Advisory Body and the World Heritage Centre in order to succeed with the nomination. All the work carried out up so far had been positive for the ecological heritage of Minorca. During the years in which Spain had worked on the dossier, progress had been made in raising awareness and educating the population, as mentioned by Zimbabwe. Spain had also greatly involved the local community, which had all been based on research and dissemination, which considerably improved accessibility and management in terms of conservation, with agreements with landowners in the case of elements found on private property. In the proposal by the Advisory Body, it was noted that Spain had been given two possibilities, and it sought clarification in the ongoing dialogue with the Advisory Body so that it could decide whether it should continue its work on the nomination file as a cultural landscape or as a serial property so that it could best contribute to the conservation of this rich heritage.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted that as a referral, ICOMOS suggested two possible approaches. One was the serial nomination approach, and the other, the landscape approach. One of the key issues with the nomination was that in using the serial approach, some of the sites did not actually have the appropriate delineation of boundaries, and the selection of sites did not actually contribute to the justification of OUV, while there were also sites that were actually excluded from the series. The other problem was that there was a reference to landscape attributes, which was not reflected in the boundary of the current nomination. Thus, the suggestion was to either enlarge some of the components with those selected for the nomination, and then include more landscape attributes; this would be the landscape approach. The serial approach would involve a selection of some of the talayot in Minorca as well as the important ones in Menorca, but ICOMOS also noted that both approaches could actually be combined, meaning that the nomination could take into account the landscape component as well. However, it was important to clarify the Talayotic in terms of the period covered as it was considered too long.

La **Délégation du Portugal** a remercier l'Espagne et l'ICOMOS ainsi que les autres délégations pour les clarifications utiles. Elle considère aussi que la Comité est devant une candidature qui a un potentiel extraordinaire en termes de valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et comme le Comité vient de l'entendre, l'Espagne est engagée à continuer de travailler étroitement avec les organes consultatifs. Pour le Portugal, il s'agit d'un bien où l'intégrité et

l'authenticité ont été clairement démontrées, et considère aussi qu'un nouveau projet de candidature doit être présenté comme un bien en série avec un accent sur le paysage culturel. La délégation estime que cette question pose un problème d'une autre nature, que cette nomination souligne l'importance de la définition d'une feuille de route extrêmement claire de la part des organes consultatifs, de façon à ce que l'État partie puisse s'engager dans la révision de la nomination avec des paramètres clairs, ceci afin d'éviter qu'après des années d'efforts souvent, consentis par plusieurs parties, on arrive à des situations moins conséquentes et souvent très frustrantes, non seulement pour l'État partie, mais aussi pour ce Comité.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

Le Représentant d'ICOMOS Juste pour réagir à l'intervention de l'honorable délégué du Portugal et faire savoir aux membres du Comité que nous avons engagé un dialogue avec l'État partie de l'Espagne et que nous sommes à leur disposition pour établir cette feuille de route.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.27 adopted.

Aphrodisias (Turkey)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.28](#)

The **Chairperson** then turned to next item on Aphrodisias.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the nomination and recommended that the examination of the nomination of Aphrodisias be deferred.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Liban** estime qu'après la lecture en détail du dossier présenté par l'État partie, ainsi que l'analyse de l'ICOMOS, le bien en série proposer pour inscription englobe le site archéologique d'Aphrodisias et les carrières de marbre situées au nord-est de la ville, et est d'avis que le rapport entre ces deux composantes est direct. Le lien entre les carrières de marbre, l'industrie de la sculpture et la tradition sculpturale représentée dans le bien est à la base de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle d'Aphrodisias. Il s'agit d'une situation unique qui regroupe : une composante technologique, l'extraction et le travail du marbre ; une composante artistique, un développement de l'art de la sculpture ; une composante architecturale et urbaine ; ainsi qu'une composante immatérielle liée au culte d'Aphrodite. Cette situation unique du bien fait que la délégation considère qu'il y a effectivement une valeur universelle exceptionnelle certaine. La protection légale du bien, le programme de conservation et le système de gestion du bien en série sont appropriés selon le rapport de l'ICOMOS. Le Liban propose donc que le bien soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial avec une recommandation à l'État partie d'assurer une protection plus complète de la zone tampon.

La **Délégation du Koweït** note également après l'étude profonde de ce dossier que l'État partie a bien répondu aux remarques de l'ICOMOS. Il s'agit d'un site qui possède une agglomération archéologique véritable et unique, comprenant des sculptures et des monuments. L'inscription des structures et des carrières forment un ensemble intégré qui est bien étudié et bien documenté. Le cas pour l'inscription repose sur l'alliance des carrières et de la ville, sur le pouvoir visuel de la gamme de ces sculptures et des monuments extraordinaires. La valeur exceptionnelle des bâtiments et des sculptures du site, en

association avec leur source en matériel, les carrières, se manifeste de différentes façons : leur valeur pour la science archéologique ; leur qualité et leur préservation exceptionnelles ; leurs effets importants sur les spectateurs et visiteurs modernes ; et le manque d'exemples comparables ayant survécu ailleurs. Il faut également noter que le site se situe dans un centre régional important durant l'époque romaine dont les traditions artistiques ont influencé certaines parties de la Méditerranée. Le Koweït appuie l'inscription de ce site, avec la recommandation de bien le protéger, sur la base des critères (ii), (iii), (iv) et (vi).

The **Delegation of Poland** remarked that Aphrodisias was an unprecedented combination of quarries, adding that the extraordinary visual power of its monument was important to understand the ancient Roman world and modern studies. Aphrodisias has monuments that were genuinely unique in antiquity and were currently well preserved with good documentation. The delegation underlined the importance of the remains of the ancient sculpture workshop in combination with the quarries, adding that the whole town structure has OUV. The importance of the cult of Aphrodite was also important to recall. Thus, the delegation supported the inscription on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** noted from the file that long scientific research had been conducted at this site from the early decades of the 20th century that provided a solid basis for analysis of the collected materials with all the necessary explanations, facts and justification of the nomination dossier. Aphrodisias is an exceptional reflection of the cult for the goddess Aphrodite, and the specific sculptors, art, and the political and urban planning systems of the Greek and Roman periods had OUV. The delegation had no doubt in the relationship of the marble quarries to the sculpture industry in Aphrodisias and, accordingly, the city boundary and the marble quarry were important elements containing the necessary attributes to express the proposed OUV. The unexposed landscape paralleled with conserved and restored archaeological structures show a high-level of authenticity. The delegation believed that protection was well in place, however suggestions from ICOMOS concerning some improvements of the buffer zone could be taken into account by the State Party. It also suggested that discrepancies identified by ICOMOS in the protection of the buffer zone, as well as conservation activities for the quarries, and indicators of monitoring systems for quarries could be resolved in due course in a work manner that would in no way affect the OUV of the property. Kazakhstan thus fully supported inscription of Aphrodisias under criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi) in the current session.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** considère que le bien d'Aphrodisias est bien connu et son importance universelle est reconnue au travers de ses sculptures et de ses monuments de haute facture. Bon nombre d'entre eux sont véritablement uniques aux plans architectural et artistique, et même connus et diffusés à travers le monde entier. Cela tant et si bien que la VUE est bien établie. Par ailleurs, le bien ne semble pas poser de problèmes de conservation. Sur le plan d'ordre technique et documentaire, la délégation estime qu'il y a eu des incompréhensions ou des moments tendus entre l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS et la réalité du commentaire du bien, tel que le montrent les documents remis par l'État partie. En effet, il s'avère qu'il y a bien lieu de valider les rectificatifs apportés par l'État partie sur le rapport de l'ICOMOS concernant l'inventaire épigraphique, statuaire et funéraire, c'est-à-dire les tombes. Cet inventaire semble être bien accompli. Le site a également fait l'objet de nombreuses recherches et publications. Pour toutes ces raisons, la délégation estime que le dossier dûment préparé par l'État partie ne souffre d'aucune défaillance ni de faiblesse. Par conséquent, elle propose de ne pas renvoyer l'inscription mais de proposer l'inscription dès maintenant sur les quatre critères (ii), (iii), (iv) et (vi), comme proposé par l'État partie. Aphrodisias a bien marqué tout un pan de l'histoire antique. Comme il se présente comme étant une œuvre artistique et en tant que bien exceptionnelle, il faut donc garder les quatre critères et l'inscrire au cours de cette session.

The **Delegation of Portugal** agreed that one could not deny that Roman and Greek civilizations were already well represented on the World Heritage List, but this fact should not

in itself be a reason for not inscribing a property as long as its OUV is recognized. Considerations concerning the overall balance of the List also had a bearing on these questions, as previously mentioned, when it was said that there was an increasing imbalance in the regional distribution of properties in the World Heritage List. The delegation explained that a number of countries had shown a very keen appetite for national inscriptions, which also had a very negative impact on the allocation of the already limited funds at the Convention's disposal. Less and less money was being allocated to conservation and even less to international cooperation and technical assistance to countries that request and need them, and due attention to these issues should be paid before the whole system collapsed. In this case, the delegation agreed with ICOMOS that the comparative study was incomplete and needed further development. For instance, the sculpture, one of the defining characteristics of Aphrodisias and the wide distribution of Aphrodisias Venuses, deserved further study. The nomination should also include a thorough study of marble quarries in the Mediterranean basin, as not many of these quarries were known. Moreover, a comparative study of the quarries in Vila Viçosa, which supplied all of the Lusitania empire and were used in lieu of Carrara marble, might have been useful. The delegation also noted the issues related to the boundaries and legal protection, among others, which were not adequately solved, and the delegation aligned with ICOMOS' opinion that this dossier was indeed very slim. Nevertheless, Portugal was ready to join the consensus on the proposal by Poland and Lebanon in order to inscribe Aphrodisias on the List, on the understanding that the State Party would react positively to the number of suggestions and requests made by ICOMOS.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** recognized that the property was undoubtedly an important archaeological landmark boasting of the Sebasteion, a religious sanctuary and a well preserved imperial cult complex. The property provided a glimpse into Roman Imperialism viewed from the lens of the property's locals. Aphrodisias enjoyed prosperity for eight centuries and its long existence solidified its position in further unwrapping Greco-Roman imperialist history. The delegation also noted its significance as a centre for marble sculpture boasting of key works that are recognized as hallmarks in art history. It was also noteworthy that the Temple of Aphrodite was transformed into a Christian Basilica in the 5th century, an important detail in the evolution of the property from being a pagan stronghold into a dynamic religious centre. The transformation of the Temple stands out among 'temple to church' conversions, particularly in the use and reuse of columns and walls. In this regard, the delegation agreed with other Members that Aphrodisias met criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi), and it welcomed the amendments to the draft decision that would further strengthen the protection of this valuable site. The delegation was certain that the State Party would increase efforts to integrate the local community and a management system, and implement the drainage rehabilitation plan within the walled city as soon as possible.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked that Aphrodisias is of outstanding importance in terms of unity and integrity. The property has visual integrity and a long, well studied history from the Bronze Age to the Ottoman period. The nominated property included all elements necessary to express its values and did not suffer from significant geomorphologic change since antiquity. The boundaries of the nominated area drew the limits of the remains to the largest extent, which ensured full representation of outstanding values. It was noted that the nominated property area covered 152 hectares and the buffer zone area covered 1,040 hectares; the large buffer zone area showed the State's consideration of the value of this site. Aphrodisias retained its authenticity in terms of form and design, material substance and location, which was clearly proven by the remarkably well preserved monuments and sculptures. The city quarries presented a good state of preservation and retained a high level of authenticity. The work of conservation and preservation at Aphrodisias had been undertaken in conformity with the Venice Charter that respected the original design and building details. The landscape dominating the environment of Aphrodisias had never been exposed either to development or to mass tourism, and offered visitors the experience of the ambiance of the Greco-Roman city in its historical context. The property had never legally been under the control of the State, and the policies and action proposed within the

conservation and management plans sustained the integrity of the site. State institutions and excavation teams were the main responsible bodies for the conservation protection, promotion and management of the site. The comparative analysis was based on local outside properties and fully met the necessary requirements. The delegation believed that the OUV of the site was present and was thus in favour of inscribing this property on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).

The **Delegation of Croatia** applauded the intervention of Portugal concerning balances and imbalances and saw it as a discussion topic by the Committee in the future. Croatia endorsed the amendment by Poland and Lebanon with the well explained argumentation as explained, and would gladly see Aphrodisias inscribed on the World Heritage List. It also hoped that the State Party would continue to work on ICOMOS' recommendations as proposed in the amendment.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** joined Lebanon and other Members to confirm the view that the property had great potential and indeed OUV. It therefore supported the inscription of the property to the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).

The **Delegation of Indonesia** understood that the property was nominated under criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi), and took note of the concerns by the Advisory Body. However, it appreciated the cooperative manner shown by the State Party in providing additional information as requested by the Advisory Body. The delegation was confident that the State Party would take on several measures, such as updating the management plan, increasing efforts to include the local community into the management system, strengthening site protection from threats faced by the property. It would thus be delighted to see the property inscribed on the World Heritage List.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** souhaite attirer l'attention sur l'abondante littérature fournie en 2016 et qui comble les insuffisances constatées qui ont été relevées concernant la documentation. Elle attire également l'attention sur le fait que cette littérature présente à souhait les liens qui existent entre les carrières et la ville elle-même, ainsi que la gamme de sculptures et monuments extraordinaires dont la valeur pour la science archéologique n'est plus à démontrer. Pour cela, la délégation soutient la proposition d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** also believed that the justification of the OUV, the integrity and authenticity of the site had been demonstrated, and it commended the commitment and efforts of the State Party in ensuring the protection, conservation and management of the nominated property. It thus agreed and supported the inscription of Aphrodisias on the World Heritage List for its OUV.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** endorsed the recommendation by Portugal to discuss the issue of representation on the List. It was convinced that the property met criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi) and should therefore be inscribed. The delegation noted the recommendations by the Advisory Bodies for enhanced protection and management of the site, as well as stakeholder engagement, and it urged the State Party to take these recommendations into account.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** recognized Aphrodisias as a veritable ancient city created at the time of the expansion of Hellenistic culture and that it had OUV, adding that the issues raised by the Advisory Body could be addressed by additional studies and research. The delegation was delighted to support the amendment proposed by Poland and Lebanon for inscription of Aphrodisias on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).

The **Delegation of Cuba** would also go along with the consensus that this property should be inscribed. It trusted that the State Party would comply with the recommendations.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment proposed by Poland and Lebanon. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified and would read, 'Inscribes Aphrodisias, Turkey, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi)'. The second part of paragraph 2.a), as well as b), c), d), were proposed to be deleted. A new paragraph 3 would read, 'Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value', followed by the statement. Paragraph 3 was also deleted, and there were a few modifications in paragraph 4. A new paragraph 5 was proposed, and would read, 'Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2019 a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020'.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.28 adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Turkey** was delighted in this remarkable day for Turkey with the Committee inscribing Aphrodisias, an extraordinary example of ancient Roman civilization in Turkey. Inscription of this site thus ensured the conservation of this historically, culturally and architecturally important site with Anatolian and Hellenistic characteristics. The decision further enhanced Turkey's commitment to the preservation and conservation of the country's cultural heritage. It was said that the Turkish authorities and institutions had spent US\$1.5 billion per year solely for preservation and conservation purposes with Turkish taxpayers contributing to this commendable effort and there were quite a number of sponsorship models that had also been put to work. The delegation spoke of 17,000 archaeological sites and 103,000 registered buildings and structures, adding that it was incumbent upon Turkey to make sure that all of them were bequeathed to generations to come. The inscription paid tribute to Aphrodite of Aphrodisias, a perfect example of the religious and cultural interaction of local Anatolian traditions with the classical ideals that was further diffused to the wider Mediterranean basin and to the masterpieces of local schools of sculpture. The delegation added that the US\$1.5 billion would start moving towards technical aid and conservation efforts as well, and that Turkey would continue working with ICOMOS on standards to better protect these sites. The delegation thanked all Members of the Committee for their support and acknowledgement of Aphrodisias' unquestionable OUV as a combination of the city and the quarries with its impressive monuments and sculptures, the remains of which still stood today in the midst of its natural environment. The delegation extended further thanks to its team and Turkish authorities back home, as well as the Ministry of Culture and Tourism for their efforts in the preparation of the nomination file.

Naumburg Cathedral and related sites in the Cultural Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut (Germany)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/whc/17/41.COM/INF.8B1)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.29](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/whc/41.COM/8B.29)

The **Chairperson** then turned to the next item on Naumburg Cathedral and the High Medieval Cultural Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/whc/17/41.COM/INF.8B4).

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the nomination and the recommendation that Naumburg Cathedral and related sites in the Cultural Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut, Germany, should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Croatia** had prepared an amendment on the basis of statements and

scientific works of leading experts on the European Middle Ages around the world who found that the west choir of the Naumburg Cathedral provided unique testimony to the works of a genius sculpture workshop of the Naumburg master. Built around the middle of the 13th century, it placed to this day the authentic connection between architecture, sculpture and glass painting, which were carried out in unparalleled quality in its time. Its iconography linked art in a theological programme, referring to Francis of Assisi and the reception of the ancient philosophy of Aristotle. Most of all, the 12 life-sized statues of the founders of the Cathedral were of astonishing realism. Their scenic narrative design as theological instruction was still understood to visitors today. It was also noteworthy that the medieval polychromy had survived, a rare instance and important record of such sculpture work of the 13th century. As a specialist of the period [on a personal note], the delegation spoke of the polychromy of the Naumburg Cathedral as being unmatched in the medieval world and the best preserved to the present day. The delegation thus proposed amendments to the draft decision in favour of referring this nomination to allow the State Party to change the title of the nomination to narrow it only to the Naumburg Cathedral, adding that the boundaries had been suggested by the German ICOMOS. However, the delegation would be more satisfied with its amendment to see this outstanding property inscribed immediately on the World Heritage List because the Cathedral was really of an Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Delegation of Republic of Tanzania** was aware of the evolution of this nomination that began in the late 1990s, adding that this nomination had been on the drawing board for 12 years. The delegation wished to hear from the State Party so that it could briefly explain the challenges in the preparation of this very important nomination.

The **Delegation of Portugal** noted that five hundred years ago a then unknown friar started a movement that would cause the biggest and lasting upheaval that the Catholic Church had known since the schism of Constantinople. Martin Luther's questioning of dogma, religious practices, the organization of the church and widespread corruption provoked a crisis in the European conscience that would in time contribute to shaping the continent and in fact the world in religious, cultural and also political terms. In talking of Naumburg it was appropriate to recall Martin Luther and the Reformation, and their indelible influence in the world's historical process. The delegation [on a personal note] regretted that Germany had renounced the 500th anniversary [of the Reformation] to add a number of important sites to the Luther Memorials in Eisleben and Wittenberg. The delegation understood Germany's reasons but hoped that this Committee would address this important issue soon. In discussing the Naumburg Cathedral, it was also appropriate to recall its first Lutheran Bishop Nikolaus von Amsdorf who was appointed personally by Martin Luther in 1542. Concerning the nomination of Naumburg Cathedral and related sites in the Cultural Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut itself, the delegation noted that this nomination had already been presented to the Committee and once deferred in 2015 for revision, and ICOMOS had been consulted for advice. It commended the State Party for its thorough investigation over so many years as it had contributed to better knowledge of the heritage. However, after so many years of such hard work with too many disappointments and frustrations, it was probably time to go back to square one, i.e. to retrieve the initial intention of the State Party to submit the Naumburg Cathedral as a single site. As a masterpiece of medieval architecture, the Naumburg Cathedral's artistic significance was well known and recognized the world over. The delegation was firmly convinced that this newly defined property has OUV and proposed that this nomination be referred to the State Party so that it could revise a dossier centered on the Naumburg Cathedral to which this Committee already recognized its OUV.

The **Chairperson** noted that all were convinced of the beautiful altar and the Cathedral of Naumburg as the belle of early medieval European civilization.

The **Delegation of Finland** noted that this was the second non-inscription in this cycle, and that the nomination was originally put forward as a cultural landscape during the Committee's 39th session when the Committee requested the State Party to further explore the

relationship between the Naumburg Cathedral and the surrounding landscape. In this amendment however eight Committee Members had recommended a referral in order to re-scope the nomination by refocusing on the given OUV of the Naumburg Cathedral alone. The delegation was thus confused and therefore wished to first hear from the State Party on how it addressed the Committee's request from the 39th session, namely, to further explore the relationship between the Naumburg Cathedral and the surrounding landscape.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** rappelle qu'en 2015 déjà, lors de la session tenue à Bonn, le Comité avait souligné l'importance de la Cathédrale de Naumburg en relation avec l'art et l'architecture du Moyen Âge. À l'époque le Comité avait opté pour différer l'inscription de la cathédrale pour permettre à l'État partie de bien vouloir se préparer. Le titre du dossier révisé convainc une fois de plus, comme l'a proposé la Croatie, que seule la cathédrale mérite d'être considérée pour l'inscription. La délégation soutient donc la proposition de référer l'inscription du site. Elle félicite et encourage l'État partie de bien vouloir tenir compte de cette restriction du projet d'inscription à la seule cathédrale et d'approfondir l'analyse comparative, comme l'ICOMOS recommande.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** note que ce dossier est préparé pendant douze ans avec un grand travail de recherche et de conservation, et avec la complicité de la communauté. Bien que rejeté en 2015 par l'ICOMOS, le Comité a différé son inscription insistant justement sur sa VUE. Un travail de collaboration s'est alors engagé avec l'ICOMOS, à la suite duquel l'État partie a accepté de réduire le bien de 80 % afin qu'il soit bien focalisé sur les éléments du Haut Moyen Âge. Toutefois, l'ICOMOS remet en cause de nouveau certains éléments, mais non la cathédrale elle-même et son environnement immédiat, et cela pour son importance historique, architecturale et artistique, dont la Croatie a parlé. L'État partie, avec un esprit très coopératif, accepte de réviser la proposition comme formulée et accepte son renvoi pour focaliser sur la cathédrale afin d'engager une discussion avec l'ICOMOS. La délégation ne peut que féliciter l'État partie de cette attitude constructive, qui donne un exemple à suivre par d'autres. La délégation est d'avis de renvoyer l'inscription sur la base de la nouvelle proposition afin de donner le temps nécessaire à l'État partie pour approfondir le dossier. Elle rejoint à d'autres délégations pour entendre l'État partie montrer dans quelle mesure ce bien peut effectivement être inscrit en tant que patrimoine mondial, pour que le Comité soit rassuré qu'il est réellement porteur en lui seul de la VUE.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** recalled that at its 39th session in 2015, the Committee had decided to defer the nomination of the Naumburg Cathedral and the Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut in the Territories of Power in the High Middle Ages so as to submit a significantly revised nomination with a focus on the Cathedral and its relationship to its surrounding landscape. During this session, the Advisory Body and the Committee, including the Philippines, attested to the Cathedral's architectural quality and works of art, which are considered to be unique in European art history. The delegation was of the view that the property has great potential to meet criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). However, like the others, the Philippines wished to refer the examination of the property at this time and requested the State Party to re-scope the nomination to reach greater potential by reiterating its OUV in a stronger manner. It was confident that the State Party would provide in due course the requisite adjustments to bolster the nomination of the property for eventual inclusion on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** noted that this nomination was a version of the previous file deferred at the 39th Committee session in 2015. During the nomination process, ICOMOS gave advice on the serial property's values and its components, which were fully accepted by Germany. If the Committee considered the efforts made by the State Party to accommodate the Advisory Bodies' opinions during the entire nomination process, the delegation believed that the Committee could give the State Party one more opportunity to seek another nomination that would this time focus on the Naumburg Cathedral and its surrounding area. In conclusion, the Republic of Korea supported the amended draft decision as one of the co-sponsors.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** was of the view that the nominated property had room for improvement and was confident that the State Party would make the best effort to refine the document in close consultation with the Advisory Body. It therefore supported the referral decision.

The **Delegation of Cuba** also supported the idea of referring this nomination to the State Party.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** appreciated the work by the State Party and its cooperation with the Advisory Body to prepare the dossier. After this nominated property was deferred by the State Party at the Committee's 39th session, the delegation wished to join Croatia and other Members in proposing a referral, adding it looked forward to inscribing this property in the near future.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** echoed the sentiments of previous speakers and supported the amended draft decision to refer the nomination back to the State Party.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** subscribed to the comprehensive analysis by Croatia and supported the revised draft decision. It also invited the State Party to re-scope the nomination and adjust the boundaries of the property and the management plan.

The **Delegation of Poland** appreciated the work of the Advisory Body, however, it wished to ask ICOMOS for its opinion regarding the scientific and universal values of Naumburg Cathedral itself, paying attention to its original importance and high artistic value. The delegation also supported the referral of this item.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** supported the amended draft decision for a referral, and the State Party being given the floor. It urged the State Party and ICOMOS to work closely together in defining a way forward.

La **Délégation du Koweït** rappelle les commentaires des membres du Comité en 2015 qu'il n'y a pas de doutes quant à l'importance exceptionnelle de la cathédrale de Naumburg. C'est la raison pour laquelle la délégation soutient l'amendement proposé par la Croatie. Mais elle souhaite poser à l'Allemagne une question, à savoir : Quelle a donc été la raison de l'État partie de proposer l'inscription dans le contexte de son paysage environnant ?

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** recalled that this nomination was discussed during the 39th session in 2015 when the Committee made reference to the OUV of the property and deferred the nomination. However, this time it received a non-inscription. The delegation therefore supported the balanced decision for a referral, as no doubt the property had OUV. Moreover, the very long preparation of the nomination file with its multiple and substantial changes from 1998 up to 2017 based on advice to first enlarge the property by including significant cultural landscape, only to then be advised to reduce it, which in itself raised many questions, i.e. what is the next step to inscribe the property: an enlargement or reduction of the boundary and buffer zone, or a reformulation of the nomination to focus on its OUV? With these questions in mind, the delegation supported the amended draft decision proposed by Croatia.

The **Chairperson** wished to give the floor to the State Party, noting that Prof. Maria Böhmer was present, the Chairperson of the 39th session in Bonn.

The **Delegation of Germany** thanked the Committee for its thoughtful consideration of the nomination, adding that the Naumburg Cathedral was placed on Germany's Tentative List almost 20 years ago as a single monument. However, on the basis of strong advice by ICOMOS experts, the nomination was changed in 2005 to a cultural landscape. After seeking ICOMOS' guidance and advice during two evaluation cycles, and after substantial revisions of the dossier in 2016, ICOMOS did not see the merit of such a complex landscape nomination. It noted that the significance of the cathedral itself was never questioned. Moreover, ICOMOS had [inadvertently] presented the west choir when the east choir was shown on the screen. As many Committee Members in 2015 strongly advocated the

outstanding qualities of the Cathedral, the delegation felt encouraged to return to the original approach and to focus on this single monument. So while the landscape nonetheless served to support the narrative of the Cathedral and the intangible dimensions of its founders, Germany would preserve, promote and explain the interconnected landscape features. The international and scientific communities invariably recognized the universal significance of Naumburg Cathedral. The Cathedral's architecture as well as its magnificent sculptures were continuously the subject of research at universities all across Europe. Regarding its relation to other European Medieval churches, Naumburg Cathedral offered a unique architectural achievement of the 13th century, which had survived in authentic condition. It is the *opus magnum* of the Naumburg Master whose innovations in sculpture and architecture had been lost in other places. The famous founder's statue of Uta of Naumburg featured prominently in every textbook on art and architectural history.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment proposed by Croatia, Azerbaijan, Cuba, Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Peru, Portugal and Zimbabwe. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was modified, which now reads, 'Refers the nomination of Naumburg Cathedral and related sites in the Cultural Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut, Germany, back to the State Party in order to allow it, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to: a) Re-scope the nomination by focusing on the given Outstanding Universal Value of Naumburg Cathedral, b) Adjust the boundaries of the nominated property and the management plan, and c) Review the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of Naumburg Cathedral for final adoption by the Committee within three years'.

The **Delegation of Poland** sought to hear from ICOMOS on the value of the Cathedral.

The **Chairperson** explained that ICOMOS did not wish to comment.

The **Delegation of Portugal** noted a difference in the language versions [of the draft decision] in that 'is requested' was not the same as '*si nécessaire*' in French.

The Secretariat wished to flag that the same occurred in the Mexico nomination in that the Committee was passing from a deferral to a referral and that sub-paragraphs a), b) and c) were proposed on the basis of a *referral*, following the Operational Guidelines in paragraph 159 in the Operational Guidelines. In this case, a *deferral* was proposed for a re-scoping of the nomination, i.e. to adjust the boundaries and review the OUV, which is normally not possible within the framework of a referral.

The **Chairperson** noted that the intention was simply to follow the guidelines. He then turned to the Rapporteur to check the language versions.

The **Delegation of Portugal** proposed '*si sollicité*'.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.29 adopted as amended.

The English Lake District (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.30](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on The English Lake District.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#), adding that this notification had some impact on the proposed statement of OUV.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the nomination and recommended that the English Lake District be inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (v) and (vi).

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Poland** was happy to support the inscription of an amazing and important property for contemporary culture, especially art and landscape design. It is an outstanding combination of the harmonious beauty of natural landscape and the agropastoral landuse system. It strongly congratulated the State Party for a very well prepared nomination file, and thanked the Advisory Body for its work.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated the United Kingdom for the well prepared nomination file of such a unique property and fantastic cultural landscape, and a remarkable National Park since 1951. Although it is a very large property of more than 2,000 square kilometres, the nomination file provided a well prepared management plan. The English Lake District is of singular natural beauty that combines a longstanding, continuing agropastoral tradition, ongoing since medieval times. The Lake District accounted for about 70m visitors a year, so Portugal believed that tourism and the vulnerability of the agropastoral system were serious considerations to be taken up by the State Party. It thus concurred with ICOMOS on the implementation of long-term monitoring of tourism impact, namely, to its natural components.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** extended congratulations to the State Party for the inscription of The English Lake District, noting that this inscription held even greater significance given that the State Party had sought to bring international protection to the site since 1986. The file was clearly ahead of its time. The delegation was thus pleased that the new nomination had been accepted on the basis of criteria (ii), (v) and (vi), and it wished the State Party well in providing oversight for maintaining OUV and implementing the necessary programmes to further enhance the property.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** commended the Advisory Bodies for their comprehensive evaluation of the property, noting the long history of the nomination. It commended the State Party for its endurance, the substantial material and the time invested. The delegation considered that this property is a cultural landscape of Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of criteria (ii), (v) and (vi). Therefore, while encouraging the State Party to implement ICOMOS' recommendations, Tanzania supported the draft decision to inscribe the property.

The **Delegation of Turkey** congratulated the State Party for the expected inscription.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** noted the documentation and ICOMOS' report and agreed with ICOMOS' recommendation to inscribe The English Lake District on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (v) and (vi). Azerbaijan agreed with the draft decision without any amendments.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.30 adopted.

The **Delegation of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** thanked the Polish authorities and people for their warm hospitality. On behalf of the Government, the delegation thanked the Committee and the Advisory Bodies, and welcomed the inscription of The English Lake District as a World Heritage Site. The delegation would of course address each of the nine points raised by the Committee in its report in 2018, though it assured the Committee that the protection and enhancement of the OUV of the property was its primary goal. As noted in the decision, the agropastoral landscape of the English Lake District inspired writers and artists, and played a significant role in the early development of the global conservation movement. Thus, its inscription was a fitting testament to that heritage. As noted by Members of the Committee, this inscription is a culmination of over 30 years work by a huge range of people across and beyond the Lake District, as well as a broad spectrum of civil society, including the communities for whom the National Park had been

their home for generations.

The **Director for Sustainable Development for the National Park**, Mr Steve Ratcliffe, spoke of how the English Lake District had taken millennia to become the evolving masterpiece that it is today. The nomination was indeed a long time in the making, culminating in over 30 years of thought and partnership, and he wished to thank ICOMOS for its assistance. Speaking on behalf of the local communities, he spoke of their pride in this cultural landscape, of how farming and industry had shaped this special place. It had inspired lives and life, and was internationally important for art and ideas, and would continue to inspire in the future. This had been a partnership and he was immensely proud to represent this partnership brought from an interest in farming and culture to the environment and the business community. The partnership had come a long way and all were committed to working together to deliver the management plan for the site. Mr Ratcliffe concluded with a quote from a most famous Romantic poet, William Wordsworth, whose writing was inspired by the Lake District, who wrote in 1835, “is a sort of national property in which every man has a rising interest who has an eye to the sea and a heart to enjoy”. The Lake District had now become an international property and work would continue with the communities to ensure that this site would inspire children in future generations throughout the world.

Gelati Monastery (Georgia)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/17/41/COM/INF.8B1)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.31](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/41/COM/8B.31)

The **Chairperson** turned to the nomination on Gelati Monastery (Georgia), recalling that this involved a significant boundary reduction of Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#), adding that this notification had an impact on the proposed statement of OUV, which had already been integrated.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** proceeded with its presentation recommended to approve the major boundary modification of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted a few slight amendments. Firstly, the factual error, as pointed out by the Secretariat, and a very slight amendment in paragraph 5 with a change of word ‘provide’ to ‘ensuring’, and then in point 5.g) with the deletion of ‘patriarch’.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.31 adopted.

The **Delegation of Georgia** spoke of the emotion felt as the issue of Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery had been open for the last eight years. The delegation expressed its deep gratitude to the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and Members of the Committee who had taken part in resolving this delicate issue over the past years. While it deeply regretted the withdrawal of the Bagrati Cathedral from the boundary of the property, it reiterated its long-term commitment to the conservation of Gelati Monastery, which explicitly demonstrated OUV on its own and its excellent state of conservation. The delegation also expressed thanks to all Georgian and international heritage professionals who, through their hard work, had contributed to highlighting the values of this property, as well as those who spared no effort in the documentation, conservation and restoration of the different elements of the monastery. Strengthening the implementation of the Convention was considered a priority for the Georgian Government, and the fact that Georgia had achieved to meet [the criteria] on two of its endangered World Heritage properties demonstrated this commitment. It also believed that dedicated work at the legal, institutional and conservation level would lead to more integrated, democratic and participatory management of cultural and natural properties in Georgia, and thus more successful initiatives and still more fruitful cooperation

in the framework of the Convention in the years to come.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee that it had left item 7.a. owing to the item on Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery, but would return to the adoption of decision 41 COM.7A 20 following this inscription, for which the blue form would be distributed.

Strasbourg, Grande-Île and Neustadt (France)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.32](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Strasbourg from Grande-Île and Neustadt, a European urban extension.

Le **Représentant d'ICOMOS** présente l'évaluation la proposition d'extension et recommande que la proposition d'extension soit approuvée sur la base des critères (ii) et (iv).

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Koweït** est [personnellement] émue parce que c'est la ville où son expérience académique et juridique a été enrichi. La délégation note que l'objet de cette inscription consiste à sauvegarder et faire découvrir au monde entier le patrimoine de cette ville, accompagner par sa modernisation et pour but d'assurer la transmission aux générations futures. Elle confirme donc son soutien pour l'inscription de cette ville.

La **Délégation du Portugal** félicite Strasbourg et son maire, ici présent, pour cette inscription, qu'elle appuie vivement.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** congratulated France for its inscription.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.32 adopted.

La **Délégation de la France** est très heureuse et très reconnaissante au Comité du patrimoine mondial et à ses membres d'avoir étendu le classement, l'inscription de la Ville de Strasbourg à la Neustadt. Elle insiste sur le statut de Strasbourg comme grande ville, capitale de région française, siège du Conseil de l'Europe et siège du Parlement européen. Elle remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial et donne la parole au maire de Strasbourg, M. Roland Ries.

Le Maire de Strasbourg, M. Roland Ries, remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial, l'ICOMOS, et exprime la gratitude de la ville de Strasbourg et de ses habitants pour cette décision très attendue à Strasbourg et dans la région Alsace. Il désire faire trois points. Premièrement, cette reconnaissance a pour Strasbourg une valeur historique très forte, puisqu'elle contribue à effacer les cicatrices du passé sans les oublier. Cette partie de Strasbourg a été longtemps négligée, la mairie a cherché à la gommer d'une certaine manière parce qu'elle évoquait des souvenirs pénibles. Aujourd'hui, grâce à l'UNESCO et l'ICOMOS, cette partie de Strasbourg trouve auprès des Strasbourgeois toute sa signification. Deuxième point, cette reconnaissance a une valeur pour aujourd'hui et pour demain, au moment de la montée des euroscepticisms, des nationalismes et des populismes, où la valeur symbolique de Strasbourg, symbolique de la réconciliation entre la France et l'Allemagne, est plus que jamais nécessaire. Et enfin, cette reconnaissance par l'UNESCO de la Neustadt comme paysage urbain historique remarquable aidera à

développer demain sur les bords du Rhin une Neue-Neustadt, une nouvelle ville. Celle-ci est en déjà en construction et elle constituera un lien direct entre Strasbourg et Kehl. De nouveau, le maire exprime sa fierté, remercie l'ICOMOS et l'UNESCO, et dédie cette inscription à Strasbourg, à la France, à l'amitié franco-allemande et à l'Europe.

The **Chairperson** addressed a personal message to the Mayor of Strasbourg by which he shared a personal memory in that there was not only a German-Franco friendship but also a partnership between Strasbourg and Krakow following the political change [in Poland] in 1990.

Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau (Germany)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.33](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the item on Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination, which could be found in document [INF.8B4](#).

Le **Représentant d'ICOMOS** présente l'évaluation et recommande que l'extension proposée du Bauhaus et ses sites à Weimar et Dessau soit approuvée sur la base des critères (ii), (iv) et (vi).

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.33 adopted.

The **Delegation of Germany** thanked the Committee for its decision. All relevant buildings of the Bauhaus School have now been united as one World Heritage Site, and some of the very different works of all three directors of that School, Walter Gropius, Hannes Meyer and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe were now recognized as part of humankind's cultural heritage. The extension adopted concerns unique buildings that testify to the close connection between theory and practice in the training of architects at the Bauhaus. They have since become standard practice all around the world. The delegation heartily invited all the Delegates and Observers in Krakow, as well as those following the discussions online, to come to Germany in 2019 to celebrate 100 years of the founding of the Bauhaus School and its impact on international modern architecture. In Weimar, Dessau and Bernau visitors could experience the modernity of design as well as the curiosity of these pioneers towards new materials and ways of living. Visitors could also learn about the experiments and the utopian ideas. It was no less than a springboard into a new age of architecture, one Germany would celebrate throughout the country in 2019.

Valongo Wharf Archaeological Site (Brazil)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.35](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on Valongo Wharf Archaeological Site.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the nomination and recommended that Valongo Wharf Archaeological Site be inscribed on the basis of criterion (vi).

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Portugal** congratulated Brazil for having proposed this meaningful site on the World Heritage List. It is a small property in size but its significance in the history of humankind is truly exceptional, bearing witness to enforced displacement of almost one million human beings. For historical reasons, Portugal has a direct link to this site and also a direct responsibility on the origin and development of the same site. This is a place that recalled the darkest side of history, of moments for which Portugal and many other countries were not immune. One cannot change the past but one can make sure that these sombre historical events are not forgotten and are fully integrated into their respective historical narrative in a consistent way. It was noted that only 11 sites had been inscribed on the World Heritage List justified solely by criterion (vi). These were sites that had marked important moments in the collective history of humanity, sites of memory that must be preserved and cherished. The delegation therefore fully agreed with ICOMOS that Valongo Wharf Archaeological Site was indeed an exceptional case where the use of criterion (vi) alone fully justified the OUV of the property and it was happy to support its inscription.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** thanked the State Party for bringing this property before the Committee, adding that its inscription was a very emotional moment for many people across the world. It was indeed an emotional moment for the delegation and for those from the African continent, as well as its diaspora. Zimbabwe therefore proudly supported the inscription on the basis of criterion (vi). The delegation recalled that in one side event during this present session a large group of people and experts from all corners of the world discussed the need to accelerate recognition of heritage associated with memories of slavery. It was agreed that the World Heritage List as it currently stood fell short in recognizing this very tragic but important fact of world history. Sites that reminded the world about slavery and the slave trade were just too few when one looks at the impact and effect this atrocity had and still has in almost all continents of the world. A call was therefore made for the Africa region and other regions to double their efforts so as to have more sites inscribed on the List. The recommendation to inscribe Valongo Wharf Archaeological Site was therefore timely and would provide the impetus for more nations to recognize and present such sites. It was fitting that the Committee inscribed Valongo Wharf here in Krakow as the most important physical evidence associated with the historic arrival of enslaved Africans on the American continent alongside a site of conscience that illustrated the strong and tangible association to one of the most terrible crimes against humanity.

The **Delegation of Poland** appreciated the sensitivity of the property but which was at the same time an important site for the history of humanity. The delegation congratulated the State Party.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** expressed its sincerest congratulations to Brazil for its successful inscription of the Valongo Wharf Archaeological Site, and thanked ICOMOS for its work in evaluating the site. During the course of this week, a side event was hosted by the Advisory Bodies on cultural sites related to the history of the slave trade and slavery where States Parties were encouraged to submit serial nominations that tell the compelling story of this period of global heritage. This inscription thus carried a symbolic reminder of the arrival of African enslaved labour on the South American continent, which was regarded as the biggest slave harbour in human history. It may very well be the site that is used to help realize our serial nomination in the Latin America and Caribbean region that pays homage to slave trade and slavery. Jamaica endorsed the draft decision for inscription and again extended heartiest congratulations to the State Party.

The **Delegation of Cuba** congratulated the State Party for this nomination, which certainly had very high value and was representative of this sad phenomenon of humanity that was slavery. Taking account of the fact that slavery was a significant episode of humanity, the delegation wished to ask the Advisory Body why criterion (iv) was not valued in this case.

La **Délégation du Koweït** félicite l'État partie pour l'initiative d'inscrire le site de Valongo chargée de l'histoire douloureuse des esclaves. Au vu de la qualité du dossier et des

recommandations, le Koweït soutient l'inscription du site.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that the dossier was not only fascinating, it was deeply moving. Valongo Wharf is a very young archeological site that was uncovered just 168 years ago, yet still carried haunting memories of the violence of the slave trade that characterized the lives of Afro-Brazilian and Afro-American peoples for centuries, surely one of the darkest moments in human history. Indeed, the property may well contain the most important tangible evidence of the arrival of African slaves on the American continent. It was thus also critical to preserve this site given successive attempts to erase the historical impact of slavery. Inscribing the property may well spur a growing awareness of Brazil's African heritage. The delegation commended the State Party for the active participation of the local Afro-Brazilian community and the preservation and conservation of the site. The community's guardianship of the property was indeed a best practice that may be emulated by World Heritage the world over. The Philippines strongly supported inscription of this dossier.

La **Délégation du Liban** remarque que s'il est vrai que cette inscription, qu'elle salue vivement, concerne des souvenirs et des mémoires pénibles pour l'histoire de l'esclavage, il y a aussi un côté plus radieux, c'était là où ont accosté les premiers bateaux de la diaspora libanaise au Brésil amenée par l'empereur Pedro II en 1876, et le bateau s'appelait la Volonté de dieu.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** concurred with the other Members to congratulate the State Party for inscribing this important property to the World Heritage List.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** reconnaît les efforts déployés par l'État partie du Brésil et pour l'excellent travail développé pour inscrire le site de Valongo sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial pour lequel la délégation félicite. Par ailleurs, l'Angola encourage l'État partie à prendre en compte les recommandations proposées par les organes consultatifs pour maintenir durablement la VUE du site. L'inscription de ce site est une marque de reconnaissance internationale de ce phénomène douloureux. Néanmoins, il pourrait inspirer les pays africains et d'autres pays qui ont été victimes de ce phénomène, de pouvoir regarder de manière positive les problématiques liées à la traite négrière, et pourquoi pas avancer également dans la logique de proposer des sites liés à l'esclavage sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Delegation of Finland** congratulated the State Party for nominating this strong, symbolic reminder of the arrival of African enslaved labour on the South American continent.

The **Delegation of Croatia** was happy that historical memory was now uniting, not dividing.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** congratulated the State Party for the inscription of Valongo Wharf on the World Heritage List and supported the draft decision.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS to respond to the question by Cuba.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** noted the question by Cuba regarding criterion (iv), and why it was not considered. The Representative recalled that according to the Operational Guidelines criterion (iv) means, 'be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history'. He also recalled that the State Party also applied for criteria (iii) and (vi), and it was explained that ICOMOS considered criterion (iii) not adequately justified. In the case of criterion (iv), ICOMOS considered that the narrative that supported the values of Valongo Wharf was not based on technical or constructive aspects of the property but rather on its relation with one of the darkest episodes in the history of humankind. So ICOMOS considered that the property from an architectural, technical or constructive point of view was quite modest compared to its immense value as a symbolic testimony of one of the most really terrible episodes in the history of humanity. So the proposal of only using criterion (vi) was in light of that consideration.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.35 adopted.

The **Delegation of Brazil** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to express how grateful and happy it was for the decision, and thanked the Polish Government for its hospitality in this wonderful city. It was noted that more than 1,000 sites were now inscribed on the List and only 11 properties inscribed as places of memory linked to sensitive and painful episodes in human history. Valongo had now been added to this List that also included Hiroshima and Auschwitz-Birkenau. The delegation emphasized the importance that the Convention afforded the need to remember those unforgettable episodes of human history, moments and sensitive sites that were recognized as necessary to share experience so as to have a more humanistic view of society throughout the world. On that basis, Valongo represented historical and social value, in particular for the Afro-Brazilian descendants of those who arrived there to reaffirm their identity and importance in the history of the Americas. In particular, the city of Rio de Janeiro, one of the rare places in the world to have conceived a fully participatory process for this type of site, and also one of the first urban areas to be declared World Heritage. The history in the Americas of three centuries were represented in the more than two million out of the four million Africans who passed through this site, i.e. 40 per cent of the total number of Africans of the 10 million who came to the Americas all together were reduced to slavery. This was the single greatest slave port in history, which is a sad record to hold. But it also represented the contribution made by Africans, and one of the most significant expressions of the message that all Brazil had inherited. An important item of progress that gave value to the African roots of the Brazilian population. Its OUV was already recognized in UNESCO's Slave Route. The Valongo Wharf was already considered one of the most important memory sites for the African diaspora. It is a material reminder of the slave trade considered a crime against humanity. The delegation thanked ICOMOS, UNESCO and the Committee for the perceived importance of Valongo as World Heritage. It was thus a great day for human history. This archaeological site in Valongo exceptionally symbolized the history of the presence of Africans and their descendants in Brazil and the Americas. The file had been presented since 2014 in association with the city of Rio de Janeiro and the municipal secretary of Rio de Janeiro who were fully dedicated to obtaining this recognition. This archaeological site is an unequalled piece of heritage as it represents the millions of Africans reduced to slavery who had worked to build Brazil as a nation and generate the largest black population outside of Africa today. This site on the List would reaffirm Brazil's role as a place for exchange and not simply a place of painful memory.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Brazil, noting that the Committee had already examined 33 items; 21 of them new inscriptions, plus three boundary changes. Before continuing, Ambassador Mr Ahmad Jalali of Iran wished to read a short poem.

The **Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran (Ambassador Mr Ahmad Jalali)** spoke of how the session and the Committee had been embraced by Krakow, such a heart-inspiring city. "Let our appreciation blossom if I can count on your consent, to all those ensuring the success of this shining event. On the wings of history you have given consideration, to the fortunate sites now accorded designation. All we have overcome walls and borders to fly free, hugging the magical passport offered by the WHC. Heritage is transcendental above the orbit of its nation, and it is UNESCO that joins all of us in creation, of this new language rather than keeping us apart, we now all feel united in the heritage of the heart. To such a variety of lands we now feel we belong, that joyfully we raise our voices in harmony's song. What a world it may be if the logic of this session, becomes the melody behind our daily expression. So that, far from seeing foreign lands as 'other', return towards them as towards a true brother, alluring UNESCO wholeheartedly invites, all of you to visit her World Heritage Sites".

The **Chairperson** thanked the Ambassador for his poetry in line with other Polish poets,

Miłosz and Szymborska, Nobel Prize winners who were both buried in Krakow.

The **Ambassador** of the **Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran** joked that he wished to be buried somewhere beautiful and inscribed as intangible heritage.

The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of items with minor modification to the boundaries in properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List, starting with the Ancient City of Bosra.

Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic)

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/8B.Add](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.39](#)

The **Representative of ICOMOS** explained that the Ancient City of Bosra was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1980 on the basis of criteria (i), (iii) and (vi) and that this buffer zone is now presented to the Committee for approval. ICOMOS recommended approval of the proposed minor boundary modification and the proposed buffer zone of the Ancient City of Bosra in the Syrian Arab Republic.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.39 adopted.

Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B.Add.2.Rev](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add2](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.51](#)

The **Representative of ICOMOS** explained that the site of Palmyra was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1980 on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). Although it was not presented to the Committee for approval, a buffer zone was established in 2008. ICOMOS recommended that the proposed minor modifications to the boundary of the Site of Palmyra, be approved. Likewise, ICOMOS recommended that the proposed buffer zone for the Site of Palmyra be approved.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.51 adopted.

L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site (Canada)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.40](#)

Le **Représentant d'ICOMOS** présente la modification mineure des limites soumises par l'État partie et recommande que celle – ci soit approuvée.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.40 adopted.

Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.41](#)

The **Representative of ICOMOS** presented the proposal of minor modification to the boundaries of the Old City of Dubrovnik and recommended that it be referred back to the State Party.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.41 adopted.

Jewish Quarter and St Procopius Basilica in Třebíč (Czech Republic)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.42](#)

Le **Représentant d'ICOMOS** présente la modification mineures des limites du bien et recommande qu'elle soit renvoyée à l'État partie.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.42 adopted.

Val de Loire entre Sully-sur-Loire et Chalonnes (France)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.43](#)

Le **Représentant d'ICOMOS** présente la demande de modification mineure des limites et recommande que la proposition de modification soit approuvée et que la modification de la zone tampon proposée soit approuvée.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.43 adopted.

Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.44](#)

The **Representative of ICOMOS** explained that the State Party proposed a substantially enlarged buffer zone for the property, and recommended to approve it.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.44 adopted.

Archaeological Area and the Patriarchal Basilica of Aquileia (Italy) – 41 COM 8B.45

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.45](#)

Le **Représentant d'ICOMOS** présente le bien et recommande que la modification mineure des limites de la zone archéologique et la basilique patriarcale d'Aquilée, Italie, soit approuvée.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.45 adopted.

Defence Line of Amsterdam (Netherlands)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.46](#)

The **Representative of ICOMOS** recommended that the proposed minor modification to the boundary of the site should not be approved.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.46 adopted.

Vegaøyen – The Vega Archipelago (Norway)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.47](#)

A la suite de sa présentation, le **Représentant d'ICOMOS** recommande que la proposition de modification mineure des limites et de la zone tampon de Vegaøyen, Archipel de Vega, Norvège, soit approuvée.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.47 adopted.

Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.48](#)

Following his presentation, the **Representative of ICOMOS** recommended that the proposed minor modifications to the boundary of the Historical Areas of Istanbul be approved.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.48 adopted.

Mount Wuyi (China)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1.Add](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.38](#)

Following his presentation, The **Representative of ICOMOS** ICOMOS recommended that the examination of the minor modifications to the boundary and to the buffer zone of Mount Wuyi be referred back to the State Party.

The **Representative of IUCN** noted that the proposal extended the boundary and enlarged the forest portion of the property by adding important sections of the adjoining Jiangxi Wuyishan National Nature Reserve. The northern sectors were somewhat different to the current property being steeper, colder, more natural and containing different variants of vegetation formation with more tropical broadleaf forest, more rare wildlife and additional species not found on the southern side of the mountain. This proposal thus further strengthened the basis for inscription of the property under criteria (vii) and (x) although it did not fundamentally change the OUV of the property considering the area is included as part of the same mountain system, were fully contiguous with the existing inscribed property and currently functioning protected areas. Both of the provinces were already involved in the current inscribed property and thus there was no significant change in administrative complexity. IUCN's Panel recommended that the minor boundary modification would be appropriate in relation to the natural criteria, but because of the concerns raised by ICOMOS, the consolidated decision of both Advisory Bodies' was for a referral given that this was a mixed site.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Viet Nam** remarked that in light of new information provided by China it wished to put forward an amendment to the draft decision concerning the minor boundary modification. The delegation was of the view that the proposal was not a new modification in that it responded to IUCN's recommendation published in the World Heritage Outlook in 2015, which proposed to modify the existing boundary of Mount Wuyi to further strengthen the integrity of its natural values. The delegation commended the efforts by China in proposing modifications, congratulating the State Party for the fact that IUCN had recommend the Committee approve this minor boundary modification. With regard to ICOMOS' recommendation to refer the the State Party for more information on cultural values, the delegation asked that the Committee consider the State Party's position in that although Mount Wuyi is a mixed heritage site, the proposed extension is a National Nature Reserve that has no national or local register on the cultural site in the proposed extension. Therefore approval of this minor boundary modification would complement the natural value of the property without impacting on the cultural dimension of the OUV. Nevertheless, the delegation encouraged China to undertake further study to address the concerns related to the cultural value of the property and to take the floor to provide further information if needed. With this in mind, the delegation propsoed a draft amendment and looked forward to the approval by the Committee.

The **Delegation of Kuwait** supported the approval of the proposed modification on Wuyi, adding that the inclusion of the north side of the mountain in the Jiangxi Province was a very responsible reaction by the State Party to the technical evaluation of IUCN and the World Heritage Outlook. As stated clearly, the modification would bring many positive, non-adverse impacts to the World Heritage property. It would complete the natural habitat, strengthen the resilience and connectivity of the site, and improve the general protection and management effectiveness of the property. Kuwait joined Viet Nam and Tunisia to approve the proposed minor boundary modification to Mount Wuyi.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** supported the approval of the proposed

minor boundary modification for this particular property and thus joined Viet Nam and Kuwait. Tanzania noted that this particular extension was particularly necessary for better coordination and management efficiency between the two provinces. It also encouraged the State Party to further explore the potential for cultural value in the nearby area, as mentioned in the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** supported the amendment put forward by Viet Nam and supported the approval of the proposed minor modification to the boundaries of Mount Wuyi.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** appuie également l'amendement proposé par le Viet Nam, ajoutant qu'elle n'attendait pas à ce que ce projet de décision renvoie donc cette modification, parce que cela ne pose de problème particulier, au contraire, ça renforce le bien par rapport à sa bonne gestion.

The **Delegation of Finland** could clearly see how this decision would benefit the natural site, and after hearing the strong support wished to hear from ICOMOS on this amendment.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to respond.

The **Delegation of China** explained that the proposed extension was a nationally protected nature reserve that provided a wonderful scenic background to the development of cultural components. There were a number of cultural sites with potential OUV in Jiangxi Province but not in the nearby areas of the proposed extension. The Ehu Academy mentioned in the ICOMOS Evaluation Report is located more than 30 km north of the proposed boundaries, which could not be included with the term 'minor modification' to the boundary. However, if the proposed minor boundary modification is approved, China would work closely with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre to further study the potential cultural value of the proposed component.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** pointed out that the additional information provided by the State Party addressed both points b). and c). of the decision, but the key issue regarding the description of the cultural elements in the extended area had not been addressed.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Viet Nam and Tunisia. Paragraph 1 remained unchanged. Paragraph 2 was amended, and would read, 'Taking note that the proposal is appropriate in relation to natural criteria, and enhances the overall integrity, protection and management of the property'. Paragraph 3 was amended and would read, 'Approves the proposed minor modification to the boundaries of Mount Wuyi, China'. A new addition to paragraph 4 would read, 'Requests the State Party with the support of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre to: a) Undertake further study to address the concerns in relation to cultural values of the property, b) Provide in detail the rationale for the delineation of the buffer zone and a topographical map in relation to the surrounding villages and the Wuyi Mountain National Reserve'. Part c) was deleted.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraphs 1–3 adopted as amended.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** requested that a deadline be indicated in paragraph 4.

The **Chairperson** concurred and sought an appropriate date.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** propose le 1^{er} février 2018.

The **Delegation of China** accepted this suggestion.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.38 adopted as amended.

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.36](#)

After his presentation, the **Representative of IUCN** proposed a referral of this minor boundary modification.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.36 adopted.

Western Ghats (India)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B2.Add](#)
Decision: [41 COM 8B.37](#)

After his presentation, the **Representative of IUCN** indicated IUCN considered that the proposal was a significant and not a minor change in the existing property and thus should be considered through a full nomination for a significant boundary modification. For these reasons, IUCN did not approve the proposal as a minor modification and recommended its resubmission.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.37 adopted.

Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of 7 Properties Inscribed at the 40th Session

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/8B.Add.2.Rev](#)
Decisions: [41 COM 8B.49](#)
[41 COM 8B.52](#)

The **Chairperson** then turned to the next agenda item 8B on the seven statements of Outstanding Universal Value of properties inscribed at last year's session (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016) and not adopted by the World Heritage Committee.

The Secretariat recalled that there were seven statements of Outstanding Universal Value that were provisionally adopted by the Committee. The seven statements concerned the following properties: i) Argentina, Belgium, France, Germany, India, Japan and Switzerland, the Architectural Work of Le Corbusier: An Outstanding Contribution to the Modern Movement; ii) Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, Serbia, Stećci Medieval Tombstone Graveyards; iii) Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lut Desert; iv) Iran (Islamic Republic of), The Persian Qanat; v) Sudan, Sanganeb Marine National Park and Dugonab Bay; vi) Turkey, Archaeological Site of Ani; and vii) Chad, Ennedi Massif: Natural and Cultural Landscape. It was noted that the statements had been refined with the cooperation of the Advisory Bodies and the concerned State Parties and were now ready for adoption. Draft decision 41 COM 8B.49 concerned six of the properties, and draft decision 41 COM 8B.52 concerned one of the properties.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.49 and Decision 41 COM 8B.52

adopted.

Large Complex Serial Transnational Nominations and the Need for Nomination Strategies

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/8B.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8B.50](#)

The Chairperson remarked that the last item on agenda item 8B concerned the Large Complex Serial Transnational Nominations and the Need for Nomination Strategies.

The Secretariat explained that the item examined the need to prepare and acknowledge a nomination strategy for large complex serial transnational nominations, adding that these types of nominations were considered desirable in fostering international cooperation. However, they may be unsuccessful without proper planning and coordination. In the case of complex serial transnational nominations submitted over multiple cycles, such as Frontiers of the Roman Empire property, the nomination strategy provides the Committee's rationale behind the nomination and reduces the chance of encountering problems later on during the nomination process. A Thematic Study had been undertaken to manage the way forward regarding the feasibility of further serial extensions for this serial transnational property. This study includes a Nomination Strategy, which proposes that substantial and distinctive sections of the Roman Frontiers be nominated as individual series under a cohesive and consistent framework. This would actively encourage international dialogue and shared practices. A timetable had been established for the implementation of Frontiers of the Roman Empire Nomination Strategy over the next five years. Serial transnational extensions would gradually be submitted to this strategy. Finally, the Secretariat clarified that even if the Committee took note of a Nomination Strategy for large complex serial transnational sites, the nomination would still have to go through the normal evaluation process and thus did not imply that the site would ultimately be inscribed.

The **Delegation of Poland** fully understood the challenges that come with the development of serial nominations and the management of serial complex sites. It commended the States Parties involved in the preparation of the Thematic Study and the development of the overall Nominations Strategy for the Frontiers of the Roman Empire. The delegation was of the opinion that a nomination might benefit from a Thematic Study and an agreed Nomination Strategy. However, it did not fully understand the rationale behind this draft decision, especially why the strategy proposed recommended the involvement of a minimum of four States Parties in a nomination. The delegation thus sought an explanation from the Secretariat in this regard.

The Secretariat explained that this was seen as a way to solve potential issues in very large serial transnational nominations, such as the Silk Roads, or of similar scope. In this case, the Frontiers of the Roman Empire is a serial transnational property that was already inscribed in three phases, with a large number of States Parties potentially interested in an extension. For many years the way forward seemed impossible to implement as there was no agreed rationale by States Parties on potential extensions. The way forward was the work carried out in the Thematic Study that worked its way through the very complicated process, involving many different administrations and various points of view. The Secretariat assured the Committee that this was not mandatory, but rather it offered a solution to solve the issues encountered by very large nominations, which were actually uncommon. The Secretariat did not think that all serial nominations should apply this process and was thus limited to very large serial nominations.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** further explained that the idea of a Nomination Strategy was that if this was put forward before the first nomination of a large transboundary serial nomination then the Committee would be able to understand the context for the first

nomination, as the Strategy would have been outlined. In order to have a strategy for these very large transboundary nominations, they would need to be based on a Thematic Study so that all the evidence is gathered, the Strategy could then be worked out and presented to the Committee as a framework for the first nomination of several more. This was the rationale for this exercise. This was done for the Silk Roads, but it wasn't presented to the Committee until the first nomination. It had just been undertaken for the Frontiers of the Roman Empire, and it was thought desirable that this Strategy be presented now so that when the first nomination comes forward in the next few years, the Committee would be well aware of where it had come from and where it was going.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** exprime sa préoccupation par ce genre de projet et explique que la Tunisie a même inscrit sur la liste indicative le Limes Tripolitanus, aussi bien la Tunisie que la Libye, ce qu'on l'appelle ainsi en Algérie aussi. La délégation demande quel serait le destin d'un site à partir du moment où il est inscrit en série, comme si les autres morceaux du limes ne comptaient plus. Tout en considérant que l'idée en elle-même est excellente, la Tunisie demande aux États parties qui ont présenté ce projet de trouver le mécanisme pour associer les autres États parties qui pourraient être ou qui seront concernés, c'est-à-dire d'impliquer les pays dès le départ et non plus tard. Parce que au final, logiquement, il y a aura qu'un seul projet commun.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** explained that the strategy set out was meant to be inclusive not exclusive. The way the Thematic Study had been undertaken was to collect evidence for all the sites of the whole Frontiers of the Roman Empire around the Mediterranean, but as things stand the detail is more readily available in the European section than in the sections east of the Mediterranean along North Africa. Ten countries undertook the Thematic Study and they outlined the whole frontiers, they then concentrated on the European section as to how this might be divided into reasonably sized sections to be put forward for nomination. They were extremely keen to engage with States Parties from the eastern Mediterranean North Africa to discuss how to take the project forward in more detail in those areas, and indeed, ICOMOS hoped that it might be possible to organize a meeting at the present session for all interested States Parties, but too many people had already left for this to happen. Nevertheless, the intention was to try and organize a meeting in the near future so that all States Parties interested in taking this forward could discuss the process in more detail and further engage other States Parties.

The **Delegation of Kazakhstan** remarked that the Silk Roads nomination process was ongoing with other States in the region possibly wishing to join, in which case, would this Nomination Strategy be applicable in the preparation process of the nomination?

The **Representative of ICOMOS** further explained that in the case of the Silk Roads, the Nomination Strategy was set out on the basis of the Thematic Study undertaken and an overarching coordinating committee was set up with suggested corridors for being nominated, which collectively would add up to the Silk Roads. Thus, one had been inscribed, while others were being worked on, and hopefully more would follow.

The **Delegation of Poland** wished to propose a slight amendment to paragraph 2 that excluded the limitation to involve four States Parties, adding that a situation could arise whereby three States Parties wished to propose a very large and complex nomination. The text was duly deleted.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision, and pronounced paragraphs 1–5 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8B.50 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** noted a small change in the timetable regarding the presentation of item 11 on the revision of the Operational Guidelines and on item 13 on international assistance.

The Secretariat announced a Polish event on World Heritage Sites and Documentary Heritage, a festive event by Eritrea, an informal meeting of World Heritage related category 2

centres, and a Conference on the Greater Virunga Landscape. The Secretariat encouraged delegates to attend the Charity Concert 'Solidarity with Aleppo'.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for the 21 new inscriptions and adjourned the session.

[Close of afternoon/evening session]

EIGHTH DAY – Monday 10 July 2017

FIFTEENTH SESSION

9.30 p.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the following agenda items would be examined during the morning session: items 8D, 8E, 9A, 9B and 10A. However, it was recalled that the State of conservation of Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery in Georgia would first be examined. The Chairperson recalled that the property was the object of a significant boundary modification and the Committee postponed the examination of its State of conservation Report until after the Committee had taken its decision on the boundary of this property. This examination was completed and Decision 41 COM 8B.31 was adopted, approving the boundary change. The Chairperson thus invited the Secretariat to present the State of conservation of the Gelati Monastery structure.

Gelati Monastery (Georgia)

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/7A](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/8B.Add](#)

Decision: [41 COM 7A.20](#)

Le Secretariat présente le bien Cathédrale de Bagrati et le Monastère de Ghélati en Géorgie inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril depuis 2010 et qui fait l'objet d'une modification importante des limites. Le Comité a statué sur le projet de décision 8.B.31 et a approuvé la modification importante des limites du bien Cathédrale de Bagrati et le Monastère de Ghélati pour exclure la Cathédrale de Bagrati pour devenir le Monastère de Ghélati. En outre, une série de recommandations relatives à l'état de conservation du bien ont été approuvées par le Comité, légèrement amendées au cours de la discussion du point 8.B. Le Secrétariat et l'ICOMOS ont donc soumis un projet de décision révisé relatif à l'état de conservation du bien. Ce projet porte la cote 7A.20.Rev. Le Secrétariat et l'ICOMOS souhaitent attirer l'attention du Comité sur le nouveau paragraphe 6 de cette décision révisée qui suggère de retirer le bien monastère de Ghélati Géorgie de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted some amendments to the draft decision. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were slightly amended by the addition of a reference to a document. A new paragraph 3 would read 'Also recalling decision 41.COM/8.B.31 adopted at the 41st session, Krakow, 2017, regarding the significant boundary modification of Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery that included Bagrati Cathedral, from the property of Bagrati Cathedral in Gelati Monastery as concerning Gelati Monastery'. Original paragraph 3 would become paragraph 4 with a slight deletion. There were new paragraphs 5 and 6. The original paragraph 4 was deleted, and the original paragraph 5 would become paragraph 7 with slight modifications. The original paragraph 6 was deleted.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** wished to know who made these changes.

The **Rapporteur** recalled that the Committee had decided to change the boundary of Bagrati. Following that, the Secretariat decided to modify the State of conservation such that this was the consequence of the decision taken in the previous session.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** further explained that decision 7A 20 Rev. had

been distributed to the Committee Members on the blue form, which clearly stated that it was submitted by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS following the Committee's decision on the boundary modifications.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision, and pronounced paragraphs 1–7 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7A.20 adopted.

The **Delegation of Georgia** remarked that the experience had been long and painful, though it hoped it would contribute to the international discourse on heritage philosophy and the future of the Convention. On behalf of the Georgian Government and all Georgian people, the delegation extended sincere thanks to the Committee, the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies, and those who contributed to this decision to rightfully replace Gelati Monastery back among the sites of OUV. The delegation was working very closely with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the update of the national Tentative List, and it looked forward to new successful future nominations.

ITEM 8D: CLARIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND AREAS BY STATES PARTIES

Document [WHC/17/41.COM/8D](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/17/41/COM/8D)
Decision: [41 COM 8D](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/41/COM/8D)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on clarifications of property boundaries and areas by States Parties, noting that eight boundary clarifications had been received from six States Parties in response to their respective inventories and in the framework of the periodic reporting exercise.

The Secretariat presented in the working document the cartographic and geographic information provided by States Parties on the boundary clarifications of eight World Heritage properties. It was recalled that, in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory process initiated in 2004, the World Heritage Centre had worked to determine missing or inadequate boundary information on properties inscribed before 1998. The Centre then worked with the States Parties to inform and request the submission of cartographic and geographic information on the boundaries of those World Heritage properties inscribed. Moreover, it was observed over the period of the second cycle that States Parties provided technically improved maps as a follow-up in their periodic reporting exercise. Thus, in this year, satisfactory maps and boundary clarifications had been received for eight World Heritage properties, all of which were included in the working document. The Secretariat explained that to be considered adequate, the clarifications must be consistent with the nomination dossier as inscribed, the evaluation conducted by the Advisory Bodies, and the Decision of the Committee at the time of inscription. In addition, the maps must meet the current quality and technical requirements. It was further noted that the World Heritage Centre had clarified many boundaries, but many remained imprecise or unclear. Thus, the World Heritage Centre would continue to provide support to all States Parties in the preparation of their boundary clarifications.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8D adopted.

ITEM 8E: REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/8E](#)

Decision: [41 COM 8E](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item 8E on the review and approval of retrospective statements of OUV. The working document presented the draft decision concerning the adoption of 25 retrospective statements of OUV submitted by 11 States Parties for properties that had no OUV statement approved at the time of their inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Secretariat explained that there were 25 retrospective statements of OUV presented in the document with the following regional distribution: one statement from the Arab States, 23 from Europe and North America, and one from the Latin America and Caribbean region. It was noted that all these statements had been included in the Annex to the working document in the original language in which they were proposed. The World Heritage Centre would undertake translation into the other working languages of the Convention subject to availability of funds, and it would be posted on the website upon completion.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41.COM 8E adopted.

ITEM 9A: PROGRESS REPORT ON THE REFLECTION CONCERNING THE UPSTREAM PROCESSES

Document [WHC/17/41.COM/9A](#)

Decision: [41 COM 9A](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item 9A concerning the Progress Report on the reflection concerning the Upstream Processes.

The Secretariat recalled that upon request from the last session, the World Heritage Centre conducted an online survey to solicit feedback from States Parties on the implementation and experience to date of the upstream processes. This online survey was very successful in terms of participation with 80 responses received equally among all five regions. After a few years of experimental implementation, a series of crucial questions arose from the experience with the upstream processes during its first phase, including conceptual, operational, financial and other aspects. Questions included: What is the proper upstream process and what is it not? What is its scope? Upstream process, yes, but in relation to which point in the process? The working document thus provided an overview of the survey's results, which were taken into account when preparing proposals for future implementation of the upstream processes, as equitably and efficiently as possible, while trying to address these questions. The vast majority of States Parties found the experience with upstream reporting to be mostly positive. A large majority of States Parties agreed that the use of the draft upstream process request format, included in the document as an Annex, could facilitate the implementation of the process. A majority also said that the upstream advice was mostly effective when provided as early as possible, ahead of the preparation of the nomination and the definition of potential OUV. Indeed, nearly all States Parties in their replies attested that they were ready to work with the Advisory Bodies and/or the Secretariat in preparation of their Tentative Lists. Indeed, support as early as possible in the process would certainly improve the chance of reducing the number of nominations that encounter

problems later in the process, and it would avoid wasting human and financial resources in nominations that were unlikely to succeed. The survey also showed overwhelming support for the prioritization of upstream assistance in favour of States Parties that fall into the categories of Least Developed Countries, Low-Income, Lower Middle-Income Countries and Small Island Developing States. However, securing funding to ensure equal access to the upstream processes for all States Parties-in-need still remained a major challenge. States Parties were generally supportive of creating a special upstream process sub-account of the World Heritage Fund and obtaining financial support from the Donors' Forum for this purpose. Additional suggestions included advertising upstream requests and fundraising events during Committee meetings and on the World Heritage Centre's [Marketplace](#). It was noted that the majority of States Parties were against funding upstream processes in the introduction of a special fee on newly inscribed properties. The role of the Advisory Bodies in the upstream processes also raised a question about the potential conflicts of interest, as they were required to evaluate nominations for which they provided States Parties with support and upstream advice. Most States Parties recommended that the Advisory Body experts involved in the upstream process for a specific nomination should not participate in the evaluation of that nomination. The practice showed that advice provided well after submission, as in the particular case of referred or deferred nominations, had actually very often been referred to as 'upstream', thus generating a sort of new notion that could be termed as 'midstream' advice, i.e. advice given to a nomination that had at least gone through the evaluation process once. Such advice was not in line with the definition or the goal of the upstream process and should not be referred to as upstream.

The Secretariat concluded that the Committee might wish to clarify the definition of 'upstream' to more effectively accomplish the goal of providing early advice to States Parties. A proposed revision had been prepared in point 39 of document 9A – the footnote to paragraph 122 of the Operational Guidelines – that could be improved by providing more detailed information on what is and what is not an upstream process. The second draft of the Upstream Support Request Format, included as Annex I to this document, had been refined based on States Parties' suggestions on the online survey. It was suggested that this format could later become an annex to the Operational Guidelines. However, in the meantime, the format may already be used to make prioritization possible, and to ensure a proper follow-up and improved coordination and transparency for the upstream process. The result of the survey thus served as a basis for the World Heritage Centre's proposal to include the implementation of this process. The responses to the survey also indicated the wish to prioritize States Parties in the category of Least Developed Countries: Low-Income, Lower Middle-Income Countries and Small Island Developing States. However, acknowledging current conditions, both in terms of staff and finance, it was not seen as feasible for the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to process more than 10 new requests for upstream support each year, though the Committee might wish to apply this limit to a two-year trial period.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that over the past few years, ICOMOS had been committed to furthering the promotion and delivery of upstream advice within its available capacities. It welcomed the coming of age of this aspect of the work of the Convention through the articulation of basic processes and procedures that would help States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in delivering such advice. ICOMOS noted that although there was great interest generated by the upstream processes, its widespread uptake by States Parties reflected to a degree the way requests were being dealt with through dialogue and communication with States Parties. The introduction of greater transparency and equitable processes was essential and did not remove the iterative aspects of this work. Upstream work should remain a flexible tool that adapts to States Parties' needs in terms of response and implementation of the many and varied types of advice requested by States Parties. Upstream advice for nominations could be carried out in a variety of ways, not just through advisory missions but through meetings or advice on the development of thematic studies and nomination strategies, such as for the large transnational serial

nominations: the Silk Roads and the Frontiers of the Roman Empire. The benefits brought by the upstream process were now evident, and not just through the pilot projects, which includes a successful outcome from Saudi Arabia, reconsideration of a property envisaged in Jordan, and strengthening an identification of protection of cultural properties at national level in Grenada and the Grenadine Islands. But the outcomes also come through support for the development of Tentative Lists, from which several inscriptions presented to the Committee this year were successful, as well as in many other less formal ways. In terms of funding for upstream processes for future nominations, some States Parties could benefit from the World Heritage Fund, but overuse of this Fund for upstream work could be counter-productive. ICOMOS considered that the upstream process did have the capacity to draw in extrabudgetary funding, as had already been demonstrated from the African World Heritage Fund for nominations in the Africa region, as well as from individual States Parties. In conclusion, ICOMOS reiterated its support for this crucial new tool, but also emphasized that for upstream work to be most effective, it needed to be used at the earliest possible stage for meaningful dialogue and appraisal of all possible options.

The **Representative of IUCN** was grateful to learn about the responses to the survey, and for the World Heritage Centre to compile the findings, which showed a good understanding of the good level of participation across States Parties on how the upstream process was being viewed. IUCN expressed gratitude to the States Parties involved with the natural and cultural heritage of the Lake Ohrid region and the Grenadine Islands group that had both seen good progress in terms of the formally recognized sites, and it was pleasing that both projects had a transboundary aspect to them, for which it hoped to see further collaboration with the States Parties involved to move towards successful next steps with each of those proposals. Following on from ICOMOS' comments, the Representative believed that the key message behind this paper was the challenge in turning the good idea of the upstream process into effective implementation. However, the real issue was in terms of the lack of capacity to support the requests, as there was no equitable funding mechanism for this process, which greatly impeded the ability of this process to help the Convention deal with the current unbalanced World Heritage List. It was noted that countries that have the easiest access to the Advisory Bodies, which are based in Italy, France and Switzerland, were also countries with the greatest access to resources and thus had the possibility to ask for advice, which would likely benefit countries already well represented on the World Heritage List. Thus it was hard not to think about the upstream process without broaching the issue of the challenge of the imbalance of the World Heritage List, with the five countries in Europe that were best represented on the World Heritage List more or less carrying one in five of all World Heritage sites, about 20 per cent of the List. This trend was thus affecting the implementation of the Convention. It was further noted that countries benefitting from inscriptions at the present session counted roughly two-thirds in the Europe and North America region, with one-third comprising the other regions combined. Thus, the issue needed to think about what affirmative action might look like to create a balance for a more representative World Heritage List, because the strategies pursued by the Convention for the past 25 years were not achieving that aim. It was thus going to be important to think about how the upstream process would lead towards a balanced representative List and how regions, whose heritage really deserved to be recognized but don't come forward, could be assisted in that regard. Concluding, the Representative remarked on the strong relationship between the upstream process and broader efforts in capacity-building, noting the really important work of the African World Heritage Fund in connecting upstream advice and guidance on nominations to training and capacity-building for a large number of beneficiaries. Good results had been seen from that effort in some of the inscriptions from Africa, and thus it served both a good model for continued work in Africa but also a model that would be good to see in category 2 centres learning from and transferring into other regions, and in particular, into regions where there was limited representation on the World Heritage List.

The **Representative of ICCROM** was happy to be working very closely with IUCN and ICOMOS on a number of these issues related to capacity-building. Specifically in relation to

the upstream process, as mentioned in the past, ICCROM considered that the upstream process had the potential to be very effective in helping States Parties ensure that their nominations were of the best quality possible before being examined by the Committee. To this end, ICCROM thanked the World Heritage Centre for carrying out this very interesting survey that had raised some very interesting issues that could be worked on into the future. ICCROM believed very strongly that the most effective way to help the largest number of States Parties in the most long term and sustainable manner was to approach the upstream process as a capacity-building exercise rather than as a one-on-one advice for only a limited number of States Parties at a particular given point in time. The Representative concurred with the very important point made by IUCN regarding access to the Advisory Bodies, adding that this needed to be made as wide as possible to allow as many States Parties as possible to take advantage of this upstream process. As mentioned by IUCN, concerning nomination workshops implemented by the African World Heritage Fund, the Representative noted that these were mentioned in the working document, but the document did not explain how those workshops were implemented, which would be useful. The Representative explained that a group of States Parties come together in a workshop format that allowed the Advisory Bodies to be present, but also allowed the individual States Parties to discuss among each other. In this way, States Parties received advice from the Advisory Bodies, but just as importantly they present their properties and issues to each other, learning from each other. After the first workshop, the States Parties go home to begin working on their nominations by themselves but with the help and advice of mentors. When a second workshop is held, more discussions take place and further problems are highlighted for which Advisory Bodies could give advice. Once again, the States Parties learn from each other and discuss their problems and potential solutions. This process allowed for a much better dialogue and a peer learning process among States Parties, as they work together rather than in isolation with only one site being treated at any one time. This was considered a very effective way of carrying upstream processes to a much larger number of States Parties at a given point in time. In relation to the African World Heritage Fund, these workshops were taking place at the regional and subregional levels, but there was also no reason why these workshops could not be held at a typological level, i.e. at the level of archaeological sites or historic towns, as obviously this would bring out specific problems related to specific typologies. ICCROM strongly commended the African World Heritage Fund for the development of this idea, and strongly recommended that this process be adopted more widely in the future as part of the upstream process in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, category 2 centres, the African World Heritage Fund, and others. ICCROM would be happy to work with interested States Parties and other organizations to further develop these ideas and create a possibility for a large number of sites to be able to take advantage of this advice at an early moment in the process of developing nomination files.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation de Cuba** remercie l'organe d'évaluation pour l'information donnée et le Secrétariat pour la documentation préparée. Concernant le processus de consultation, la délégation estime que l'Unesco a tendance à utiliser de plus en plus ces mécanismes mais par moments ces mécanismes ne sont pas plus efficaces car on voit que les enquêtes sont là pour orienter quelques questions et ne permettent pas un débat ouvert qui permettrait d'avancer plus. La délégation pense que c'est un processus très important qui permet aux pays, surtout les pays moins développés, d'avancer dans les schémas et les processus d'inclusion. Néanmoins, la délégation a une préoccupation concernant le financement de ce processus, qui doit être assuré au-delà du programme ordinaire et du budget ordinaire de ces conventions de l'Unesco afin d'assurer la soutenabilité de ces mécanismes ce qui est très important pour tous les États membres. De ce fait, le Comité doit s'assurer que ces mécanismes sont bien exprimés et bien classés par le budget ordinaire de ces conventions à l'intérieur du programme et budget de l'organisation.

The **Delegation of Finland** thanked the Secretariat for the comprehensive report and useful

analysis of the survey on upstream process, especially in helping to receive more complete nomination dossiers and also for addressing the balance of the World Heritage List. It agreed on the limit of 10 annual new requests to be considered so as to manage the workload in the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies. However, when limiting the number of requests, prioritization becomes a key issue. As was known, the World Heritage List was still imbalanced and there were types of heritage and regions that were under-represented on the List. The delegation also took note that the progress report considered that upstream processes were most effective when undertaken at the earliest stages in the nomination process, i.e. at the moment of preparation or revision of Tentative Lists. Therefore Finland considered that the use of paragraph 61.c of the Operational Guidelines as the basis of prioritization, as suggested in the draft decision, did not sufficiently cover the issue of balance with regard to effective access to the upstream process. For example, nominations from Africa, the Pacific and the Caribbean were mentioned in paragraph 61.c as only the seventh priority, and Tentative Lists would not be considered at all if prioritization was solely based on paragraph 61.c. Therefore Finland, together with Jamaica, proposed an amendment that would first prioritize preparation or revision of the Tentative Lists, then Least Developed countries, Low-Income and Lower Middle-Income Countries and Small Island Developing States, should guideline 61.c be the basis for prioritization. This would also align with paragraph 13 of the draft decision that would limit financing for the Advisory Missions budget line to this group of countries only.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that although a recent initiative, it believed that the upstream process was an important recent tool that had been developed quickly to help improve implementation of the Convention in a balanced manner. It welcomed and commended the Secretariat in reflecting on the suggestions made by the States Parties, as well as the outcomes of the online survey at the current stage of the upstream process. The delegation also welcomed the prioritization system that would contribute to a better functioning of the process and it supported efficient distribution of the limited resources, which would favour the countries-in-need and would eventually contribute to a more representative list. The delegation hoped that the World Heritage Centre could find a way to restructure its composition in order to overcome the difficulties of institutionalizing the upstream process in coordination with ICOMOS and Advisory Bodies so as to better cope with nominations and Tentative Lists. It appreciated and strongly supported the proposal to revise the definition in the Operational Guidelines because it was currently unclear and thus should be clarified and improved to better reflect the spirit, mechanism and the target of the process. It also believed that this could be a topic to be added for discussion to the Ad-hoc Working Group. The delegation also welcomed the suggestion made by the World Heritage Centre to establish a sub-account within the World Heritage Fund in order to fund the upstream process, which was very important and States Parties should consider contributing to this sub-account.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** considère ce processus comme étant un mécanisme important et utile pour le continent africain surtout, et d'autres continents évidemment où il y a des pays émergent. La délégation pense ce processus en amont est fondamental pour pouvoir soumettre des dossiers avec un minimum de qualité. Il fait partie de la dynamique de renforcement des capacités et, en même temps, il apporte des conseils aux États parties pour pouvoir améliorer la qualité de leurs dossiers, ce qui facilite par conséquent le travail du Comité dans la prise de décisions. L'Angola donc soutient fortement cette initiative. Elle félicite le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le rapport présenté et a pris note des commentaires faits par les organes consultatifs, notamment concernant le travail fait par le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain, avec des suggestions assez intéressantes de commencer à développer justement des ateliers thématiques pour diversifier la liste du patrimoine mondial. La délégation encourage cette initiative afin que la liste soit de plus en plus riche et diversifiée. La délégation prend l'opportunité de soutenir la proposition faite par la Finlande pour que les ressources disponibles soient utilisées de manière rationnelle, en donnant la priorité aux pays qui en ont plus besoin et c'est ainsi que la justice sera faite et

que nous aurons une liste crédible et équilibrée.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Secretariat for the report, noting the great interest of States Parties to the upstream process reflected by the large number of responses to the online survey. Like others, it saw the potential in the upstream process to help bring about a more balanced and representative List by providing assistance to the States Parties most in need and underrepresented on the World Heritage List. It should also help States Parties identify sites that might benefit from designations or programmes other than World Heritage, thereby avoiding complex and costly evaluation processes that may affect the credibility of the Committee at a later stage. Thus, there was a need to ensure quality and equitable provision of upstream advice and support so as not to inadvertently produce further imbalances on the List. The delegation supported the remarks of IUCN in this regard and strongly agreed with the prioritization of upstream process for LDCs, SIDS and developing countries as a whole. It also believed that, in revising the Operational Guidelines in the future, the Committee might consider upgrading the definition of the upstream process itself, and move it from a footnote to a dedicated section in the Operational Guidelines, as the general sentiment was to further institutionalize the process.

The **Delegation of Portugal** also thanked the Secretariat for this very useful report, noting that from the answers provided by States Parties to the survey, it seemed clear that the upstream process was indeed a useful mechanism to improve nomination dossiers when applied. Portugal commended the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for the ongoing reflection on this subject, which helped clarify a number of issues and would offer better guidance to States Parties on upstream processes. As mentioned by Turkey, it also believed that a clear definition of this process was welcome. As requests for upstream processes might be greater than the available means, the delegation wondered whether it would be useful to also involve ICOMOS National Committees in the process whenever expertise in specific matters was available. ICOMOS Portugal was often relied upon with very good results. The delegation agreed that the Committee should do its utmost to continuously engage work with Africa and SIDS with a view to further identifying nominations from these regions, which would ultimately contribute to a more balanced World Heritage List.

La **Délégation du Liban** souligne l'importance de la question du processus en amont puisqu'il semble visible que davantage de projets aillent vers ce type de processus et remarque qu'il est important dès maintenant de fixer certains principes. Elle remarque que la question des priorités accordées aux États parties, régions, types de biens, ou de catégories de biens sous-représentés, a déjà été mis sur la table, et ne pense pas qu'il y ait eu de processus en amont très développé auprès de la région du Groupe I (Europe de l'Ouest et Amérique du Nord), puisque les projets pilotes n'ont pas concerné cette région. La délégation souhaite souligner qu'il existe une importance à donner une priorité aux questions complexes, c'est-à-dire les types de biens qui demandent une approche un peu innovante, parce qu'il n'est peut-être pas utile de faire un processus en amont pour l'inscription d'un monument ou d'une catégorie de ce type. Peut-être serait-il davantage fructueux de choisir les biens qui sont complexes, les catégories complexes, les biens situés dans des régions, par exemple, où se posent des problématiques innovantes. Cela concerne la direction de l'upstream process qui ne devrait pas être uniquement depuis les organes consultatifs vers les États, mais plutôt qui devrait aller dans les deux sens, c'est-à-dire que les organes consultatifs doivent aussi apprendre à partir du upstream process. Il faudrait que les organes consultatifs apprennent à sortir de leur position traditionnelle, qui apparaît trop souvent comme celle d'un juge ou d'un jury d'examen, pour se concentrer et commencer à travailler sur les problèmes de base : comment faire sur le terrain ? Comment monter un dossier ? Comment regarder des opérations innovantes ? La délégation a souvent l'impression que du point de vue des organes consultatifs il s'agit surtout d'essayer d'empêcher de mauvais sites de rentrer dans la liste alors qu'elle rétorque que le but devrait être de développer de nouvelles formes de nominations et de nouvelles perspectives.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** was of the view that the upstream process was a necessary mechanism to have countries move forward with nomination proposals in an effective and efficient manner, adding that upstream processes should be in operation prior to the submission of a nomination. This mechanism would save time and resources of countries and the Advisory Bodies. Further, it would also help ensure the implementation of the Convention by maintaining the appropriate parameter of OUV. True to their objective to help countries in their nominations, the involvement of Advisory Bodies is a requisite for a successful upstream process. The delegation took note of the suggestion to limit the requests for upstream process to 10 requests per year to ensure that the Advisory Bodies could respond adequately within their existing resources, with initial support given SIDS and countries with priority to access the Advisory Missions budget line. It also supported the notion of studying the proposed amendment to the footnote of paragraph 122 of the Operational Guidelines [on Upstream Processes].

The **Delegation of Jamaica** commended the World Heritage Centre in preparing the report on the upstream process, which clearly provided further clarity on the initiative. It also noted that the online survey made it easier for the World Heritage Centre to determine how to improve and operationalize the process going forward. It was noted that for every success there were always additional repercussions around funding. States Parties were seeing the value and wished to take advantage of the benefits under the programme. As noted by Finland, this is where the World Heritage Centre would need to prioritize according to the realities of the different regions. Fully recognizing the expense of undertaking the upstream process, but given the number of problems concerning potential mixed nominations, the delegation asked whether there was a possibility that priority be given to these [mixed] nominations as part of the limited application of the upstream process envisioned in any given year. It also sought clarification regarding paragraph 40 of the report concerning institutional upstream advice, or what is referenced as officially recognized upstream process, where States Parties seek *independent* advice to guide the preparation of their dossiers as opposed to seeking guidance from the World Heritage Centre or the Advisory Bodies, i.e. Did this in any way impact how the Advisory Bodies evaluate dossiers?

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** also appreciated the great efforts undertaken and the progress made so far by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in addressing this critical issue of strengthening the upstream process. The report was adequately detailed in context and approach, however, while this was a step in the right direction, the delegation was worried that the World Heritage Centre was increasingly overwhelmed by a workload that was not supported by an appropriate level of funding. In this regard, the delegation recommended that – at least in the medium and longer term – this initiative be integrated within the work of category 2 centres so as to strengthen regional capacity-building in the form of training and mentorship based on regionally available professionals. It believed that this would address the technological anomalies and ease the work of the Advisory Bodies and could thus be a cost-effective alternative. The delegation also submitted a minor amendment to the draft decision.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** reconnaît la pertinence du coût C6 en amont pour avoir des dossiers de proposition d'inscription bien préparés. Elle remercie le Centre du patrimoine pour toutes les informations qui ont été fournies dans ce rapport d'avancement. Elle partage plusieurs des idées qui ont été développées, notamment la prise en compte des besoins prioritaires des pays les moins avancés dans les projets de processus en amont, et précisément en termes de renforcement des capacités et de conseil. Dans ce sens, la délégation pense que l'accès aux organisations consultatives devrait être facilité, que ce soit dans un cadre sous-régional, régional ou suivant une approche thématique et salue le fait que cette vision semble être partagée par les organisations consultatives. Vu la pertinence du processus en amont et en vue d'assurer sa pérennité, elle soutient l'idée d'envisager son financement par le budget ordinaire. Enfin, elle appuie les propositions d'amendement qui tendent à accorder la priorité aux dossiers des pays les moins avancés, comme proposées

par la Finlande et la Jamaïque.

The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** highly commended the efforts that the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies were undertaking on upstream processes. The main points had already been raised by previous speakers, nonetheless, it agreed that the concept, scope and procedure of upstream processes needed to be addressed on an operational basis to increase its beneficiaries and to enhance efficiency. It also sought clear guidelines to prioritize States Parties for the upstream process.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for its comprehensive report, adding that the upstream process was very important and created new opportunities of cooperation among States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It believed that the online reflection survey exercise by the Secretariat had shed light on certain issues. One of the important issues was the upstream process request format, which was largely supported by States Parties as a result of this survey. The delegation further believed that the proposed draft was of high quality and could be endorsed by the Committee. It was also important to encourage States Parties to join this upstream process at an early stage of the nomination process, namely, at the level of Tentative Lists. In this regard, it commended the Advisory Bodies for their proposal to States Parties to cooperate on the preparation of Tentative Lists. Another important point concerned the issue of providing adequate financial resources for upstream processes, which seemed extremely difficult, especially in this period when overall funding for the work of the World Heritage Centre was under financial pressure. In this regard, it welcomed the proposal by the Secretariat to open the sub-account and to advertise upstream processes in the Marketplace. The second very important point concerned capacity-building, and in this regard the delegation believed that the upstream process should not be limited solely to the preparation of nomination and Tentative Lists but should go further in providing capacity-building for heritage experts, site managers and professionals in the field of conservation and management. The upstream processes should thus be causally integrated in the Secretariat's overall capacity-building strategy.

La **Délégation du Viet Nam** félicite le résultat de l'enquête sur le processus en amont et surtout ses idées et sa méthode à appliquer en réalité. Elle estime que ce processus joue un rôle très important pour aider les États parties, surtout les pays en voie de développement, à renforcer leurs capacités nationales, à préparer les dossiers ainsi qu'à réviser leurs listes indicatives. Mais il est aussi important d'équilibrer les propositions du processus en prenant en compte les besoins des États parties.

La **Délégation du Liban** remarque que beaucoup a été dit sur la question du funding et comment trouver des ressources pour l'upstream process, mais elle demande avant tout de pouvoir répondre à la question « pourquoi veut-on trouver des ressources » ? C'est pour cela que la délégation souhaite entendre les organisations consultatives que ce qu'elles ont appris de ce processus. Est-ce qu'elles ont évolué dans leur conception de la façon de faire des dossiers ou pas ? Leur conception sur la façon de faire des dossiers a-t-elle évoluée ?

The **Delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Secretariat for this initiative and for this report. With regard to the capacity-building approach, the delegation felt that it was very important that States Parties also invite national partners, regional partners like NGOs and civil societies to form a kind of cooperation between States Parties, like south-south cooperation, south-south-north cooperation. In this regard, category 2 centres also had a very important role.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** félicite le Centre pour le travail sur l'enquête en ligne, et le Secrétariat sur l'excellent rapport. Elle note avec attention les commentaires des organisations consultatives et en particulier, avec beaucoup d'intérêt, le commentaire de l'UICN qui insiste sur la nécessité d'assurer l'équité et l'équilibre dans la représentation géographique des pays. Elle soutient la proposition faite par la Finlande pour ce qui concerne d'initier le processus en amont dès l'établissement des listes indicatives, et rejoint le Liban sur la recherche sur la réflexion pour trouver des mécanismes interactifs entre les différents acteurs et en particulier les États parties.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** reiterated the value of the upstream process and the need for it to be mainstreamed within the operations of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. However, regarding access to the upstream process, the delegation spoke about how it was seen as a resource centre, or clinic, by countries that sought to prepare nominations and nominate properties, adding that even countries with more resources than Lower-Middle countries required support. The delegation wondered whether there was another way of introducing a provision whereby countries could access the 'clinic' but also share resources in the upstream process by putting their own resources into the system in order to benefit from the technical support provided by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre to respond.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that some comments also concerned the budget, for example, Cuba and Tanzania had referred to the Regular Programme, and she reminded the Committee that the UNESCO Regular Programme was in a very critical financial situation. Funds essentially covered staff and statutory provisions with a very limited amount allocated to field offices. With regard to the issue of workload, mentioned by Tanzania, the Director informed the Committee, as explained in the Budget Working Group, that staff at the World Heritage Centre had been reduced from 41 to 27 even though it received requests every day for help; the same was also true for the Advisory Bodies. The Director explained that if money was taken from the Regular Programme, there would be no additional amount allocated to the Culture Sector or the Convention under those conditions. However, in the case of a sub-account, as mentioned by Turkey and Azerbaijan, it would be set up under the provisions of the Committee. In this way, the Committee could set priorities based on how it wished to see the funds spent. Hence, one of the reasons why this proposal was made. The Director also took note in the discussion of possible potential future revisions to the Operational Guidelines, adding that it was a good idea to introduce more new and innovative approaches so as to learn from all sides, i.e. not only through the Advisory Bodies but also through the States and stakeholders whose involvement would enhance learning about and for the process, which was important, as mentioned by Lebanon. The Philippines also mentioned other designations that might arise during the upstream process, whether within UNESCO or outside, i.e. other programmes that were more relevant for certain sites. Capacity-building was mentioned by Tanzania, and the Director found the issue absolutely crucial, as explained by the Advisory Bodies. The Director further explained that work was ongoing to work more closely with the category 2 centres, specifically on World Heritage and on the provisions of the Convention and the Operational Guidelines. With regard to the question of independent advice, the Director agreed that of course States Parties were free to take advice from whoever they wished, but from the Secretariat's experience – and from her own personal experience of 26 years – there were occasionally problems associated with independent advice because although the chosen experts might be excellent, they might not be familiar with the process of informing the World Heritage Centre or the Advisory Bodies, or the provisions of the Operational Guidelines and the Committee, which often resulted in nominations failing at the Committee stage. As mentioned by Tunisia, the Director agreed that interactions between States was a very important point. Some successful training programmes had occurred when States Parties prepared nominations at the same time, which Zimbabwe referred to as a clinic. The Director concurred that States could indeed help each other as they successfully go through these procedures.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Bodies to respond, starting with ICOMOS.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** welcomed the very interesting discussion on this subject, underscoring the remarks by Lebanon about the need for a two-way and innovative process, which it absolutely agreed with, adding that this was the way ICOMOS had been undertaking its work. But there were caveats if one is to be innovative, as this takes time, and it was also essential that the advice is requested at the earliest stage possible. This is often reiterated, but even at the Tentative List stage, the parameters could only be fixed if asked to give

advice, for example, on one or two sites considered for potential inclusion on the world Tentative Lists. The possibilities to be innovative were even less if the proposal put forward on a particularly nomination was fixed before upstream advice was sought on precisely how it should be presented. Thus, looking back further upstream in order to look more widely at innovative approaches, and particularly how to address the imbalance on the World Heritage List, it was often found that more information was needed than was currently available, and perhaps there was a need for more thematic studies in order to frame these innovative approaches. Hence, being innovative had an impact on capacities, and on time frames; both of which were important issues. Nevertheless, what ICOMOS considered to be the real potential of upstream advice was to be innovative in looking how gaps might be filled in the most effective way possible, and to look at not just individual nominations but serial and transnational serial nominations that might come forward. ICOMOS believed that a great deal could be learnt from the interactions so far with States Parties on this process. What States Parties need were reassurances that they were going in the right direction, reassurances that their nomination had the potential to be successful. Thus, in order to deliver that advice, the subject [of the nomination] had to be opened and explored before reverting its focus back [to the nomination], which is a process that takes time and needs to involve stakeholders and all those supporting the nomination. Thus, this should be an open collaborative process if it is to be effective. There are many ways in which opportunities could be done at a later date, but there was also a need to settle principles for interaction, as well as more clearly defining the upstream process, particularly where it starts and where it ends.

The **Representative of IUCN** remarked on the points raised by Finland and Jamaica, adding that it supported the idea of improving prioritization. It also very much supported the comments by Tanzania, which were conveyed in the amendment, on the important role of category 2 centres. A further two questions were raised: one by Lebanon, and the other by Jamaica. The Representative first wished to reassure Lebanon that the upstream process for IUCN – and likely for ICOMOS and ICCROM – involved getting out into the field a lot, whether that was in cases like Lake Ohrid or the Grenadines in workshops with States Parties, or with processes with the African World Heritage Fund, which have had events taking place in the field in a number of different places. The Representative further added as a way of reassurance that the perception of the Advisory Bodies at Committee sessions was not representative of the way the upstream process unfolded. In terms of what had the Advisory Bodies learned [working on these upstream processes], the Representative explained that the first thing of real importance was building regional diversity into programmes, where IUCN had full-time staff members working on World Heritage, for example based in Senegal, employed staff who were Russian and Chinese mother-tongue, Spanish speakers and so on, so that it might be able to communicate in all six UNESCO working languages, plus about a dozen more, which was considered vital for real communication at the level nominations were discussed. This was also where collaboration with the category 2 centres was vital, and certain staff members directly supported collaboration with category 2 centres. A second important point was the general openness to communication and dialogue that had also been part of the way nominations were increasingly being discussed within the process. Thus, it was also important that IUCN remained accessible to States Parties, including welcoming States Parties to offices, which was seen as a very important route for discussion, outside of Skype, conference calls and so on. A third point was the importance of engaging in the process early on, i.e. often it was too late to have a discussion about the right idea, a good concept or even whether World Heritage was the best instrument to recognize a site when nominations had already been put together. Thus, in the learning process it was best to have early discussions, and hence the engagement in Tentative Lists. A final point on what has been learnt was to have techniques that actually make sense, as for example in the case already mentioned regarding the capacity-building programme with the African World Heritage Fund, which was a well thought through, tried and tested model that worked, and the reason why IUCN recommended it. In addition, the workshops on Tentative Lists had shown a number of successful experiences

with States Parties. On a provocative note, the Representative spoke of how innovation could be introduced in the Committee session that could substantially change the direction of imbalance in the World Heritage List, though this had never happened as the Committee ended up more or less in the same situation. Innovation could take the form of really supporting sites in under-represented countries, regions, types of heritage. With regard to the question by Jamaica [on independent advice], the Representative agreed with the Director's response regarding the disconnect between the provisions of the Convention and the Operational Guidelines with the scientific process, which might be great if it did not have to apply to the World Heritage Convention but had no real roots in terms of the standards of the Convention. This was where the largest amount of money and time was being spent and these problems therefore had to be unfixed. It was thus considered vital for States Parties to allow IUCN or ICOMOS to provide them with an institutional view that could reassure States that the project on which they were working was actually sound. In this regard, the Representative agreed with Lebanon's point that in those instances there was much merit in focusing on nominations that could be very complicated by putting things on a good track early on, particularly for more complicated concepts or sites.

The **Representative of ICCROM** thanked the Committee for the comments in regard to this topic, noting that many Members had commented positively on the capacity-building aspects of the upstream process, which was obviously something ICCROM would work on with interested Committee Members and States Parties more closely in the long run. The Representative noted that a number of Committee Members had talked about the need for more an interactive process of sharing among States Parties within a region, adding that this was exactly the purpose of the workshops that the African World Heritage Fund had been developing. The idea was that States Parties would clearly get advice from the Advisory Bodies but also from each other and would thus become a shared learning experience among States where they could bring forward their problems and suggest solutions to those problems. This was considered very important, as was bringing in more stakeholders into that process of nominations or Tentative Lists. The second point worth emphasizing was that while there was definitely a need for prioritization, as brought up by a number of Members and certainly in relation to Lower-Income countries and SIDS, there was a case to move towards a more workshop-type format into the future so that more States Parties could be involved at a given time. ICCROM did not wish to limit [nominations] to only 10 in the future, especially when workshops could be developed more broadly, which would help open up the issue of prioritization to some extent and thus offer advice to more States Parties. The third point concerned the question by Lebanon on what had the Advisory Bodies learned. The Representative responded that one learned all the time. As someone who had worked at ICCROM for more 20 years, he had never conducted a workshop or activity in which he hadn't learnt from the participants in a kind of two-way learning that was in fact crucial. With regard to specifically these kinds of workshops, the Representative spoke of an evaluation workshop that had taken place a couple of weeks ago with the African World Heritage Fund where, among other things, it was learned that there was a need to focus on developing management plans at the same time as working on the nomination itself. Too often the nomination file was worked on while the management plan was neglected up until the last moment when [the drafters] would have to jump in and start working on the management plan. There was thus a need to carry out these tasks simultaneously; a finding that actually came out of that evaluation workshop. The second thing learned was that the capacity to carry out comparative analyses was actually still scarce in most States Parties, and that needed strengthening in the future. Concluding, the Representative noted that this was a continually learning process; to discuss, evaluate and develop these aspects into a more effective tool. With regard to the the issue of imbalance in the List, it was noted that the Committee had been dealing with this issue since the development of the global strategy in the 1990s, but the balance in the List since 1994 had virtually remained unchanged. He was not sure whether the upstream processes could solve this problem but certainly ICCROM could at least start working more closely with under-represented States Parties to make sure

they are able to compile strong nominations.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted amendments from Finland, Jamaica, Tanzania and Turkey. Paragraphs 1–10 remained unchanged. There was an addition in paragraph 11 from Finland and Jamaica, which would read, 'giving priority for the preparation or revision of Tentative Lists, to the Least Developed Countries, Low-Income and Lower Middle-Income Countries and Small Island Developing States, followed by the mechanism of paragraph 61.c) of the Operational Guidelines'. Paragraph 12 remained unchanged. There was a new paragraph 13, which would read, 'Requests that the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies also give consideration to the thematic imbalances highlighted by the gap analyses in the prioritization of the upstream requests'. Paragraph 13 would become 14, and 14 would become 15. There were new paragraphs 16, 17 and 18. Paragraph 16 would read, 'Also decides to include in the mandate of the extended Ad-Hoc Working Group an item on the definition of upstream processes'. New paragraph 17 would read, 'Encourages the World Heritage Centre to reorganize its structure in a way to better cope with upstream processes'. Paragraph 18 would read, 'Recommends that other Category 2 Centres consider integrating in their capacity-building initiatives the Nomination Upstream programme following the example of the African World Heritage Fund programme in Africa in partnership with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, which is considered a successful, regional capacity-building model'. The original paragraph 15 would now become paragraph 19.

The **Delegation of Finland** referred to paragraph 17 and the proposal by Turkey in which the World Heritage Centre would reorganize their structure in order to better cope with upstream process, adding that it wished to hear from the Secretariat as to what this could mean in practice. Finland joined Tanzania in supporting the amendment in paragraph 18.

The **Delegation of Turkey** explained that the idea was to have a dedicated unit in charge of the upstream process within the World Heritage Centre to develop this initiative in the future.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the current structure of the World Heritage Centre comprised of the PSM [policy and statutory meetings] team that also deals with the coordination of State of conservation reports, with nominations and Tentative Lists, as well as upstream projects. They work in coordination with the regional teams. The Director felt that this was an internal management question and she would certainly discuss this issue with the ADG should the Committee decide to introduce this item into the decision. However, as previously mentioned, the World Heritage Centre depended totally on the Regular Programme and with the severe reduction in staff since 2011, she was unsure how the recommendation to change the Centre's structure would solve the issue.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that having heard from the Secretariat it did not see the need for Turkey's amendment as the work would be undertaken in any case.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** concurred that it was unsure of the importance of reorganizing the World Heritage Centre to have a separate unit for upstream processes, especially as this would be better integrated within the regional groups rather than isolated from the rest of the work, i.e. upstream processes should be part of the normal procedure of the Centre. For example, when the Arab group works on different subjects, it was important that the Arab group also work on the upstream process for properties located in the Arab region. With regard to innovation, the delegation wished to add to the paragraph 13, 'Requests that the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies give also consideration to the thematic imbalances highlighted by the gap analysis', then following, 'as well as innovative approaches to heritage in the prioritization of the upstream requests'.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** wished to propose at the end of paragraph 14, 'and others on a case by case as well as cost-sharing basis'.

Following the discussion on the importance of a balanced World Heritage List, the **Delegation of the Philippines** wished to add an amendment in paragraph 16, which would

read, 'and the effectiveness of the global strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List'.

The **Delegation of Turkey** thanked the Director for the explanation, but still believed that it was important to have a general reorganization within the World Heritage Centre specifically for upstream processes, adding that this kind of dedicated unit, coordinating with other regional units, would help in the development of the upstream process in the future. In addition, the language in the amendment 'encourages' the Centre to consider it.

The **Chairperson** understood that the Director would be happy to be 'encouraged', but the question was whether the sentence was needed in this document.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** had a minor correction in paragraph 13, to read, 'Advisory Bodies to also give consideration [...]'.

La **Délégation du Portugal** désire aider sur le paragraphe 17. Elle rejoint les autres délégations mais demande s'il ne serait pas bon de donner plus de latitude au Centre, de manière à mettre en œuvre des mesures qui puissent être considérées nécessaires et possibles, justement pour faire face au processus en amont. Il pourrait être inscrit, par exemple : « encourage le Centre du patrimoine mondial à prendre les mesures nécessaires et possibles, de manière à mieux faire face au processus en amont ». Le message reste là mais permet au Centre de reconnaître les préoccupations des membres du Comité, de manière à traiter cette question de la façon la plus efficace possible. La délégation pense que cela pourrait convenir au Comité et au Centre.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted the concerns, especially from Turkey, adding that she would be happy to discuss the issue with the ADG. However, in general, especially for significant structural changes, this task was charged to the Executive Board, not the Committee. Thus, under normal procedure, change in the Heritage Division depended on the Executive Board.

The **Delegation of Turkey** fully understood that the place was indeed the Executive Board, but it still believed in the necessity of the change within the Centre. Nevertheless, it could go along with the proposal by Portugal to take the necessary and feasible measures in a way to better cope with the upstream process, adding that it would take up this issue at the Board.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision, and paragraphs 1–12 were adopted.

The **Representative of IUCN** proposed a small addition in paragraph 13 that would consider the thematic and regional imbalances, adding that one of the big challenges in IUCN was not necessarily the gaps in some of the thematic studies but that certain regions do not come forward. Thus, it was up to the Committee to consider looking beyond *thematic* imbalances and consider also looking at *regional* imbalances.

The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraphs 13–19 duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 9A adopted as amended.

ITEM 9B - PROGRESS REPORT ON THE REFLECTION ON PROCESSES FOR MIXED NOMINATIONS

Document [WHC/17/41.COM/9B](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/whc/17/41.COM/9B)
Decision: [41 COM 9B](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/whc/17/41.COM/9B)

The **Chairperson** turned to item 9B, regarding the reflection on processes for mixed nominations.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the working document covered a very important topic, recalling that Decision [39 COM 9B](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/whc/17/39.COM/9B) requested ICOMOS and IUCN to

implement proposals to improve the evaluation of mixed sites, with the document examining the progress made towards greater coordination between the two Advisory Bodies. These efforts have produced significant results, yet more had to be done even though communication and coordination between ICOMOS and IUCN had been enhanced since the 39th session; joint missions, briefings, mission itineraries, communication with States Parties, have all become solidified as standard practice. The Director also recalled the excellent Nature-Culture Journey in Hawaii at the World Conservation Congress [read more [here](#)]. Much less progress had been made, however, in areas where more resources were required to improve collaboration and this would be needed to offer coordinated upstream advice for mixed sites. The draft decision thus reiterated the importance of greater coordination, and encouraged States Parties to provide support.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to ICOMOS.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that in the spirit of cooperation and collaboration on this issue, ICOMOS would make a common statement on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies. Referring to mixed sites, the Representative noted that mixed properties and nominations still remain rare in a relative sense, as was discussed under the previous item on upstream processes, and this despite the realities on the ground where natural and cultural values were often indivisible. It was thus an opportunity to again encourage States Parties to work upstream with both IUCN and ICOMOS so that this process did not have to add complexity and uncertainty to proposals. The working document outlined the progress made in relation to specific actions since the 39th session of the Committee. Actions requiring little or no additional resources have obviously progressed more rapidly, such as coordinating Advisory Bodies' communications with States Parties and coordination of mission itineraries, and so on. Other aspects, such as interactions between the IUCN and ICOMOS World Heritage Panels, the sharing of desk reviews, and the coordination of requests for additional information, for example, have now become standard practice since the 39th session. Resource constraints, both financial and human, was influenced greatly by the dimension of time and had not allowed the Advisory Bodies to move as far on other aspects, as outlined in document 9B. In addition, the Representative wished to bring to the Committee's attention relevant areas of shared work. The IUCN/ICOMOS project titled 'Connecting Practice' was near completion of its stage 2. Reports would be made available online as Stage 1 was already done [read final report [here](#)], but in brief the Bodies worked closely with site managers and national agencies in Stage 2 at two specific locations. The first was in the Maloti-Drakensberg Park (South Africa and Lesotho), and the second was in the Hortobágy National Park (Hungary), which was presented in a side event in Krakow. IUCN/ICOMOS also worked with the possibilities of adapting the 'Enhancing our Heritage' [toolkit](#) to all World Heritage properties: natural, cultural and mixed. This had been trialled very usefully by site managers in Switzerland and Finland. The Advisory Bodies were grateful for these partnerships and for support from the Christensen Fund, the States Parties of Switzerland and Germany, and from the case study partners and States Parties; an important testing platform for operationalizing the interlinkages and dependencies between nature and culture in all heritage properties, whether inscribed as cultural, natural, cultural landscapes, but especially for the mixed properties. An important new initiative led by IUCN and ICCROM with the involvement of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre was the World Heritage Leadership Programme, which was supported very generously by the Government of Norway, to provide new strength to shared capacity-building efforts in better addressing the entangled character of nature and culture. Finally, ICOMOS recalled information provided by IUCN under agenda item 5B regarding the World Conservation Congress held in Hawaii in 2016, which included a number of relevant resolutions for IUCN, but also the key outcomes of the IUCN and US/ICOMOS jointly auspiced Nature-Culture Journey, of which the inspiring document [Mālama Honua](#) – To care for our island Earth – was worthy of attention. In the same framework, IUCN and ICOMOS would join forces with ICCROM and other partners to host a Culture-Nature Journey at the forthcoming ICOMOS General Assembly in December 2017 in Delhi, India.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** thanked the World Heritage Centre for its report and congratulated the Advisory Bodies for providing a unified report that was leading by example in this area. It was pleased to note that there was increased collaboration between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in terms of the preparation and evaluation of mixed sites, though it was concerned that there were still a number of areas that needed to be incorporated within the proposals made by the World Heritage Centre. The Advisory Bodies had spoken about the issues of time and cost, and the delegation hoped that this would eventually be resolved as they gain more practice in working together on mixed nominations. It was pleased with the draft decision but wished to see the proposals made by the Secretariat reflected in the draft decision and not just remain as recommendations, which may or may not be implemented.

The **Delegation of Finland** thanked IUCN and ICOMOS for the report and the progress made in advancing the preparation and evaluation processes related to mixed nominations. It believed that the progress made today was already a significant improvement, and it encouraged the Advisory Bodies to continue this effort within the available resources, and it supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** was happy and appreciated the well prepared proposal by the Advisory Bodies. In addressing the pertinent issue of the best approach to the nomination of mixed properties, the delegation fully subscribed to the proposed recommendations in this report. However, it also wished to re-advocate for a strengthened cooperation between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies in view of achieving more mixed nominations. The delegation also appealed to States Parties with mixed properties to reinforce their culture-nature interfaces in view of sustaining these otherwise rare, mixed World Heritage properties. The delegation also submitted a minor amendment to the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Portugal** thanked the Advisory Bodies for having provided the report in a joint manner, adding that it was well known that mixed nominations involved a complex process for which it commended ICOMOS and IUCN for their efforts in improving the joint evaluation of these sites. In paragraph 4 of the draft decision, the delegation noted that it had recommended that States Parties ideally seek prior advice from IUCN and ICOMOS at least two years before a potential nomination submission, if possible, in compliance with paragraph 122 of the Operational Guidelines. It was also noted that the Committee just approved Decision 41 COM 9A in which the Committee took note of the limited resources, understandably, to limit the number of new upstream process requests per year. Thus, it wished to know whether the advice regarding mixed properties be considered among this limited number of requests, and if so, in which order would it appear.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** expressed thanks to the Committee and Advisory Bodies in improving evaluation processes for mixed sites, whose efforts were commendable, although it noted that the very actions required were hindered by the limited budget. The delegation believed that any serious headway towards improving evaluations of mixed sites would require putting into practice a number of proposed items, such as undertaking IUCN/ICOMOS Panels, where feasible, either to address the whole evaluation or to complete evaluations after the first IUCN and ICOMOS Panels in December. The delegation also strongly believed that IUCN and ICOMOS should produce a single jointly agreed decision for mixed sites, and it had thus put forward an amendment to the draft decision to reflect this harmonization of how mixed sites could be evaluated.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Jamaica and Tanzania. Paragraphs 1 to 4 remained unchanged. Paragraph 5 received an amendment from Jamaica to add at the end, 'to include as far as feasible: a) establishing a common approach for desk review, b) undertaking a joint IUCN/ICOMOS panel to either address the whole evaluation or to complete the evaluations after the first IUCN and ICOMOS panels in December, and c)

producing a single, jointly agreed decision for mixed site evaluations. There was a slight amendment in paragraph c) from Tanzania with the deletion of one word. A new paragraph 7 would read, 'Invites States Parties hosting potential mixed properties to reinforce their culture/nature interfaces in view of consolidating and sustaining the values of the properties'.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraphs 1–4 adopted.

The **Rapporteur** advised that Portugal had a comment on paragraph 4 [on IUCN and ICOMOS].

The **Delegation of Portugal** asked that the Advisory Bodies be given the floor to respond.

The **Representative of IUCN** had a comment in paragraph 5, related to the question raised. However, in paragraph 4, he felt that the World Heritage Centre was probably the appropriate body to respond [to Portugal's question] because it reflected on prioritization, though he surmised that prioritization, as just agreed under agenda item 9A, would be applied. Moreover, for mixed site proposals there would be particular encouragement to ask that prioritization apply to all nominations.

The **Chairperson** noted a question from Portugal directly addressing the World Heritage Centre.

The **Delegation of Portugal** sought a clarification because in Decision 41 COM 9A there was a prioritization in requests received within the new limit of 10, while in paragraph 4 States Parties were asked to seek prior advice from the Advisory Bodies for mixed nominations owing to the complex nature of nominations. The question thus concerned the prioritizing process, i.e. would a request for an upstream process put forward by a State Party on a mixed site be included within this new limit just adopted of 10 nominations.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** remarked that mixed sites was the least represented category on the World Heritage List and hence the rationale behind this whole project. The Director concurred, as already mentioned by the Advisory Bodies, that advice should be given as early as possible, even at the stage of Tentative Lists so as to guide States Parties on the best options for mixed sites, cultural landscapes, and cultural or natural sites. More advice would in fact be required for mixed sites in terms of defining the potential OUV. This explained why paragraph 4 was included so that States Parties could seek advice from the Advisory Bodies as early as possible. In terms of priorities for the upstream process, which was also mentioned by Jamaica and others, the Director certainly agreed that priority should be granted to mixed sites, but other priorities needed to be taken into account as well.

The **Delegation of Finland** responded to the question from Portugal with reference to Decision 41 COM 9A just adopted, in which paragraph 11 (which was proposed by Finland and Jamaica) gave priority in the preparation or revision of Tentative Lists to Least Developed Countries, Low-Income, Lower Middle-Income Countries and Small Island Developing States. Thus, should any of these groups of countries propose a mixed site, then it would be very high up in the prioritization list.

The **Chairperson** returned to draft decision, and paragraphs 4–6 were duly adopted.

The **Delegation of Turkey** thanked the Advisory Bodies for this jointly produced report on the important issues of coordination. According to the report, harmonization in reporting and a review of the format would be the next step, pending extrabudgetary financing. However, the draft decision did not refer to further work by the Advisory Bodies in that regard. The delegation asked the Advisory Bodies to explain if there was a specific reason for not referring to such work, and if acceptable, it wished to add an additional paragraph to seek further work on this issue.

The **Chairperson** noted that this referred to paragraph 8.

The **Representative of IUCN** sought a clarification from Turkey on exactly the work it wished

to see reflected in the decision, adding that paragraph 5 had just been adopted where work sought from the Advisory Bodies had been outlined by Jamaica, one of which included harmonization of approaches to mission reports. IUCN had no objection to the mention of these matters in the decision, however, it was important to note that they were subject to capacity and resources. For example, organizing an extra panel meeting would have an associated cost. In this regard, Jamaica's language [in the draft decision] covered the work from the point of feasibility and thus there was no problem in adding other parts of the document where there was a commitment to do further work, either in a separate paragraph or as an additional bullet point in paragraph 5, notwithstanding the constraints in terms of capacity and cost.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** added that it had deliberately included reference to 'as far as is feasible', bearing in mind such budget constraints.

The **Delegation of Turkey** understood the point, but nonetheless wished to add a minor remark to report back to the Committee, possibly to the 43rd session when this issue could be discussed again. The amendment would read, 'invite and request Advisory Bodies to report back on the progress made on this issue to the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2019 maybe'.

The **Chairperson** remarked that the reference should be more precise, and not read 'maybe'. Paragraph 5 was duly adopted, with a new paragraph 6 as a result of Turkey's amendment.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** sought clarification on the cited 'issue' in 'to report back on this issue'.

The **Chairperson** concurred that precise wording should always be sought.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that the amendment was to take note of any procedural improvement in this issue and to see whether there was any consensus on the 'single jointly agreed decision' [mentioned in 5.c)]. The report would be submitted at the Committee's [43rd] session for possible further study.

It was noted that 'issue' was changed to 'above-mentioned paragraph', and the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraphs 6–8 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 9B adopted as amended.

ITEM 10A – REPORT ON THE PERIODIC REPORTING REFLECTION (2015–2017) AND LAUNCH OF THE THIRD CYCLE

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/10A](#)
Decision: [41 COM 10A](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item on the Periodic Reporting Reflection (2015–2017) and launch of the third cycle, inviting the Secretariat to present the item.

The Secretariat reported that document 10A was presented pursuant to decisions taken by the Committee at its 39th and 40th sessions and contained in the report on the periodic reflection that took place from 2015 to 2017 when it was launched by the Committee in 2015. It was recalled that the Committee adopted the Decision in Bonn for a two-year reflection period to improve and update the periodic reporting exercise. This was done further to the second cycle of periodic reporting that had been completed with the adoption of the regional report and action plan for the Europe and North America region. At that time, many different regions and participants in this exercise had shared proposals to improve the periodic reporting questionnaire and the exercise as a whole. The Committee therefore at that time requested that a survey be carried out with States Parties on the periodic reporting exercise, gathering the feedback of States Parties on the process and on possible improvements. It also requested that the Committee draft a new revised updated format of the questionnaire

and develop monitoring indicators for the Convention and the the 1972 Recommendation, which was adopted around the same time as the Convention but specifically concerned national heritage. Finally, at the end of this reflection period, a new revised Chapter V and Annex 7 of the Operational Guidelines were to be produced. Recalling the background, the Secretariat explained that the periodic reporting started with the periodic reporting reflection survey: an online survey by the Secretariat that gathered comprehensive feedback from the States Parties (about 75 to 80 States Parties responded) and was active between October to November 2015. The results of the survey were shared with States Parties in the beginning of 2016, and an inception meeting of the established Expert Working Group, comprised of national and cultural heritage experts, UNESCO Institute of Statistics, the Advisory Bodies, and colleagues from the World Heritage Centre met in the period May–June [2016]. The World Heritage Centre presented the outcomes and analysis of the survey to the Committee at its 40th session in Paris, the results of which formed the basis of further work on periodic reporting that was carried out by the Expert Group.

The Secretariat further explained that the Committee approved the terms of reference of the Expert Group in its Decision [40 COM 10A](#). Based on the detailed terms of reference, the Expert Group began its work and organized small groups from among the different experts within the Group. It was noted that the Expert Group's work was a very complex exercise because of the many topics that were addressed, such as the new issues to be included in the questionnaire, what would be taken out of the questionnaire and what were the most important issues to retain, while at the same time developing monitoring indicators and an analytical framework, addressing the issue of a global report, and so on. The work was organized around three meetings. The first was an inception meeting that took place in June [2015] that was partly a face-to-face meeting and partly on Skype. The second was a working meeting that included brainstorming and drafting, which took place in September [2015]. The last meeting involved the actual drafting of the text and language of the periodic reporting questionnaire, which was carried out in December. The World Heritage Centre provided overall guidance for this exercise and coordinated the process and workload, while a number of colleagues worked on thematic programmes or in regional units that also provided good inputs, but the bulk of the work was carried out by the Expert Group. The Secretariat remarked that the working methods were innovative and cost-effective, as much of the work was carried out on UNESTEAMS and other available UNESCO tools. The work was divided up into six main task areas, each led by a member of the Expert Group who coordinated the input feedback from the members of the Committee. Brainstorming sessions and the development of proposals followed on from consultations and wider review from within the Group. The main working method adopted a consultative and multi-perspective approach with inputs from regional units and thematic programmes that included the integration of sustainable development through embedding the work within the respective chapters. The Secretariat added that synergies, the sustainable development approach, the rural heritage sustainable development policy and the 2030 Agenda were among the important substantive issues included in the periodic reporting exercise. She then presented Mr Christopher Young, the lead expert of the Expert Group, who would present the results, outcomes and recommendations of the Group.

Mr Christopher Young, of the Periodic Reporting Reflection Expert Group, expressed gratitude to the fellow members of the Expert Group. He explained that the work was organized through six tasks, each was carried out by a subgroup made up of members of the Expert Group, adding that there was quite a lot of overlapping membership that was actually good in ensuring a reasonably consistent approach. The Group analysed the lessons from the second cycle based on the reflection survey, looking at the questionnaire, the synergies and so on, and identified monitoring indicators in the analytical framework, which was a new introduction that should make the follow-up and analysis much more effective across the world as a whole. The Group spent a lot of time on integrating the sustainable development approach into the questionnaire and finished with doing a feasibility study on a global World Heritage report. This provided the basis for revising the questionnaire and for the

recommendations that the Committee was asked to consider during the present session. Mr Young explained that the first thing was to analyse the lessons learned, and the Group used both the reflection survey and the questions at the end of the actual second cycle of the periodic reporting questionnaire that asked site managers how it was for them to respond. It was noted that the responses to the forms and the review were given by different people, particularly on sites. The immediate responses from site managers obviously provided more input, while the reflection survey was largely the work of national focal points. Another point about the reflection survey was that it may have been skewed to some extent because the rate of response from the different regions ranged from 80 per cent down to 12 per cent, meaning that views of one particular region might have been over-represented. Generally, the satisfaction levels were reasonably high and the overall objectives were supported. People wanted the questionnaire to be streamlined, but most States Parties also wanted to add new questions, as well as to cover other topics; though those two objectives were not entirely compatible. There were concerns over how to use the questionnaire for serial or transnational sites. People wanted a more nuanced range of options for replies, which actually meant more boxes to tick. There was a lot of focus on the need to improve the web platform, which was currently ongoing. In addition, there was a lot of focus on having much better guidance than in the second cycle, and that training could be improved.

Mr Christopher Young reported that the objectives of the periodic reporting exercise, which were first set in 1998 in the Kyoto Committee session, were generally agreed to still be valid and should be maintained. People generally felt that they were being achieved, but the least level of achievement was their effectiveness in developing regional cooperation and the exchange of information and experience. It was recognized that there was a need to integrate the questionnaire with other activities; in the second cycle there was no direct linkage between the State of conservation reporting system or the upstream processes and periodic reporting. This time, a direct hyperlink was introduced to a State of conservation report so that the site manager had access to it when filling in the questionnaire. The Group was asked to identify monitoring indicators and to recommend an analytical framework, and to include questions in the questionnaire on how individual States Parties and properties were implementing policy decisions taken by the Committee over the past decade, i.e. the sustainable development perspective, the capacity development strategy, disaster risk management and climate change were considered the main topics. Synergies were also important, as well as making the exercise more user-friendly. The Group was also asked to report on positive achievements, and both questionnaires now have a question asking States Parties and site managers to give one example of a good practice from their State Party or from their site. The Group also recognized that there was a gap in the questionnaire in that many of the questions asked about factors that might damage or improve the site, but there were fewer questions on how the attributes of OUV were affected by those factors. Although in the second cycle States Parties were asked to identify the attributes of OUV of their sites, very few on the whole did so. The Group therefore introduced questions asking States Parties to identify the attributes of OUV; now that the retrospective statements of OUV were virtually completed this should be easier to achieve. Questions on whether [attributes] have been maintained, enhanced or damaged to some extent was also introduced. In the section 'affecting factors', more emphasis was placed on the positive factors, as requested by States Parties who felt that there was too much focus on the negative impacts. The factors now line up with those used in the State of conservation database. However, this did not necessarily mean that focal points and site managers would necessarily agree with the analysis of their site in the State of conservation system, as they were coming from different perspectives, but they would at least be using the same factors. It was also noted that there was quite a lot of interest in the eventual idea of a global World Heritage report. In order to achieve that, a consistent framework for reporting across all the world's regions was required, but because the reporting in the second cycle, and indeed in the first cycle, were independent it would be difficult to pull lessons out across the world as a whole unless one went back to the original questionnaires. The Group therefore recommended that a periodic reporting coordinator

work within the World Heritage Centre to ensure a consistent approach when working with the regional units. It also recommended that the process be led by the States Parties, as it involved their reporting process and was thus their opportunity to identify the follow-up action it wished to see in each region.

Turning to the conclusions, **Mr Christopher Young** remarked that one of the things the Group was asked to do was to look at the synergies with other conservation instruments. For the natural side, the Conventions of the Biodiversity Liaison Group, of which there are six, were chosen, and specific questions were put about how liaison works with those. For the cultural side, the UNESCO culture Conventions was chosen. Questions about other regional conventions that States Parties may belong to and have a conservation impact were also included. But the key focus was on these, and particularly the culture sites on the Hague Convention where there is an overlap between enhanced protection on Hague Convention sites and World Heritage sites. The Group looked at slightly more than 15 per cent of World Heritage properties covered by at least one other designation, and the World Heritage Centre was now integrating that new information into their databases, meaning that when the questionnaire is issued to regions, they will be prefilled as far as possible so that all the State Party has to do is confirm that the information is correct. The Group was also asked to look into the integration of the sustainable development approach, an essential part of the implementation of the Convention now and into the future. The policy adopted recognized three dimensions to sustainable development: i) environmental, inclusive social development; ii) inclusive economic development; and iii) fostering peace and security. Data to be gathered that would affect these dimensions – and an overlap between these dimensions has been shown – included climate change, disaster risk management, sustainable tourism, conflict, fostering of peace and security, gender equality (a primary UNESCO objective), and the participation of specific groups. The Group tried as far as possible to harmonize the new content, focusing on synergies with other culture and diversity-related Conventions. One of the conclusions to come out of the second cycle was the need for better analysis of the results of the questionnaires. It was felt that there needed to be a more sustained suite of monitoring indicators, which also linked to the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals and the need to identify information that would feed into them, particularly SDG 11.4 [Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage]. As a result, the Group produced a draft set of monitoring indicators, in Annex I of document 10A, which covered six fields: i) the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties; ii) their management; iii) their governance, which is different to management; iv) synergies; v) sustainable development; and vi) capacity development. These therefore addressed many of the main policy priorities of the Committee. The Group was also asked to look at an analytical framework, as again there was a need for a consistent approach across regions. Clearly there would be big differences between regions, their priorities and their concerns, but having a consistent methodology for analysis should help to make those differences clear and thus improve the possibilities of doing something about them. Both monitoring indicators and the analytical framework would be launched with the third cycle, and the Group recognized that they were going to need moderating and fine-tuning because paper analysis was very different from actually trying them against real data. The Group was also asked to look at a global World Heritage report. This was based in part as a response to World Heritage in Europe Today [access [here](#)], which is the more popular publication produced on the European World Heritage report, which did its best to get away from the basic data of the actual World Heritage Report itself. It tried to use that data as a way of drawing out lessons, flagging-up good practice, and so on, and consequently it was well received. The Group was thus trying to look at a way of doing the same on a worldwide basis. More than 80 per cent of States Parties in the reflection survey were keen on having a ‘State of the World Heritage Report’ to follow the third cycle. There were lots of examples of UNESCO annual or multi-annual reviews, but they tended to be very large and weighty publications and not particularly accessible to people at site level or the general public. The aim was thus to look at something more approachable and that could be used more widely,

and also less expensive to produce.

Mr Christopher Young reported that there was a long line testing phase where States Parties were invited to respond to both the new sections 1 and 2 questionnaire. This testing process involved both focal points and site managers from all regions who volunteered to participate. They simulated the periodic reporting exercise by actually answering the questionnaire on a voluntary basis to see what happened. There were several reasons for doing this. The first was to get an initial response from States Parties and their sites so that they could see how it would actually work. The second was that it provided some initial data on which the monitoring indicators and the analytical framework could be tested. While it was only a small amount of data, it would give UNESCO a first test run. Eighty percent of the properties tested were cultural, 12 per cent were natural and 8 per cent were mixed; participation from the regions was also very varied and gender balance was achieved. On the whole, the response to the questionnaire was broadly good, i.e. over 50 per cent of people said it was good or very good with a relatively low percentage saying it was less good, which was encouraging. In addition, there were a lot of responses and comments to the questions, which would also give the Group the opportunity to fine-tune the exercises, and hence the system, as it went along. The demo version of the questionnaire was available online in English; the French version was still being worked on and would soon be available. The Committee was thus being asked to launch the third cycle of periodic reporting at the present session, even though the practical issue of the questionnaires would not happen until 2018, which would give time to fine-tune on the basis of the testing phase. The Group's principal recommendations are that there needs to be more guidance to reinforce a sustainable suite of guidance and training tools. These would build on the ones already developed during the second cycle, but much more could be done and hopefully it would be updated during the next five to six years. The Group also recommended that a periodic reporting coordinator work on a continuous basis within the Secretariat, which would obviously depend on funding. The Group was also recommending that the draft monitoring analytic framework should be trialled based on the results of the test phase, and that the reporting of the actual reporting by the States Parties would begin after the 42nd Committee session in the same six-year cycle, but because the start was delayed for a year, it was recommended that Africa and the Arab region start at the same time. The Group also recommended that instead of Europe and North America being spread over two years, as previously, it could be done in one year. It was noted that the reason it was spread over two years in the past was to facilitate the analysis. However, it was found in the second cycle that with the more digitized system, spreading it over two years just meant duplicating a lot of work in the analysis. Thus, the work would be better dealt with in one year, which would also bring the actual reporting cycle down to five years in a normal cycle, meaning that the six-year cycle periodic reporting would actually happen in six years as opposed to eight, which is what it had taken so far because of the long time spent on reviewing.

Mr Christopher Young further reported that the Group was asked to produce draft recommendations for revisions to Chapter V [on periodic reporting] and Annex 7 of the Operational Guidelines [format on the periodic reporting], to present later in the session when the Chair of the Working Group on the Operational Guidelines would present the results of that exercise. Mr Young remarked that the text of Chapter V was introduced into the Operational Guidelines in 1998 and it had remained unchanged even during the last big revision in 2005 because at that point the first cycle had not yet been completed, while the revision to the questionnaire had not yet been worked out. However, the draft Chapter V and Annex 7 was now ready to be presented later in the session. The Group had done its best to draft it in a way that did not require it to be altered every time the questionnaire is changed. Annex 7 was thus a summary of the questionnaire, i.e. not the full questionnaire that was included in the Operational Guidelines in 1998. Again, this reflected the extent to which the Committee now relied on online documentation, as well as the Operational Guidelines themselves. It was noted that the four objectives of periodic reporting would remain the same. Mr Young believed that periodic reporting had all sorts of benefits. From his own

experience as a national focal point and site manager, periodic reporting was a very good way of reminding site managers of the actual conditions of the sites. Having to take that step back was considered a very good exercise. This time, with the various new processes introduced and integrated into the questionnaire, the periodic reporting questionnaire would become a two-way tool in that it would actually serve as a capacity development instrument, enabling site managers to work through [and integrate] issues such as the sustainability development perspective, helping them to understand what the Committee wished to achieve. There was also scope for States Parties and regions to make more use of the periodic reporting system, particularly now that it had been revised, to develop regional and national action plans in the future. The data was of use not just to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and the Committee, but also to States Parties and World Heritage properties.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Bodies to respond, starting with ICOMOS.

The **Representative of ICOMOS** remarked that ICOMOS and ICCROM decided to present a joint statement, and first wished to thank the World Heritage Centre for the opportunity to be part of this Working Group. The periodic reporting reflection exercise and the work set up had been a very good opportunity for fruitful joint reflection and exchanges among the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and representatives of other units from UNESCO. Through an operational approach, the goal was to revise the questionnaire and that also brought about an overall reflection on the aim of the periodic reporting exercise beyond the mandatory objectives, as well as to reflect on the improved Nature-Culture Journey and on the way in which values could really inform management responses and the monitoring of them. Periodic reporting responds to the need for updating the international community and society on the progress made in the implementation of the Convention and on the health of World Heritage properties and their management systems. This new structure also allowed for the gathering of a wide range of data that feeds into statistics that could give a sense of the trends. However, it may be less helpful as a tool for monitoring specific issues owing to the timeframe in which it is developed and due to the large amount of data that needs to be processed. In the Advisory Bodies' view, certainly for ICOMOS and ICCROM, this should be understood as a self-assessment instrument that is offered to the States Parties and site managers to build a broad yet detailed overview of the way in which the Convention is and may be implemented to evaluate the instruments or the synergies that could be built with other Conventions at the national and, more importantly, at the site level. This is achieved through the management tools that these Conventions bring with them, as well as the overall state of health of the property where weaknesses reside, and where strengths could be harnessed to improve the situation. The phrasing of some of the questions actually tried to respond to this understanding of the questionnaire. As a self-assessment tool, the focus given to attributes and to the needs for identifying them were clearly underlined by Mr Christopher Young. The Advisory Bodies were of the understanding that thorough knowledge of the features and processes that support OUV, as well as other values, were key to effective protection and management. The implementation of the questionnaire would thus suggest further improvements on how attributes, as well as other values, could be addressed in management. It was also the first step for the integration of sustainable development policy for World Heritage properties and the 2030 Agenda Sustainable Development Goals in the framework of the questionnaire, and would certainly be strengthened in future cycles with the operationalization of their objectives, a work in process. As a self-assessment instrument, it was considered that the most fruitful way to use the periodic reporting exercise and the questionnaire would be its appropriation by States Parties and by site managers throughout the process, and well before the actual exercise began, favouring a shared understanding of the rationale and the objectives, as well as the type and level of information sought in order to harness the most long-term results, leading to some long-term lessons learned. It was the opinion of ICOMOS and ICCROM that it could represent a powerful platform for capacity-sharing and exchange, as well as for the periodic reporting exercise.

The **Representative of IUCN** expressed appreciation to the World Heritage Centre for the opportunity to participate in the Periodic Reporting Reflection Expert Group, and for the collegiate and constructive work of the Group over the past two years. IUCN took note that the content of the new questionnaire, the proposed new process for analysis and the use of the data had greatly improved since the last cycle. The integration of cost-disciplinary elements in the questionnaire, such as synergies with other culture and biodiversity-related Conventions, gender balance and equity, and alignment with the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda meant that the reporting instrument was reflective of its time. The introduction of monitoring indicators was also an important step forward for enabling the Committee to systematically track whether and how the objectives of periodic reporting were being met. IUCN also noted that the revised questionnaire now aligned itself more closely with efforts undertaken by the IUCN World Heritage Outlook, which complemented the work of periodic reporting. The IUCN World Heritage Outlook is the first global assessment of natural World Heritage, with the global update due in late 2017. In the future, IUCN looked forward to both initiatives serving as valuable sources of reference, together building a more complete picture of the conservation prospects of natural World Heritage sites. Finally, IUCN supported the development of a global World Heritage report, taking note that the feasibility study presented in document 10A was a preliminary outline, and it recommended that the Committee continue to seek input in the development of concrete proposals for the report in the future.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** noted and appreciated that World Heritage and sustainable development had been harmonized in the periodic reporting by the fundamental indicators of environment, social aspects, peace and security, and economic development. This was a very commendable achievement in the right direction for the benefit of the communities within or outside World Heritage properties. With regard to the launch of the next cycle of periodic reporting, which recommended that the six-year cycle start with the Arab and the Africa region undertaking the cycle simultaneously in 2018–2019, the delegation appreciated and agreed with this situation. However, considering the number of States Parties in Africa and the challenges facing the region in terms of working tools and administrative processes, the delegation strongly recommended to separate this undertaking between Arab States and the Africa regions because of the difficulties that might occur when done simultaneously.

The **Delegation of Finland** welcomed the results of the Expert Group, adding that it also had in mind the very positive feedback of all Member States in 2015 on a survey on the importance of the periodic reporting process as a tool. The new questionnaire based on user-friendliness and a wider view of synergies between other related Conventions would provide greater possibilities to gather relevant information that could be processed, analysed and compiled for the benefit of all countries. The delegation welcomed the fact that the aspects related to the 2030 Agenda and gender equality would also be taken into account in this work. The idea of having an attribute-driven conservation approach was also a welcome step because the great diversity of the sites and their specific OUVs needed to be duly reflected in the reports. The periodic reporting process was an excellent tool for all countries and individual World Heritage sites to genuinely examine the state of the art management and conservation of the sites looking into the future. It took the opportunity to commend the publication of World Heritage in Europe Today as a good example of the use of periodic reporting, which was a useful tool for World Heritage actors, and for outreach and awareness-raising purposes. Finland supported the draft decision.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** félicite le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le travail accompli et surtout la façon dont le questionnaire est présenté et affiné qui est maintenant doté d'un grand souplesse et flexibilité afin de répondre aux besoins des intéressées. Également il facilite la récolte des données sur les questions pertinentes de la mise en œuvre de la Convention. Par contre, la délégation exprime une préoccupation par rapport au lancement

du troisième cycle telle que souligné par la Tanzanie, et souhaite que le Secrétariat donne des explications détaillées concernant la raison pour laquelle l'Afrique et la région Arabe sont jumelés étant donné que l'Afrique constitue la priorité dans le programme de l'UNESCO.

The **Delegation of Cuba** congratulated the World Heritage Centre and the Expert Group for its remarkable presentation. According to the procedure of the periodic reporting process, the main actors were the focal points and site managers. In this regard, the delegation sought to hear from the Expert Group whether they had thought about providing more opportunities for the local community to participate in the process.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** was positive towards the recommendations by the Expert Group, as they provided clear guidance on how periodic reporting should be carried out in the third cycle. Appreciating the complexity of World Heritage, Indonesia saw the merit of the inclusion of various relevant questions in the questionnaire. On natural heritage, for example, it was imperative to develop a comprehensive platform in monitoring natural heritage under the Convention, as well as its connection with relevant UNESCO programmes, such as the Man and the Biosphere or the Global Geoparks Network. In this regard, clear alliances could also be built between natural heritage and the relevant goals under the 2030 Agenda, such as target 11.4 on safeguarding cultural and natural heritage, Goal 6 on the sustainable management of water, Goal 12 on sustainable consumption, Goal 13 on climate change, Goal 14 on conservation of oceans, and Goal 15 on sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems. Indonesia hoped the new questionnaire format would help States Parties develop an integral picture of the state of conservation of their World Heritage, and enable UNESCO to identify and develop its own contribution to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda. Indonesia supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** welcomed the work on further improving the modalities of the periodic reporting exercise, and the unpicking of the questionnaire, which it felt would actually make life easier when working on the reports. It also welcomed the launch of the third cycle of the periodic reporting. However, like Tanzania and Angola, it felt that the Africa region and the Arab States should be separated for the reasons evoked by Tanzania.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to respond.

The Secretariat thanked the Committee Members for their comments and observations with regard to this document, adding that she was pleased to hear from Zimbabwe that this would make life easier, not least because the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the Expert Group had worked for a long time on this rather complex item. She noted a few questions, but the most important was raised by Tanzania, Angola and supported by Zimbabwe concerning why the Secretariat had proposed to combine Africa and the Arab region. She explained that the Secretariat had not proposed the twinning as such. The Secretariat simply proposed postponing the launch of the periodic reporting exercise for the Arab region, which happened to be the first region (as had been the case in the first and second cycles). The reason for not starting the process immediately after this Committee session was due to the fact that the question was still brand new and further guidance was still required for the States Parties and the regions to better prepare themselves for this exercise, which would actually make it more useful for the States Parties themselves and for the World Heritage statutory processes in general. This was the reason the World Heritage Centre, together with the Advisory Bodies, had reflected on how best to organize this launch and it was decided to postpone the cycle for the Arab region. The Secretariat clarified that the proposal was not to postpone the whole cycle by one year, i.e. moving all regions back one year, as this would prolong the gap between the cycles and push back the next periodic reporting exercise further than the five or six years that are foreseen in the Operational Guidelines. Hence, the innovative proposal to postpone only the first region and have the two regions work on their own periodic reporting exercise in parallel. The Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies did not see any clash of interests or any preference of one region over the other, as this was a purely State Party driven exercise. The Secretariat simply provided the

coordination to facilitate and provide guidance, but it did not implement the periodic reporting for each of the regions. Thus, this could very well happen in parallel with the two different regions working simultaneously without overlap or affecting other regions or States Parties.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Angola in paragraph 12. Paragraphs 1–11 remained unchanged. Paragraph 12 had a slight addition by Angola, as explained. Paragraphs 13 and 14 remained unchanged.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision, and paragraphs 1–12 were adopted.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** sought to co-sponsor with Angola its support to the amendment.

The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraphs 13 and 14 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 10A adopted as amended.

[Close of morning session]

EIGHTH DAY – Monday 10 July 2017

SIXTEENTH SESSION

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 10B – FOLLOW-UP TO THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR ALL REGIONS

Document [WHC/17/41.COM/10B](http://whc/17/41.COM/10B)

The **Chairperson** turned to the progress report on periodic reporting and the follow-up activities in the five different regions: Asia and the Pacific – Section 1, Africa– Section 2, the Arab States – Section 3, Latin America and the Caribbean – Section 4, and Europe and North America – Section 5, which were represented in the working document. Consequently, five separate decisions would be taken. Before inviting the Secretariat to present the follow-up of the second cycle of the periodic reporting exercise for Asia and the Pacific region, the Chairperson noted an error in the title of a property in the Philippines, which should read ‘Historic City of Vigan’.

Follow-up to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Section 1 (Asia and the Pacific unit)

Decision: [41 COM 10B.1](#)

The Secretariat began by recalling that, in view of the Asia-Pacific region’s cultural and geographical diversity, as well as its physical scale, two distinct regional action plans were produced at the end of the periodic reporting cycle. One would address the priorities, challenges and needs identified at the regional and subregional levels, and one for the Pacific Action Plan that was first developed for 2010 to 2015 and was then revised and extended in December 2015 for the period 2016–2020, thanks to a workshop organized in Suva (Fiji) with the support of the World Heritage Fund and the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust. The Suva Action Plan for Asia was adopted at the final Regional Meeting for the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in Asia in December 2011 in Suwon City in the Republic of Korea. It authorized priorities for the entire Asia region and identified 21 issues that concern one or more subregions. One of the main outcomes of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the region was the capacity-building strategy and associated programmes for Asia and the Pacific, which were developed by the category 2 centre workshop in China and adopted by the Committee at its 38th session in Doha (Qatar), which was supported by the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM. In this framework, WHITR-AP [World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region] and ICCROM organized in 17–28 October in 2016 a course on heritage impact assessment that took place at the World Heritage property of the Historic City of Vigan in the Philippines. Using a training-of-trainers approach, the organizers made sure that the message of the course could reach a broad audience. In collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, WHITR-AP was also preparing a training course tailored to the specific needs of the Pacific States, scheduled for December 2017 in Fiji. This would provide States Parties in the Pacific region with the basic knowledge, resources and tools for the protection of both natural and cultural heritage, and introduce a series of tools such as heritage and environment impact assessments. In the Pacific, the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust project, ‘Capacity-Building to Support the Conservation of World Heritage Sites and Enhance Sustainable Development of Local Communities for Small Island Developing States (SIDS)’, ran from 2011 to 2016 and used the Convention as a tool for sustainable development to strengthen local, national and

regional capacities, and promote awareness by involving local people and enhancing sustainable conservation and management of cultural and natural heritage. The project also allowed a focal point from the Federal States of Micronesia to witness the inscription of Nan Madol, the State Party's first inscription on the World Heritage List in 2016. This provided an opportunity for capacity-building on the most urgent conservation issues.

The Secretariat reported that in Central Asia, taking lessons learned from the critical conservation issues on the Historic Centre of Shakhrysb in Uzbekistan, it was recalled that during deliberations in the Committee, Prof. Jad Tabet (Lebanon) raised the issue of using different tools and mechanisms in the Convention, recalling that periodic reporting was the prime responsibility of States Parties. In this context, national workshops on the implementation of the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) were organized at the World Heritage properties of Samarkand – Crossroad of Cultures and the Historic City of Bukhara in Uzbekistan in October 2016 and February 2017, respectively, in collaboration with the UNESCO Office in Tashkent and supported by Netherlands Funds-in-Trust. In Nepal, the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust project 'Strengthening the Conservation and the Management of Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha', was established in 2010 to support the conservation and management of the Lumbini property of great spiritual and architectural significance. Following the April 2016 International Steering Committee, the Committee met again in February 2017, jointly organized by the Nepali authorities and UNESCO. The support offered for the preparation of serial, transnational nominations of the Silk Roads was a key outcome of periodic reporting in the region, and a number of activities were organized in Asia to support the nomination process. This represented an important step forward for international cooperation around World Heritage in the region, and now involved 15 countries who act as members of the Intergovernmental Coordinating Committee of the Silk Roads World Heritage nomination. Following the 2016 Almaty Agreement for the Silk Roads World Heritage nomination process, an expert meeting was organized from 13 to 15 November 2016 in Kyzylorda (Kazakhstan) and involved 45 participants. The meeting set the way forward for the World Heritage serial and transnational nomination process for the Fergana–Syrdarya Corridor of the Silk Roads. The Silk Roads nomination process had now also been initiated in South Asia, enabled by the UNESCO/Republic of Korea Funds-in-Trust project support for the preparation of the World Heritage serial nomination of the Silk Roads in South Asia. This resulted in two publications: the project report and the technical report produced by the World Heritage Centre in collaboration with University College of London in the United Kingdom. The UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust project, 'Support to the South Asian Cultural Landscape Initiatives' was officially launched in Thimphu (Bhutan) on 3 August 2016 by Ms Mechthild Rössler, Director of the World Heritage Centre, who was joined by representatives of the Bhutanese authorities and leading experts from Japan. This project aims to support South Asian States Parties, and particularly Bhutan, in understanding, conserving and raising awareness of cultural landscapes, and reinforcing regional and international cooperation.

The Secretariat then turned to one of the Convention's strategic objectives, which focuses on communities, and the UNESCO/Republic of Korea Funds-in-Trust project, 'World Heritage, Sustainable Development and Community Involvement', which was established in May 2014 to address the growing interest in the integration of sustainable development aspects in the management of World Heritage. Activities have since been carried out at three World Heritage properties in Pakistan and Bangladesh to revitalize income-generating crafts related to World Heritage conservation among local communities. These activities include the reproduction of glazed tiles, traditional wood-carving, and so on. The project involved not only highly skilled master craftspeople but also young people and women who train to use traditional building materials and techniques. Finally, the International Symposium, 'The Conservation of Brick Monuments at World Heritage sites' was held in the Historic City of Ayutthaya in Thailand with support from the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust and organized by the World Heritage Centre and UNESCO Bangkok in collaboration with the Fine Arts Department of Thailand. This symposium presented an opportunity to raise awareness about

brick sites and associated monuments in Asia, and to foster recognition of the relevant international conservation standards. It also helped to further develop technical skills among selected brick craftspeople, and to improve operating procedures and standards for the conservation of Ayutthaya and other World Heritage sites in Thailand. Mr Jing took the opportunity to thank all the partners who implemented some of the follow-up activities in the Asia-Pacific region.

The **Chairperson** passed the floor directly to ICCROM.

The **Representative of ICCROM** congratulated WHITR-AP for the development of a Regional Training Strategy for Asia and the Pacific based on the periodic reporting exercise that was carried out during the second cycle. ICCROM always believed that the periodic reporting was not just a process to present a snapshot of the state of conservation of sites in the region at a particular point in time, but more importantly to provide a true needs assessment in relation to those sites, i.e. What are the conservation needs? What are the capacity-building needs? What can the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and the international community do to meet those capacity-building needs? ICCROM expressed gratitude to WHITR-AP for carrying out that Regional Strategy, suggesting that category 2 centres in other world regions should also try to develop their own regional capacity-building strategies to specifically meet the needs in individual regions or subregions.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 10B.1 adopted.

Follow-up to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Section 2 (Africa unit)

Decision: [41 COM 10B.2](#)

The **Chairperson** then invited the Secretariat to present the follow-up activities in the Africa region.

The Secretariat remarked that some of the achievements related to Africa examined during this session speak for themselves in terms of what had been accomplished on the continent by States Parties in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and their strategic partners. The Secretariat wished to highlight some of the objectives that had been set since 2012–2017 for the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting, which stressed in particular the preparation of successful nomination dossiers, improved state of conservation of World Heritage properties by effective risk management, increased community involvement, direct economic benefits to local communities, and the effective management of existing properties by recognizing, documenting and formalizing traditional management systems and integrating them into existing management mechanisms. The Secretariat also mentioned the development and implementation of strategies that enabled States Parties to effectively address the challenge of balancing heritage, conservation and development needs, and the establishment and implementation of mechanisms for heritage conservation, protection and conflict management. The worldwide success of awareness-raising on these objectives had been witnessed in the great mobilization and celebration of African World Heritage Day, which is celebrated every year on 5 May, and was also marked with a statement from the Director-General in six languages. Considerable progress had also been made in improving the state of conservation of properties thanks to the extensive training and capacity-building in the area of heritage, impact assessment and risk preparedness. There had been a noteworthy increase in awareness across the continent on the importance of elaborating and implementing sustainable development strategies with the full engagement of local communities owing largely to the Ngorongoro Declaration, which was proclaimed in June

2016 in Ngorongoro (Tanzania). Ongoing activities in Timbuktu, for example, also demonstrated the successful integration of heritage conservation into conflict management and peaceful efforts. Also within that framework several activities had been implemented, such as a university programme in heritage conservation that involves African youth, while harmonizing education, capacity-building and job opportunities for young people. An African resource-person database was also put in place to bring in expertise, both in the field of cultural heritage and natural heritage. Under Community Parks, a COMPACT project was implemented, which was also supplemented with the cultural component of this programme and where there was an increased involvement of communities seen in the re-use and conservation of cultural properties. The element on developing national-level indicators to demonstrate the economic impact on the heritage had also been pursued, in particular, in the region of Eastern Africa and Central Africa. The National Heritage Passport was also developed for each African country where there would be a clear mapping of the cultural heritage and natural heritage situation of each country in preparation of any human-induced or natural disaster.

The Secretariat noted that States Parties had also been guided in regard to implementing a Roadmap for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention with the establishment of National Committees. The two major activities include: i) a US\$6.5 million project in close cooperation with the African Development Bank to conserve Lake Chad Basin Project (BIOPALT) whose waters were receding, and would involve research work and the preparation of a nomination dossier; and ii) the active implementation of the CAWHFI project launched in [Dja Faunal Reserve] Cameroon covering the three countries of Congo, Central African Republic and Cameroon in the Sangha Trinational, as well as in Lopé-Okanda (Gabon). In regard to the Ngorongoro Declaration, one noteworthy point was that it provided the framework on how to bridge the gap during this period of 2017, at the end of the Second Cycle and into the Third Cycle, i.e. 2019, as decided in the morning session. In those three years, the Ngorongoro Declaration and the outcome of that conference were really bridging and enabling the implementation of the activities mentioned. The World Heritage Centre had conducted more than six nomination workshops on risk preparedness and heritage impacts and management training workshops throughout the continent. It was noted that the success and the results that had been witnessed during this session were largely thanks to the close cooperation the World Heritage Centre enjoys with its strategic partners, in particular the African World Heritage Fund, the Ecole du Patrimoine Africain, the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa, and the Advisory Bodies, particularly ICCROM for the very active engagement in capacity-building, as well as IUCN and ICOMOS. The Secretariat took the opportunity to thank all the donors, African as well as European and Asian, and particularly China that had been contributing significantly to both conservation and capacity-building in the continent.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Tanzania** appreciated the efforts undertaken and the progress made by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in cooperation with the various States Parties for holding upstream process workshops, which were organized in Togo and Kenya in 2016 and 2017, respectively. In addition, a number of meetings on the updating of Tentative Lists was organized in South Sudan and Kenya, as well as workshops for capacity-building for States Parties in the initial stages of implementation of the Convention in 2017 in Equatorial Guinea, Sao Tomé and Príncipe, Guinea Bissau and Angola. Tanzania was pleased to note that the report was adequately detailed in terms of statistics, context and approach. It commended the work of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and encouraged them to continue with the implementation of the Action Plan 2012–2017 for the African Region in collaboration with the African World Heritage Fund.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** félicite les centres et remarque que la priorité Afrique commence à prendre de l'élan et pense que les projets qui sont lancés, notamment les questions du développement durable avec cette grande déclaration de Ngorongoro, vont prendre corps et

que l'Afrique sera à même d'apporter des éléments constructifs dans ces débats, et également de prendre des renforcements de capacités. Elle souligne des résultats notoires, mais pense que le travail doit se poursuivre dans les prochains cycles de rapport périodique afin d'avoir des experts de plus en plus préparés pour pouvoir assister les États parties à partiellement monter des dossiers de nomination, et également pour aider dans la gestion des défis sur le terrain une fois inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Ainsi, la délégation est satisfaite des efforts qui ont été faits et approuve les projets de décision qui seront proposés.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 10B.2 adopted.

Follow-up to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Section 3 (Arab States Unit)

Decision: [41 COM 10B.3](#)

Le Secrétariat remarque que depuis l'adoption du Programme régional pour les États arabes en 2011, le Centre poursuit la mise en œuvre des priorités de ce programme avec une attention particulière accordée à la sauvegarde du patrimoine en situation de conflit armé, en particulier en Iraq, en Libye, en Syrie et au Yémen. Dans ces pays, les besoins en matière de protection, de prévention, de conservation, de formation sont immenses et nécessitent une mobilisation humaine et financière sans précédent. Par conséquent, la réponse du Centre aujourd'hui est en deçà des moyens dont elle dispose. L'action en faveur du patrimoine dans les pays en conflit n'a pas été gérée à l'échelle de l'unité des États arabes ou du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Elle a été menée à l'échelle de l'Unesco dans tous les secteurs, notamment ceux de la culture, de l'éducation, des sciences humaines et sociales et de la communication, avec l'engagement de nos bureaux hors-Siège, avec le Centre régional pour le patrimoine mondial à Bahreïn et en synergie et collaboration avec les organisations consultatives. Elle s'est organisée à plusieurs niveaux : Au niveau diplomatique, et notamment au Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU, avec des avancées notables, au niveau des organes gouvernementaux de l'Unesco, notamment par l'adoption de la stratégie de l'Unesco liée aux conflits, au niveau statutaire au sein même de ce comité et de sa convention, mais aussi en synergie et en coordination quasi-quotidienne avec les Conventions de l'Unesco de 1954, sur le patrimoine culturel en cas de conflit armé, et de 1970 sur la lutte contre le trafic illicite, mais aussi celle de 2003 sur le patrimoine immatériel. Au niveau opérationnel, par la mise en œuvre de projets qui permettent un suivi régulier de la situation sur le terrain, car souvent et toujours en cas de conflit, ne pouvant pas accéder aux sites, l'unité doit faire un travail à distance, donc une évaluation des dégâts, l'évaluation rapide des dommages, la fourniture d'un soutien d'urgence aux sites touchés, que ce soit par des formations à l'extérieur ou des liens quotidiens par Skype ou autre, et le renforcement des capacités quand elle le peut. Le cinquième niveau est un travail de réflexion sur la question de la sauvegarde du patrimoine dans une perspective post-conflit et notamment sur les questions liées à la reconstruction – comme avec l'ICCROM et l'ICOMOS – et, en dernier lieu, la sensibilisation du grand public et en particulier des jeunes dans la région arabe, car ce sont eux les acteurs et le futur de cette situation surtout en lien avec la destruction intentionnelle du patrimoine. Ceci se fait aussi avec le soutien de la campagne #Unite4Heritage (Unis pour le patrimoine), et des activités de sensibilisation avec les secteurs des sciences humaines et de l'éducation, donc, sur ces thèmes des jeunes et de toutes les questions identitaires ou sur le rôle du patrimoine à réunir plutôt qu'à diviser. De même, l'unité fait beaucoup d'interventions dans les médias internationaux sur la situation du

patrimoine culturel endommagé par les conflits. En parallèle avec ce travail, le Centre a poursuivi la réalisation du Programme régional de 2011 pour les États arabes malgré la grande pression reliée aux conflits, il a essayé de garder en tête que l'unité est là pour les pays qui essaient de « continuer la gestion et la protection de manière normale ». Ce travail a concerné le soutien au Koweït et au Maroc dans la préparation de leur liste indicative, du soutien au Maroc, à la Jordanie et à la Tunisie dans la réflexion et dans le renforcement des capacités pour la préparation de dossiers d'inscription ; le soutien technique, la formation et le renforcement des capacités à la gestion, à la protection, à la conservation des biens pour le patrimoine mondial de la Syrie, du Liban, de la Jordanie, de la Palestine et de l'Égypte, et ce par l'intermédiaire de projets opérationnels, de missions de conseil et d'assistance technique. Sur le plan de la coopération régionale, la coopération du Centre avec l'ALECSO, l'Organisation arabe (l'homologue de l'Unesco pour la région arabe) a été renforcée par des activités conjointes et une planification stratégique concrète sur l'information et la sensibilisation ; le travail a été fait sur #Unite4heritage et sur la question des jeunes dans les pays arabes, à travers des films de sensibilisation sur le patrimoine culturel, comme sur la Syrie après le conflit, et, avec des collègues de la Convention sur le trafic illicite, sur les fouilles illégales, et le trafic illicite en Iraq et en Syrie. Le Secrétariat souligne le rôle important que jouent ses partenaires dans la mise en œuvre du programme régional, en particulier les organisations consultatives, le Centre régional arabe pour le patrimoine mondial à Manama (Bahreïn), qui continuent de fournir un appui important au programme régional et avec lequel l'unité travail quasiment au quotidien. Elle signale aussi le soutien instrumental des bureaux hors-Siège de l'Unesco à Beyrouth, Doha, Bagdad, Erbil, Ramallah, Amman et au Caire dans la mise en œuvre de la Convention et des projets opérationnels. Finalement, elle souligne que la région arabe aurait de grands besoins en termes de politiques à action dans le contexte du conflit armé, mais aussi dans le domaine du renforcement des capacités où l'accent devrait se faire non pas sur des cours ponctuels, mais plutôt sur des formations solides et longues pour renforcer le cadre institutionnel des entités en charge du patrimoine. Elle signale enfin que la région arabe fait face au défi majeur de la pression urbaine et des lacunes légales et administratives qui causent une dégradation rapide et irréversible des tissus urbains dans les biens du patrimoine mondial. A cause de cela, les monuments sont conservés et le tissu urbain se dégrade très rapidement. Cette dégradation appelle des approches de planification et de gestion intégrées au niveau du territoire du bien, en harmonie avec la recommandation concernant les paysages urbains historiques et des objectifs de développement durable, notamment l'ODD 11.4 portant sur les villes.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

La **Délégation du Koweït** croit et contribue au développement des capacités des pays de la région dans le domaine du patrimoine mondial. La délégation remarque que le patrimoine culturel arabe se trouve dans une situation difficile et demande deux choses : premièrement, s'il y a un mécanisme qui prévoit de prendre des mesures avant le déclenchement de catastrophes et de crises ? Elle note qu'un tel observatoire se trouve à Beyrouth. Deuxièmement, y-a-t'il une différence d'information entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial avec celles de l'observatoire de Beyrouth ?

La **Délégation du Liban** est d'accord avec le Koweït sur la situation du patrimoine dans la région arabe et pense qu'il n'est pas possible d'utiliser des procédures habituelles compte tenu de la situation. C'est une situation nouvelle, et des innovations s'imposent, il faut trouver des façons plus inventives, moins formelles, pour pouvoir réellement comprendre et refléter ce qu'il se passe sur le terrain, et quelles sont les procédures à prendre dans un tel contexte. C'est pour ça que la délégation se demande si le rapport périodique présenté tout à l'heure peut s'appliquer à la situation présente, compte donner du fait qu'il faudrait surement inventer de tout nouveaux processus. C'est dans ce contexte là que les États parties, les organes consultatifs et les centres ont besoin de la latitude pour trouver de nouvelles formules, de nouvelles façons de faire et de nouvelles méthodes pour réellement pouvoir

rendre compte de l'état de conservation et des problèmes qui se posent au niveau des différences de sites.

The **Delegation of Turkey** concurred with the remarks made by Lebanon, adding that the way the the State of conservation reports were analysed, particularly for properties in the Arab region, had become pretty standard. The Committee would go through the reports and adopt the decision without having a proper discussion or coming up with innovative ideas. The delegation thus wondered whether it was possible for the World Heritage Centre to reflect on ways to improve the way the Committee analysed these reports during the sessions. For example, would it be possible to have more interactive sessions in the future, particularly for SOC reports and for this region. Could the World Heritage Centre reflect on this and come up with a different method of working on this issue?

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to respond.

Ler Secretariat relie l'intervention du Koweït et la question de la prévention des risques dans les pays arabes aux conditions sociales, politiques et économiques des jeunes dans la région, et à la radicalisation des jeunes et ce qu'on a vu comme participation des jeunes, par exemple de Palmyre, dans la destruction de leurs temples avec leurs propres mains, à dynamiter leurs propres temples à Palmyre. Cela montre qu'il y a un fossé entre les jeunes de la région arabe et ce qui est en train d'être dit au Comité. Pour le Centre, la mesure principale concerne l'éducation sur la tolérance, l'éducation sur la diversité, l'éducation sur la valeur de l'histoire, sur la contribution de chaque civilisation à la construction de notre histoire commune. Évidemment les problèmes géopolitiques ne sont pas surmontables seulement par l'éducation. En revanche, d'un point de vue technique, la prévention des risques est un élément principal dans la stratégie de l'Unesco qui a été adoptée à la Conférence générale de 2015 ; donc, la gestion des risques est une approche qui devrait faire partie intégrante de tout travail de plan de gestion pour un site du patrimoine mondial. Par exemple, Le Centre a abordé le sujet de Damas sur la réduction des risques d'incendie en cas de bombardement de la vieille ville de Damas et ce sont ce genre de mesures qui sont à portée et pour lesquelles les pays qui ne sont heureusement pas aujourd'hui en conflit ou soumis à des situations de désastre. Ce sont des mesures qu'ils peuvent prendre dès maintenant pour réduire les risques, comme par exemple, les mesures de protection des dépôts pour les musées, etc. En ce qui concerne l'observatoire, il s'agit d'une plate-forme sur laquelle les experts de la région, les experts internationaux qui ont travaillé sur le patrimoine syrien, peuvent s'inscrire afin qu'on ait une base de données sur leurs compétences liées à des cas spécifiques, comme par exemple un historien qui a travaillé à Alep, un architecte qui a fait le relevé de la citadelle, etc. C'est une base de données qui permet de localiser l'expertise, la documentation et donc de préparer les bases scientifiques pour la restauration et la reconstruction. L'aspect novateur pour l'Unesco a surtout été de travailler au niveau du Conseil de sécurité sur des questions humanitaires et sécuritaires par rapport au patrimoine. Il ne s'agit pas d'une innovation sur les questions de conservation en tant que telles, mais d'une innovation sur l'approche générale, qui est beaucoup plus globale, plus intégrée et qui prend en compte des questions géopolitiques. Sur cette note, il y a des experts syriens qui, en parlant de la reconstruction d'Alep, ont évoqué les mouvements modernistes dans l'Europe d'après-guerre et le laboratoire d'architecture que peut offrir une ville détruite aux jeunes architectes et créateurs du monde arabe. Finalement, concernant la proposition de la Turquie, c'est un souhait qu'il y ai une session plus interactive sur les conflits, peut-être par un *side event* dédié ou quelque chose qui mette plus en lumière un travail global de tous les pays en conflit, non seulement dans les pays arabes mais aussi en Afghanistan, RDC ou ailleurs, où les problématiques ou les approches peuvent être rationalisées.

The **Chairperson** invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre to comment on this issue.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** appreciated these comments, especially from Turkey on an interactive session, adding that it could easily be done because there did exist general topics, for example, on Heritage in Syria or Heritage in Iraq, even though the

Committee still had to take individual decisions on each of those sites. This occurred in Monday's morning session (when the Director-General was present) for example on the situation in Aleppo, which detailed the new technologies that could be employed and which proved very interesting in terms of the innovative ideas generated from the scientific community and others on how to deal with these issues. With regard to the questions on periodic reporting in general, as raised by Lebanon – an item that would be discussed later under item 11 on the Operational Guidelines – the idea was to make the periodic reporting easier for countries, while lessening the workload for the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. The Director felt that a general reflection on the role of periodic reporting was indeed very important and greater interaction and creative ideas were definitely needed on how reports could be better used. The Director recalled that when periodic reporting was first devised in 1998 by the General Assembly of States Parties, one brilliant outcome – that she had not imagined – was that site managers and focal points greatly enjoyed and appreciated this exchange. She also shared an experience of a recent visit to Palmyra in which, despite the extremely difficult conditions, the [national authorities] were still able to provide detailed boundary maps. So even unexpected activities, could and do work.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICCROM for comment.

The **Representative of ICCROM** added that in regard to the difficult situation in the region, it was important to provide professionals with the necessary capacity and training to carry out some of the short-term issues that needed to be dealt with. ICCROM, in collaboration with UNESCO and the ICOMOS Committee on Disaster Risk Preparedness, had carried out a number of capacity-building activities in the region on documentation of heritage and also on first aid, i.e. what could be done in a relatively short amount of time to help professionals go back in and deal with the specific emergency and necessary first aid measures. These efforts need to continue in the short term, but obviously ICCROM must work on longer term training needs so that when the situation allowed itself, people could go back and continue working, and have the necessary skills to carry out that work. This work had also been carried out in collaboration with the neighbouring States Parties, for example, some of these courses had taken place in Lebanon for Syrian professionals, and for Libyan professionals in Tunisia, and so on. It was thus a collaborative effort by all the States Parties in the region. Finally, ICCROM very much supported the suggestion by Turkey to have a more interactive session during the Committee because it was difficult in some ways during the State of conservation reporting to really bring out and highlight some of these issues. Thus, it would be very useful to have a round table discussion or a new kind of format to really bring these issues to the fore so that they could be dealt with more effectively.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 10B.3 adopted.

Follow-up to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Section 4 (Latin America and the Caribbean unit)

Decision: [41 COM 10B.4](#)

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the Latin America and the Caribbean region.

Le Secrétariat informe le Comité des activités relatives au suivi du Plan d'action Patrimoine mondial pour l'Amérique Latine et les Caraïbes (2014-2024), adopté par le Comité à sa 38e session (38 COM 10B.4). Pour une mise en œuvre efficace, le Plan d'action a été articulé autour de plans sous-régionaux axés sur les besoins spécifiques de chaque sous-région. Ainsi, un plan d'action spécifique pour les Caraïbes a été adopté et lancé en novembre 2014

et un plan pour l'Amérique du Sud a été élaboré et mis en route en mai 2015, tandis qu'une réunion dédiée à l'établissement du plan d'action sous-régional pour l'Amérique centrale et le Mexique sera organisée au Mexique pour le mois de septembre prochain. Dans le cadre du suivi du Plan d'Action pour le patrimoine mondial en Amérique du Sud, un Atelier international avec la participation de tous les pays de la sous-région et les pays africains lusophones portant sur les notions fondamentales de la Convention sur le Patrimoine mondial a eu lieu à Rio de Janeiro, Brésil, du trois au sept octobre 2016. Le résultat fondamental de cette activité a été l'adoption d'un programme de renforcement de capacités avec une attention particulière aux nécessités de formation au sein de la région. Cet atelier a été organisé par le Centre régional de Catégorie 2 pour la gestion et la formation en patrimoine mondial Lucio Costa, en étroite coopération avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les trois organisations consultatives de la Convention et notre bureau de l'UNESCO à Brasilia. Cet atelier a permis de définir un programme de renforcement des capacités pour les années à venir. Dans le cadre du Suivi du Plan d'Action pour le patrimoine mondial des Caraïbes, un atelier sur la Convention du Patrimoine mondial a eu lieu à Port d'Espagne, Trinité-et-Tobago, du premier au deux novembre 2016. Cet autre atelier de renforcement des capacités a été organisé grâce au soutien financier du Programme de participation de l'UNESCO et en collaboration avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Bureaux de l'UNESCO de la Havane et de Kingston. Le séminaire a réuni quelques soixante participants de plusieurs États des Caraïbes. Toujours dans le cadre des priorités établies par le Plan d'Action sous-régional pour le patrimoine mondial des Caraïbes, un symposium sur patrimoine et changement climatique dans les petits états insulaires a eu lieu à Kingston du 29 au 31 mai 2017. Organisée grâce à la contribution financière du Programme de participation par le Bureau de l'UNESCO à Kingston, en consultation avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial, cette activité a contribué à l'objectif 3 du Plan d'action sous-régional des Caraïbes pour le patrimoine mondial 2015-2019 : réduire l'impact du changement climatique en renforçant les capacités en matière de gestion des risques. Une soixantaine de participants principalement originaires des pays des Caraïbes ont bénéficié de cette activité. Parmi les activités dont la mise en œuvre requiert des périodes plus longues, et qui sont actuellement en cours il y a lieu de mentionner ici un projet concernant le renforcement d'un système de gestion participative du Qhapaq Ñan, réseau de routes andin, financé par le fonds-en-dépôt UNESCO/Japon. Ce projet a été lancé en 2016 avec les six États parties concernés (Argentine, Bolivie, Chili, Colombie, Équateur et Pérou) ; il a nettement progressé au cours des derniers mois. La première activité, relative à la production d'un système de données pour le suivi de l'état de conservation du bien, a été réalisée en Colombie pendant le premier semestre 2017, suivie de deux ateliers internationaux, organisés en Bolivie (mai 2017) et en Équateur (juin 2017). Une autre activité de longue durée, dans le domaine de la conservation, est le Projet pour la préservation et la conservation de Tiwanaku et de la pyramide d'Akapana, en Bolivie financé par le fonds-en-dépôt UNESCO/Japon et mis en œuvre avec l'appui du Bureau de l'UNESCO Quito. Dans les derniers mois, des progrès ont été accomplis dans la reformulation du plan de gestion et dans l'élaboration d'un plan de conservation intégral pour le bien, ainsi qu'au niveau du renforcement des capacités des communautés locales. Le projet devrait être finalisé l'année prochaine. Enfin, il mentionne deux autres activités qui ont été mises en œuvre dans la sous-région des Caraïbes. D'abord, le projet « Renforcement des capacités pour la conservation et la gestion du Parc national Brimstone Hill Fortress, Saint-Kitts-et-Nevis » mis en œuvre tout au long de l'année 2016 grâce au soutien financier du fonds-en-dépôt des Pays-Bas, avec un séminaire, auquel ont participé des représentants des pays voisins, une étude sur la structure architecturale et la mise en œuvre de travaux de conservation préliminaires pour remédier aux dommages après le tremblement de terre de 2013. Ensuite, le projet « Améliorer les capacités dans les petites régions insulaires en développement – Grenada et Saint-Vincent-et-les Grenadines » portant sur les capacités en matière d'inventaires, comme base indispensable à la révision des listes indicatives, en vue de futures candidatures.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** took this opportunity to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their work in Latin America and the Caribbean with respect to the objectives of the Regional Action Plan 2014–2024, adding that much had been achieved through increased public awareness around World Heritage, particularly among governments, and certainly within the Caribbean where there was growing support for World Heritage. Jamaica had felt on the ground the impact of the Action Plan with close to ten major initiatives that were just referenced. The delegation was certain that the significant amount of work that goes into coordinating these initiatives were appreciated, from developing project proposals to actual implementation. With this in mind, the delegation believed that States Parties across all the regions should be duly acknowledged for the extent of their involvement, and thus proposed an amendment to the draft decision in this regard.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment from Jamaica. Paragraphs 1–6 remained unchanged. The new paragraph 7 would read, 'Further notes with appreciation the contribution of the States Parties of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Grenada, Haiti, Mexico, Peru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Jamaica, in organizing and implementing various activities during the period 2016–2017 under the Regional Action Plan for Latin America and the Caribbean 2014–2024'.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraphs 1–8 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 10B.4 adopted.

Follow-up to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Section 5 (Europe and North America unit)

Decision: [41 COM 10B.5](#)

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the region of Europe and North America.

Le Secretariat présente le dernier rapport de suivi sur les rapports périodiques de la région Europe et Amérique du Nord, qui concerne la région Europe plus particulièrement. Ce rapport est articulé autour de trois points. Le premier est un rappel des objectifs du plan d'action d'Helsinki adopté lors de la 39e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial en 2015 ainsi qu'une présentation de l'enquête de suivi qui a été lancée par le Centre du patrimoine mondial en octobre 2016. Le deuxième point est une présentation synthétique des résultats de cette enquête de suivi pour la mise en œuvre du plan, et le troisième point est un rappel de certaines activités aux niveaux régional et sous-régional qui complète la mise en œuvre du plan d'action d'Helsinki. Point numéro 1 : le plan d'action. Il est structuré en plusieurs niveaux, en trois grandes priorités, puis en objectifs, en actions spécifiques et en cibles régionales qui sont dotés de bases de référence quantitatives. Les trois priorités du plan sont tout d'abord l'identification et la protection de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Ensuite, une gestion efficace des biens du patrimoine mondial. Troisième priorité, la nécessité d'une sensibilisation accrue à la Convention. Le plan d'action a été conçu de manière à intégrer un suivi régulier de sa mise en œuvre jusqu'à la prochaine phase de rapport périodique pour la région Europe et, à cette fin, une plate-forme d'autoévaluation à destination des points focaux a été créée par l'Unité Europe l'année dernière. Le Secretariat rappelle que cette plate-forme d'autoévaluation a été présentée aux membres du Comité lors d'un side event à la dernière session du Comité. La première enquête de suivi en ligne a été faite d'octobre à décembre 2016. Elle couvre donc les 15 mois qui se sont écoulés depuis l'adoption du Plan d'action d'Helsinki. Cette enquête de suivi a deux objectifs. Le processus même de l'enquête permet de maintenir un certain niveau d'engagement, non seulement des points focaux mais aussi du Centre du patrimoine mondial, de garder un niveau de vigilance sur la mise en

œuvre de ce plan d'action entre deux grandes phases de rapport périodique. Le deuxième objectif : cette enquête de suivi permet de fournir des données quantitatives permettant de mesurer la mise en œuvre des différents objectifs et actions du Plan d'Helsinki et éventuellement de réévaluer les objectifs et les bases de référence sur la base des progrès réels des États parties. Point numéro 2. Présentation synthétique des résultats de cette enquête. Le Secrétariat commence par exprimer sa gratitude envers tous les points focaux qui ont pris le temps et la peine de répondre à cette enquête de suivi. Elle rappelle également que cette enquête est disponible sur le site Web du Centre. Trente-trois États parties sur 49 ont répondu à cette enquête et cela couvre 412 biens du patrimoine mondial, ce qui correspond à 83 percent des biens de la région Europe. L'enquête a fait apparaître des progrès pour 25 des 44 cibles régionales et il est apparu que pour 12 de ces 25 cibles, les objectifs ont été atteints. Certaines cibles ont également été largement dépassées, ce qui permet l'établissement d'une nouvelle ligne de référence, de nouveaux objectifs quantitatifs pour la mise en œuvre de ces actions. Un exemple : pour ce qui concerne la priorité numéro 1 et l'action 4 qui consiste à assurer le financement de la mise à jour des analyses de lacunes dans la liste pour un ou plusieurs États parties, la cible était définie de US\$75,000 des États-Unis pour les États parties avec deux analyses de ces lacunes. Les résultats obtenus par l'enquête montrent un montant de US\$115,000 réunis pour trois analyses. Autre exemple, de larges dépassements de ces cibles nationales pour la priorité numéro 2 relative à la gestion efficace, l'action 21 qui consistait à établir des systèmes de renforcement des capacités pour les gestionnaires de site, la ligne de référence qui avait été définie était de 40 activités et le résultat obtenu a été 79. Il a été noté que les résultats de l'enquête sont en ligne. Alors, quelles sont, au sein des priorités, les actions qui sont reçues comme les plus pertinentes de ce plan d'action ? Pour la priorité numéro 2, gestion efficace du patrimoine mondial, c'est l'action 15 sur l'établissement d'indicateurs de suivi et à suivi régulier qui apparaît la plus pertinente et montre à quel point le suivi montre qu'on veut encore du suivi et l'établissement de nouveaux indicateurs. Ensuite vient l'action 18 qui consiste à réviser et mettre à jour les plans de gestion des biens afin d'y intégrer les mécanismes du patrimoine mondial ou à établir ces plans de gestion. Enfin, autre exemple d'action jugée la plus pertinente par les gestionnaires de site pour la priorité numéro 1 est l'action 9 qui prescrit de déterminer clairement les attributs de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle et d'en faire un des éléments clés des plans de gestion. A contrario, pour la priorité numéro 3 qui concerne la sensibilisation accrue à la Convention, l'action 27 relative aux processus participatifs et à l'engagement communautaire, l'enquête a fait apparaître que, pour seulement 29 pour cent des biens, ce cadre de participation avait été formalisé et intégré au plan de gestion alors que la ligne de référence établie par le plan d'action était de 50 pour cent.

Le Secrétariat présente le Point numéro 3. Ces activités sont détaillées dans le document qui a été soumis et s'inscrivent dans le cadre des actions 21 à 24 du Plan d'action d'Helsinki, qui sont destinées au renforcement des compétences interdisciplinaires des gestionnaires de site. Elle cite en premier lieu la Conférence nordique annuelle sur le patrimoine mondial qui a eu lieu à Reykjavik en Islande en septembre 2016, et qui a donné lieu à la création de l'Association nordique du patrimoine mondial, qui a été créée au sein même d'un bien du patrimoine mondial, le site de Þingvellir (Thingvellir). Elle cite ensuite la seconde rencontre des associations européennes du patrimoine mondial qui s'est tenue à Ségovie en Espagne en octobre 2016, suite à l'initiative de la France, qui avait organisé l'année précédente la première réunion des associations européennes du patrimoine mondial à Strasbourg. La thématique de la réunion de Ségovie était le rôle social du patrimoine et cette réunion a adopté une déclaration, la Déclaration de Ségovie, détaillant des stratégies et des outils pour permettre l'intégration des communautés dans le plan de gestion et montre que ceci fait partie d'une des actions qui sont en-dessous des lignes établies pour son suivi. Le Secrétariat annonce avec plaisir la troisième réunion des associations européennes qui est prévue à Lübeck à l'invitation de l'Allemagne les 5 et 6 octobre prochain, et dont la thématique est « Partage du patrimoine mondial » (Sharing World Heritage) [lire plus [ici](#)]. Enfin, elle rappelle l'importance du travail fait par les bureaux régionaux dans la mise en

œuvre de la Convention, et souhaite mentionner une dernière activité faite avec le bureau régional l'Unesco de Venise ; il s'agit de la deuxième édition de l'Académie internationale sur le développement durable qui a été organisée à Turin du 1er au 4 décembre de l'année 2016 avec le Centre de recherches Silvia Santagata. Cette seconde réunion portait sur la gestion des désignations multiples relatives aux conventions de l'Unesco, c'est-à-dire le réseau des réserves de biosphère, les villes créatives et sites du patrimoine mondial. Elle rappelle que ces activités accompagnent la mise en œuvre du plan d'action mais il lui semble, pour avoir participé à certaines d'entre elles, qu'elles ont aussi un objectif essentiel dans la gouvernance du patrimoine mondial puisqu'elles encouragent la perméabilité et les échanges entre les différents acteurs de la gestion de ces biens ; c'est-à-dire non seulement les gestionnaires de site mais aussi les responsables des administrations locales, régionales et nationales, ainsi que les acteurs politiques. Elle déclare qu'un rapport conjoint des deux sous-régions Europe et Amérique du Nord sera présenté lors de la 43e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial en 2019.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Finland** welcomed this opportunity to share experiences of regional activities, and was happy to see the actions and initiatives in the implementation of the Helsinki Action Plan for Europe adopted at the 39th session. It also welcomed the Helsinki Action Plan Monitoring Survey. From the Nordic perspective, the delegation wished to highlight the formation of the Nordic World Heritage Association as a regional initiative. Since 1995, the [network of] Nordic World Heritage sites meet annually to share their experiences in implementing the Convention. This 20-year tradition has shown that competence and capacity-building are best achieved through international cooperation and by learning from one another. In September 2016, a new step was taken when the Nordic World Heritage Association was founded. The Association would lead to a network of ever more closely cooperating sites that could also make good use of various types of funding opportunities for common projects. The delegation concluded by highlighting the upcoming European Year for Cultural heritage in 2018 and inviting the World Heritage Centre to take an active part in it.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 10B.5 adopted.

ITEM 12B – PROGRESS REPORT ON THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR'S 'REPORT ON THE GOVERNANCE OF UNESCO AND DEPENDANT FUNDS, PROGRAMMES AND ENTITIES' (DOCUMENT 38C/23)

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/12B](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/17/41/COM/12B)

Decision: [41 COM 12B](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/41/COM/12B)

The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 12B on the follow-up to the Recommendations of the External Auditor with a view to improving governance by concrete measures.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented working document 12B on the follow-up of the External Auditor's Report concerning governance, as requested by the Committee at its last session. The Director recalled that an Open-Ended Working Group was established by the General Conference in 2015 with a mandate to examine the governance procedures and working methods of the governing bodies of UNESCO, and two subgroups were therefore established: Sub-Group 1, to discuss structure, composition and methods of work of the governing bodies, and Sub-Group 2, to examine the structure, composition and methods of work of UNESCO's international and intergovernmental bodies. The Open-Ended Working group and the two subgroups held several meetings in the course of 2016 and 2017. During the meetings of Sub-Group 2, issues related to the governing bodies of the culture

Conventions, including the 1972 Convention, were discussed. The recognition of good practices, notably periodic reporting and appropriate methods of work, as well as appreciation of the 1972 Convention's Secretariat, were strongly underlined by the Sub-Group 2. Sub-Group 2 also met another time on 9 June [2017] to finalize its draft recommendations, and on that occasion it proposed several general recommendations for all international and intergovernmental bodies, mainly focusing on efficiency, harmonization, alignment with overarching priorities of UNESCO coherence coordination, and synergies and best practices. In this framework, a specific recommendation concerned the need to reduce and manage politicization of nominations and decisions. The Sub-Group 2 also proposed specific recommendations for the World Heritage Convention, specifically recommending to ensure a balanced and representative World Heritage List. The recommendations were transmitted to the meeting of the Open-Ended Group on 23 June [2017], and it was noted that the recommendations of the General Conference Open-Ended Working Group would be submitted to the 202nd session of the Executive Board in October 2017, transmitting its own comments to the 39th session of the General Conference in autumn 2017. For the time being it was thus proposed that the Committee take note of the Progress Report of the ongoing work undertaken by the General Conference to examine the governance, procedures and working methods of UNESCO's governing bodies.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** remarked that it was actively participating in the Working Group on Governance as Co-Chair with the Sub-Groups that had been working intensely over the past two years. It was noted that Sub-Group 2 discussed the 1972 Convention, identifying it as a source of best practices, such as the periodic reporting and the practice of establishing an Ad-hoc Working Group to look at more complex issues in between sessions. A specific recommendation adopted by the Working Group at its last meeting on 23 June [2017] was for the World Heritage Committee to ensure a balanced and representative World Heritage List, which echoed the discussions earlier in the morning session. The delegation was glad that the issue of the global strategy for a more balanced and representative List had been given to the extended Ad-hoc Working Group to examine. The Working Group on Governance also adopted a set of general recommendations to enhance efficiency and transparency of all intergovernmental councils and the culture Conventions, including the World Heritage Convention and its governing bodies. In particular, one general recommendation of particular importance was the need to reduce and manage politicization of nominations and decisions. The delegation also believed that another recommendation of the Working Group, in terms of harmonization in the composition of the Bureau with other intergovernmental councils, could be looked at by the Committee. The third general recommendation of interest was the call for co-sponsors of draft decisions and substantive amendments to convene consultations before presenting amendments to the plenary for decision and discussion. This would allow for greater transparency and indeed more time for Committee Members to talk about the draft decisions, while allowing for a better understanding and a meeting of minds on the more difficult nominations and properties. This would also promote the equitable application of standards and consistency. The delegation felt that it would be useful for the Committee to study the relevant recommendations of the Working Group on Governance to be adopted later in November 2017 by the General Conference. The delegation therefore submitted some amendments to the draft decision, such as inscribing on the agenda of the next Committee session an item to follow up on the relevant recommendations. It thanked all the Committee Members who expressed support for the amendments.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** commended the efforts underway by the Open-Ended Working Group to examine governance procedures and the working methods of the governing bodies of UNESCO. Tanzania aligned with the observation of the Advisory Bodies and awaited reception of the recommendations of the Working Group along with their likely impact and financial implications. In this regard, Tanzania congratulated the efforts of the Working Group and supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Turkey** echoed the remarks by the Philippines, Chair of the Sub-Group on governance. Turkey had also actively participated in the Governance Working Group's negotiations, adding that this Convention had many good practices that were raised during the negotiations. The delegation believed that this should be reflected in the Working Group's summary, and together with the Philippines, it had submitted a draft amendment in this regard. It looked forward to continued discussions on this issue at the next Committee session.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** recalled the spirit of the Working Group, as mandated by Resolution 38C/101, which was to undertake an holistic and comprehensive reform of UNESCO to ensure greater effectiveness and efficiency in the governance of UNESCO. The Working Group had been working continuously throughout the best part of two years. In this regard, Indonesia believed that such work had resulted in valuable recommendations that was responding to the need to optimize the governance of intergovernmental programmes, committees and Conventions, including the World Heritage Convention. The delegation was of the view that the discussion on governance would develop more synergies, harmonization, efficiency and a positive impact on the governing bodies of the Convention. Hence, it supported the draft amendments submitted by the Philippines.

The **Delegation of Finland** had actively taken part in the Open-Ended Working Group on Governance and, as mentioned by the Philippines, during these meetings several good practices of the Convention had been mentioned, such as periodic reporting, live streaming the Committee sessions, and the working groups open to all States Parties during the sessions. As Finland had pointed out on several occasions, efficient governance, policy coherence, and functional intersectoral and inter-programmatic linkages were crucial in making UNESCO's work coherent, credible and influential. Finland greeted all actions taken so far in improving the governance of the culture Conventions, even if the different nature of the Conventions in certain areas created challenges, adding that there were still plenty of possibilities to examine them further. The delegation invited the Convention to continue its dialogue and cooperation with UNESCO's culture and biodiversity-related Conventions and programmes, and it looked forward to the recommendations of the Working Group on Governance and its adequate follow-up. The delegation co-sponsored the Philippines' amendment to the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** also supported the amended draft to the decision by the Philippines, adding that it expected the recommendations of the Working Group on Governance to provide overarching views to enhance efficiency in the working methods of the Committee. It strongly believed that it was worth studying and examining the relevant recommendations of the Working Group as they would serve as a good basis for further discussion, and in this regard it was important to discuss this item at the next session.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** appreciated the work carried out by the Open-Ended Working Group over the past two years. It also commended the progress made by the two Sub-Groups of the Open-Ended Group and it looked forward to the finalization of their work. Zimbabwe reiterated its support for the amended draft decision.

The **Delegations of Cuba and Kuwait** supported the amendment by the Philippines.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by the Chairperson of the Drafting Group [the Philippines] with three new paragraphs added to the draft decision. Paragraphs 1–3 remained unchanged. A new paragraph 4 would read, 'Decides to study the relevant recommendations of the Working Group on the governance procedures, and working methods of the governing bodies of UNESCO established by the General Conference Resolution 38C/101'. Paragraph 5 would read, 'Requests the World Heritage Centre to provide the Committee with information on the outcomes of the Working Group on Governance in due course'. A new paragraph 6 would read, 'Also decides to inscribe an item on its agenda at its 42nd session in 2018 on the "Follow-up and implementation of the

recommendations of the Working Group on Governance as endorsed by the General Conference'. The Rapporteur noted the addition of 'as' in 'as endorsed', as technically the General Conference had not yet taken place; it would take place in November 2017.

The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision, and paragraphs 1–6 were duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 12B adopted as amended.

ITEM 11 – REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/11](#)

Decision: [41 COM 11](#)

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the Working Group had met over the past few days and was proposing a revised draft decision on the revision of the Operational Guidelines. The Chairperson invited Mr Jad Tabet (Lebanon) to present the report to the Committee members.

The **Chair of the Working Group on the Operational Guidelines**, Mr Jad Tabet, presented the conclusions and the draft decision elaborated by the Working Group on the Operational Guidelines. Last year, the Committee at its 40th session adopted in its Decision [40 COM 11](#) the revision of paragraph 61 of the Operational Guidelines. However, despite the extensive discussion, no consensus was reached on the revision of paragraph 68 [on Tentative Lists] and Annexes 2A and 2B [on Tentative Lists' formats], and this matter was included in the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group for examination at the present 41st session. The second item on the agenda of the Operational Guidelines Working Group concerned Chapter V and Annex 7, as requested by the Committee in its Decision [39 COM 10B.5](#) [on periodic reporting] and Decision [40 COM 10A](#) [progress report on the periodic reporting reflection 2015–2017]. The first meeting of the Working Group on Operational Guidelines was held on Friday 7 July. Overall, 57 participants were present. It was agreed to first discuss paragraph 68, followed by Chapter V and Annex 7. Concerning paragraph 68, the first discussion was dealt with smoothly and efficiently guided by a solution-oriented approach. It started with a presentation by Ms Katarzyna Piotrowska of the National Heritage Board of Poland, who chaired the Ad-hoc Sub-Group tasked with discussions on paragraph 68. Mr Tabet took the opportunity to thank her for her successful and wise chairmanship. During her presentation, she had given an overview of the outcomes of the group's work, and she recalled attempts that had been made since 2007 to deal with these issues; the current discussion had been on the agenda of the Operational Guidelines Working Group since 2015. Mr Tabet explained that starting from November 2016, the Group met every month as agreed, six times, and discussed extensively many possible options for resolving the issues related to paragraph 68. The Group began with a discussion in the broadest possible context and, in addition to paragraph 68, had formulated a number of proposals on different aspects of the Tentative Lists that were later included in the list of recommendations presented in working document 12A [[here](#)]. With regard to the proposal for paragraph 68, it was unanimously agreed by the Ad-hoc Working Group, and it had also been discussed and presented at two open-ended meetings of the Group. The proposal suggested to continue the current mechanism of registering Tentative Lists, maintaining the presentation to the Committee and their publication on the World Heritage website. The Group also proposed the introduction of an amendment to paragraph 68 in the form of a disclaimer, underlining the national character of the Lists and noting that publication did not imply any expression of opinion on the part of the World Heritage Committee, of the Secretariat or of UNESCO. A number of States Parties took the floor to express appreciation of the work accomplished, as well as support for the recommendations proposed and the solution identified by the Ad-hoc Working Group. The discussion on paragraph 68 concluded with the Operational Guidelines Working Group consensually agreeing to this proposal, as well as to the recommendations included in

Decision [39 COM 11](#) [revision of the Operational Guidelines] proposed by the Ad-hoc Group in working document 12A, Chapter V and Annex 7.

The **Chair of the Working Group**, Mr Jad Tabet, further explained that the Working Group then moved on to the discussion of Chapter V and Annex 7. In its opening remarks, the Secretariat emphasized the importance of updating the Operational Guidelines, as this had not been done since 1997. The Group was then given a brief presentation of the periodic reporting reflection, including the main updates, improvements and developments to the periodic reporting questionnaire and process, as well as the findings of the reflection survey, such as general support for maintaining the four periodic reporting (PR) objectives. The Secretariat also highlighted the main changes to the PR questionnaire online tool, including the new questions related to synergies with other Conventions, such as with the 1954 Hague Convention and its Second Protocol that is very important today, and the question related to sustainable development. The proposal was then examined on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Several questions were raised, namely about consistency over a six-year time lapse and the feasibility of a global World Heritage report. Clarifications were made by the Secretariat and the lead expert of the Periodic Reporting Reflection Group, Dr Christopher Young. At the end of the first day's session, the Working Group had covered half of the proposed changes. The Group then met the following day with 43 participants in attendance, and the work resumed on the final paragraphs of Chapter V before moving on to the format of periodic reporting in Annex 7. It was noted that the format had been completely replaced and was now in a simplified and more general form that allowed some degree of flexibility for future changes. The format was also reviewed on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and unanimous agreement was reached. The Group then reviewed and agreed to the decision as amended. The mandate of the Working Group was thus concluded in an efficient manner, thanks to the commendable work achieved by the Ad-hoc Group under Ms Piotrowska. Given the remaining time, Ms Piotrowska had proposed a discussion outside the mandate of the Group on the relevance and future of Annex 3 to the Operational Guidelines, which as previously requested by the Committee in Bonn in its Decision 39 COM 11 should be reviewed entirely so as to include definitions and relevant guidelines for States Parties in the preparation of Tentative Lists, nominations, management and reporting systems. Lively discussion on the approach to be taken to Annex 3 ensued with numerous States Parties, as well as the Advisory Bodies taking the floor with questions and reflections on the content and on the pertinence of this Annex. After further deliberation, it was agreed that it was important that the Committee recall its previous decision on Annex 3, in paragraph 8 of Decision 39 COM 11, in order to ensure follow-up, and that the best way forward would be for this issue to be added to the mandate of the Operational Guidelines Working Group for examination in two years' time at the 43rd Committee session. It was noted that the category 2 centre in Bahrain had announced its readiness to host in 2018 a preparatory meeting about Annex 3, but this has yet to be discussed. The mandate of the Working Group came to an end, and it was decided that the last allocated working session on 9 July [2017] could be used as an opportunity to hold an informal discussion and a Q&A session on the Periodic Reporting Reflection and the launch of the Third Cycle prior to the discussion of agenda item 10A on 11 July. Finally, Mr Tabet spoke of his pleasure of submitting to the Committee the final report that marked the end of the revision of the Operational Guidelines process that started in the 39th session in Bonn. He spoke of his honour in having chaired the three working groups that tackled this issue in Bonn, Istanbul, Paris and Krakow. He expressed his satisfaction for the success of the revision process, and thanked all those who participated in this process, the Member States, the Ad-hoc Working Group Chairs, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Tabet for the clear presentation and congratulated him on his excellent work and efficiency, opening the floor for comments.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** thanked Mr Jad Tabet for his commendable work over the past three sessions, and for the progress made. It also warmly congratulated Ms

Katarzyna Piotrowska who chaired the discussions in the Ad-hoc Working Group over the course of the last eight months, which helped reach this consensus on the outcome of paragraph 68 and was balanced and pragmatic. The delegation hoped that the supplementary recommendations reflected in the draft recommendation, which encouraged constructive dialogue among concerned States Parties, would help reduce some of the problems encountered at the level of Tentative Lists and at the nomination stage in the Committee.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 11 adopted.

ITEM 7 [Continuation]: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee decided to examine the general decision 41 COM 7 on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties at the end of the debates on items 7A and 7B. This agenda item had been introduced by the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies earlier in the week, and the Chairperson opened the floor for comments.

The **Delegation of Poland**, represented by Ms Katarzyna Piotrowska, wished to thank everyone for their kind words. Regarding agenda item 7, the delegation recalled the World Heritage Site Managers Forum that took place during the present Committee session. The Forum was organized by the National Heritage Board of Poland together with ICCROM and in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre together with IUCN and ICOMOS. The Forum was attended by about 100 participants from 25 States Parties, representing all types of World Heritage properties from all the world's regions. The idea of the Forum was to unite representatives from World Heritage properties with those at the heart of the World Heritage procedures so as to build stronger bridges between the procedural core of the World Heritage system with the site managers, as the ongoing work to safeguard values of the properties constituted the real expression of the Convention. The objectives of the Forum were to assist site managers in learning about the decision-taking process and to understand the Committee's role in safeguarding World Heritage properties while informing site managers about the reactive monitoring process and exposing them to the decision-taking level. In this way, the site managers' role in the reactive monitoring process at the State Party level could be better understood. At the same time site managers were asked for their views of the World Heritage system and how it might be improved. The Forum concluded with a statement that contained their observations and needs with regard to the World Heritage system, processes and capacity-building. The delegation believed that the observations of the site managers should be carefully considered by all States Parties within the system as an important voice of those who work on a daily basis to protect this common heritage. Copies of the [statement](#) were distributed in the plenary and were available on their [website](#). The engagement of the participants of the Forum, as well as the interventions left no doubt as to the need to continue the site managers' forum in conjunction with the Committee sessions. The delegation had thus proposed a slight amendment to the draft decision that acknowledged the statement prepared by the participants of the Forum.

The **Delegation of Angola** remarked that in the same perspective it had submitted an amendment to the draft decision to mark the tenth anniversary of the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the framework of the Agenda 2030 that invites all to focus on human rights and dignity, while taking into account the conclusion of the International Indigenous Peoples Forum on the World Heritage that took place at this 41st session.

The **Delegation of Portugal** also suggested an amendment to the draft decision that was reminded by the discussion under item 7A of the Historic Centre of Shakhrysyabz in Uzbekistan on the importance of the conservation and protection of World Heritage sites. In this regard, the delegation sought to highlight the importance of paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and, in recalling paragraph 172, requested the World Heritage Centre

in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies to evaluate the effectiveness of the Reactive Monitoring Missions.

The **Delegation of Poland** recalled another side event that took place during the present session 'For a Structured Dialogue with Civil Society', which was organized by the National Heritage Board of Poland and Europa Nostra. This initiative was a very important step towards dialogue with civil society organizations as it looked for their inputs in achieving more effective conservation at the site and national level. An amendment about the initiative had been proposed to the draft decision.

The **Chairperson** noted no further speakers and gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** returned to the point made by Portugal, agreeing that it was very important to recall the provisions of paragraph 172. The Director informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre was already undertaking a project on improving the effectiveness of the World Heritage Reactive Monitoring Process, which had been presented at the Marketplace side event. It was hoped that funding would be made available for this project, and it was indeed very much in line with the proposal by Portugal in its amendment to the draft decision.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to NGO Observers for comments.

A **Representative of NGO Europa Nostra** remarked that Europa Nostra is a pan-European organization with a membership of 260 NGOs and a network of 150 Associate Organizations. With over 50 years of experience, it has become the voice of civil society committed to cultural heritage in Europe. The brief intervention would also echo the views of many heritage colleagues all over the globe who work with competence, dedication and passion at various levels of governance, local, national and international. The Representative expressed special thanks to the Chairperson for allowing a very large number of NGOs to take the floor, which was a welcome development and one she encouraged his successors to continue. She also thanked Poland and its National Heritage Board for their vital support in the organization of the joint event with Europa Nostra 'For a Structured Dialogue with Civil Society'. This initiative also received the full support from UNESCO's Director-General, Ms Irina Bokova. In addition to the attendance of NGOs, the side event was attended by many different stakeholders: States Parties, the Organization of World Heritage Cities, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre represented by its Director, Dr Mechthild Rössler. Europa Nostra was now grateful for this opportunity to convey to the Committee the key messages that were identified before, during and after the side event on the basis of numerous conversations and consultations with the various parties concerned, both public and private. First of all, Europa Nostra acknowledged that much had been done to involve civil societies at various levels: site managers, Historic Cities, States Parties, the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre, and increasingly at the level of the Committee. Nevertheless, so much more could be done to ensure that dialogue with civil society becomes more structured, regular and effective, as this would contribute to further strengthening the good governance, credibility and effectiveness of the Convention. The Representative further remarked that all could agree that this Convention and its Operational Guidelines gave ample space for the building of a structured dialogue. Recent wider developments were also relevant in this context. For example, the policy document on sustainable development adopted in 2015, the relevance of UN Agenda 2030 and the SDGs, especially SDGs 16 and 17 in addition to SDG 11.4, as well as the human rights approach to cultural heritage developed under UN auspices through the work of UN Special Rapporteur for Cultural Rights. All these wider developments stressed the vital importance of citizens' participation and the full involvement of local communities in decision-making with regard to their cultural and natural heritage. More recently, at its congress held in Turku in Finland, Europa Nostra adopted a Turku Manifesto, 'Participation Counts for Heritage'. Europa Nostra acknowledged the organization of the NGO Forum over for the past five years prior to the

World Heritage Committee sessions to discuss specific World Heritage cases and to explore ways to strengthen the voice of civil society. To achieve a more structured dialogue with civil society, further efforts were needed on all sides. The Representative was fully aware that the Committee and its Secretariat could not deal efficiently with hundreds of NGOs, therefore the heritage NGOs have to better organize in order to provide a credible and manageable platform for dialogue. The various international NGOs that operate at the global or regional levels – like Europa Nostra – seek to contribute to this goal. NGOs working in the field of cultural heritage could learn a lot from the more advanced level of organization and resources demonstrated by colleagues working in the field of nature conservation with a key role played by IUCN. While commending the vital work carried out by ICOMOS and ICCROM, Europa Nostra particularly looked forward to discussing with them best ways to ensure a more systematic and effective input from civil society organizations with regard to cultural heritage sites on the World Heritage List. The Representative spoke of pursuing this Krakow Initiative by coordinating an informal working group composed of a limited but representative group of heritage NGOs and their networks, and with representatives of the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The aim of this working group would be to discuss and make recommendations for a more structured dialogue with civil society on World Heritage matters. The time was ripe to have a discussion on this subject at the next Committee meeting in 2018, and the Representative suggested that the Committee and the Secretariat include in the agenda of the Committee's 42nd session a time for these important discussions. It was hoped that the Committee could endorse and participate in this initiative.

The **Chairperson** hoped that this session could be remembered as a new opening regarding this important relationship between heritage and society.

The **Delegation of Australia** thanked the Chairperson for his superb chairing of the meeting, adding that it wished to address three aspects of the draft decision. First, Australia underlined the seriousness with which it engaged in efforts to deal with the invasive alien species impacting its natural World Heritage properties, adding that invasive species posed a great threat to the OUV of many places. Second, Australia strongly affirmed the need to address illegal wildlife trade through effective implementation by States Parties as signatories to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species. In particular, by dealing with illegal wildlife trade where intervention is most effective: reducing demand so that illegal trade no longer finds a market, worth an estimated US\$20 billion a year, the fourth largest source of crime globally after people-trafficking, arms dealing and drugs smuggling. The delegation recommended that delegations read the highly informative 2016 Report on Illegal Wildlife Trade [\[here\]](#) produced by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Third, and most critically, Australia welcomed the focus of this meeting on the impact of climate change and mass coral bleaching on World Heritage properties. The consequences of climate change for reef ecosystems had been felt sooner and more deeply than anticipated by the scientific community even five years ago. The global mass coral bleaching event that began in 2014 had caused extensive damage to World Heritage properties across the globe, the Great Barrier Reef included. Significantly, the worst pollution on the Great Barrier Reef in 2016 was concentrated in the northern third of the reef, the most remote area, farthest from any substantial direct human influence. This underlined the truly global nature of the threat of climate change that goes beyond the ability of States Parties and site managers to address alone, and which required concerted effort by the international community as a whole. That is why Australia was strongly committed to the implementation of the Paris Agreement to ensure that every effort is made globally to hold the increasing global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, while pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C. The risk to common natural heritage is stark and urgent, but the outlook is not hopeless. The world's reefs can be protected.

The **Representative of the IUCN** supported all the comments made by Australia and recognized the importance of the initiative to create the Site Managers Forum at the present

meeting, congratulating Poland on the initiative. He spoke [on a personal note] of his experience as a World Heritage site manager, adding that creating space in the Committee's proceedings to allow site managers to come together was a great initiative and he encouraged it to continue. In that regard, IUCN responded to the Site Managers Forum document on the good ideas and constructive suggestions presented, and also to see how its work could be more effective so that the message could go back to the site managers. IUCN also wished to thank Europa Nostra for its comments, adding that IUCN had been advocating NGO participation for some time and in fact one of the conclusions on World Heritage at the last IUCN World Parks Congress [in South Africa in 2003] (it takes place every 10 years) was how much the Convention would benefit from opening up opportunities for civil society to participate. The ideas brought forward by Europa Nostra really helped crystallize the challenges, and the opportunity to debate this further at the next Committee session was thus extremely welcome.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** turned to the draft decision. Paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unchanged. Paragraph 3 received a proposal from Poland, which would read, 'Takes note with appreciation of the World Heritage Site Managers Forum Statement and encourages the future host countries to continue this initiative and organize World Heritage Site Managers Forums in conjunction with the World Heritage Committee session'. Paragraph 4 remained unchanged. A new paragraph 5 was proposed by Portugal, which would read, 'Recalling the importance of Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and its adequate implementation, further recalls decision 40 COM 7, which requests the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to evaluate the effectiveness of the Reactive Monitoring including procedures and case studies and to present a preliminary report for the consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018, if funds are available'. Paragraph 5 became paragraph 6. Paragraphs 7–13 remained unchanged. Paragraph 14 received a new addition, which would read, 'and welcomes the offer of the Government of Poland to host an international conference on Reconstruction to provide guidelines to the World Heritage Committee to be held in Warsaw in March 2018'. Paragraph 14 would become 15. Paragraphs 15–21 remained unchanged. There was a slight addition in paragraph 22 from Finland, Jamaica and Angola, which would read, 'Reiterates the importance of States Parties undertaking the most ambitious implementation of the Paris Agreement of the United Nations Agreement on Climate Change by pursuing efforts to limit the global average temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial level, and strongly invites all States Parties to ratify the Paris Agreement at the earliest possible opportunity, and to undertake action to address climate and the Paris Agreement consistent with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities in the light of different national circumstances, that are fully consistent with their obligation within the World Heritage Convention to pursue the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage properties'. Paragraph 22 would become paragraph 23. Paragraphs 23 and 24 remained unchanged. Paragraph 25 received an amendment from Finland, Jamaica and Angola, which read, 'And notes with appreciation the willingness of civil society groups to engage with these processes'. Paragraph 26 (original paragraph 25) and paragraphs 27–38 remained unchanged. With regard to paragraph 39, the Rapporteur recalled that early on during this Committee the Philippines proposed a text discussed under item 5A, which was considered for introduction in item 7B, which would read, 'Reiterates its request to the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and States Parties, to promote better understanding of the implications and benefits of properties being inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to develop appropriate information material in this regard with a view to overcome the negative perceptions of the List of World Heritage in Danger. The information material should highlight the importance of the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value'. There was also a new paragraph 40 from Poland, which would read, 'Takes note with appreciation of the Chairperson's initiative on structured dialogue with civil society, and encourages States Parties and civil society organizations to continue exploring possibilities on how civil society

can further contribute to enhanced conservation of heritage on the site and national level and provide relevant input to the heritage related debate at the global level'. Paragraph 41 from Angola would read, 'Notes, in conformity with Resolution 20 GA 13 of the General Assembly of the World Heritage Convention and the Decision 39 COM 11 of the World Heritage Committee, the establishment of the International Indigenous Peoples Forum on World Heritage as an important reflection platform on the involvement of Indigenous Peoples in the identification, conservation and management of World Heritage properties, with a particular focus on the nomination process'.

The **Chairperson** noted the 41 paragraphs before turning to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–21 were duly adopted.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that while it understood the importance of the amendment by Finland, Jamaica and Angola, it had some doubts about whether the Committee should use very technical language, as it should not elaborate on climate change negotiations. Thus, it preferred to have more general language and to delete the first proposal 'by pursuing efforts to limit [...]' as it was too technical.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** thanked Finland, Jamaica and Angola for these amendments on paragraph 22 which added value to the text, and which were direct quotations from the Paris Agreement that had already been adopted. Therefore, it had no problems with both additions.

The **Delegation of Portugal** referred to the French version of paragraph 14, noting a problem of translation, which in the English read 'to provide guidelines', and in French '*afin de procurer des directives au Comité*'. The delegation proposed instead '*Afin de fournir des directives*' or '*donner des directives*'.

The **Chairperson** thanked Portugal for this important remark to improve the quality of language. The revised paragraph 14 was re-accepted as amended. He then returned to paragraph 22 and asked Turkey whether it would accept the sentence, as explained by the Philippines regarding the Paris Agreement.

The **Delegation of Turkey** was grateful for the clarification but not all the States Parties had ratified the Paris Agreement and thus, for those that had not yet done so, the delegation sought to have a general reference.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it could kindly propose a change, and whether it would be acceptable for those who had already signed the Paris agreement.

The **Delegation of Finland** remarked that the first priority would be to retain the text, but of course it understood that not all countries had ratified the Paris Agreement, adding that initially it had wished to add some text before the words 'by pursuing' followed by the text of the agreed language of the Paris Agreement. However, it did not appear to solve the issue as presented and therefore it preferred to maintain the text, as there seemed to be support for it.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** re-emphasized the point that the Committee should find a way to make appropriate linkages to other Conventions and agreements that had bearing in some way or another to the work of the Committee, as well as work of the World Heritage Convention within its general framework. As noted by the Philippines, the delegation believed that, as part of the Paris Agreement, States Parties were all familiar with the document in some way, shape or form, and thus the text should be maintained as it did not pose a challenge as presented.

The **Delegation of Portugal** sought some clarification from Turkey as it wished to understand Turkey's objection, not least because Turkey is a signatory of the Paris Agreement although it was not yet ratified. The delegation wondered whether it was due to the reference to 1.5°C.

The **Delegation of Turkey** concurred that Turkey was a signatory but had not yet ratified the Paris Agreement. Nevertheless, it felt that the language was too technical and it thus

preferred to keep it as general as possible. For that reason, it proposed, 'Noting that the Paris Agreement is a way forward in tackling climate change, and calls upon States to do their utmost within climate action, in line with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities and in light of their national circumstances'.

The **Delegation of Portugal** felt that the Committee was creating more problems for itself, adding that it took all the delegations in Paris to agree on a balanced draft. It suggested moving forward.

The **Delegation of Angola** concurred with Portugal that it took a lot of effort to reach that specific text, with the beginning of the text just reiterating the importance of this most ambitious implementation while the second part of the paragraph strongly invited all Parties to ratify the Paris Agreement. So the intention was clear, and it supported to retain the text.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** shared the views of Portugal and Angola. However, to address the concerns of Turkey, the delegation suggested quoting the entirety of Article II.1.a of the Paris Agreement, which reads, 'holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2° centigrade above pre-industrial levels and pursuing [...]'.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to accept this amendment or go to a show of hands.

The **Delegation of Turkey** was not entirely satisfied but it did not wish to block the consensus on this issue, even though it found this very technical language from the Paris Agreement inappropriate in this context. However, noting no support, it agreed with the consensus.

The **Chairperson** concurred that there was no apparent support, turning to the Committee to ask whether the new version was acceptable.

The **Delegation of Portugal** thanked Turkey for its comprehension, adding that it could agree with the suggestion by the Philippines as it was simply repeating the signed text.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 22 adopted.

The **Delegation of Finland** noted a small correction in paragraph 22 that should read, 'by holding' and 'by pursuing'.

The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 22 adopted, and paragraphs 23–39 were also adopted.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** demande que la décision précise à quel président elle se réfère.

The **Chairperson** noted that 'of the 41st session' was added, and paragraph 40 was duly adopted. Paragraph 41 was also adopted as amended.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 7 adopted as amended.

ITEM 8C – UPDATE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER LIST

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/8C](https://whc.unesco.org/doc/17/41/COM/8C)

Decisions: [41 COM 8C.1](#)

[41 COM 8C.2](#)

[41 COM 8C.3](#)

The **Chairperson** now invite the Secretariat to present the updated List of World Heritage in Danger, taking into account the decision taken during the state of conservation report, as well as the nominations of properties on the World Heritage List.

The Secretariat recalled that the present Committee had inscribed 21 new properties on the World Heritage List – three natural and 18 cultural – and approved the extension of five properties already inscribed on the List. The new overall figures on the World Heritage List

were now: 1,703 properties, of which 832 are cultural, 206 natural and 35 mixed. The breakdown by region of the new 21 properties inscribed at the present session was: i) Africa, three properties; ii) the Arab region, one property; iii) Asia-Pacific, seven properties; iv) Europe-North America, eight properties; and v) Latin America and the Caribbean, two properties. The States Parties of Eritrea and Angola had their first property inscribed on the World Heritage List, and out of the 21 successful nominations, four are situated on the territory of current Committee Members. Following the debates on agenda item 8B, four nominations were referred, and two deferred. In this session, the Committee did not follow the Advisory Body recommendation that was represented in the draft decision in 14 cases. In this way, one referral became an inscription, one deferral became referral, seven deferrals became inscriptions, four non-inscriptions became referrals, and one non-inscription became a deferral. The Committee allocated approximately 22 hours of the discussion to examine 33 nominations, or about 40 minutes per nomination, and as a result of the decision relating to the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List, and the decision on nomination of properties to the World Heritage List at this session, the Committee decided to inscribe two properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger: the Historic Centre of Vienna in Austria and Hebron Al-Khalil Old Town in Palestine. At the same time, three properties were removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger: the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery in Georgia, which had now become Gelati Monastery; Comoé National Park in Côte d'Ivoire; and Simien national Park in Ethiopia. According to these decisions, there are now 54 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee, as Secretariat of the Convention, about the consequences of these decisions in terms of workload for the Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the Committee. It was noted that 10 inscriptions did not come about from recommendations for inscription but from deferrals and referrals. This meant that 10 provisional statements of OUV had to be reviewed by the Advisory Bodies and coordinated by the World Heritage Centre, and the Committee also requested six additional State of conservation (SOC) reports that emerged from those decisions. It was noted that the 10 additional provisional statements of OUV come in addition to the three pending ones that had not been finalized from India, Iraq, and Kazakhstan, Kirghizstan and Uzbekistan. This was the workload in terms of the statements of OUV, but there was also the growing workload in terms of the State of conservation [reports]. This year, the Committee had reviewed 154 SOC reports; in 2018, there would be 169 SOC reports, including 19 from past decisions on nominations, which often comes from nominations that were inscribed hastily and had no management plan or other issues. In this regard, the Director wished to remind the Committee of its Decision [39 COM 15](#) in Bonn in 2015 regarding the budget, and the decision on the number of SOC reports that should come to this Committee, which read, 'Taking note of the emphasis placed by the World Heritage Committee on conservation and management, which are top priorities, and considering that the actual stand of expenses/budgeting does not reflect this prioritization, recommends that the World Heritage Centre, in its implementation of the budget gives priority to conservation and monitoring activities, and therefore calls for increasing the proportion of the World Heritage Fund dedicated to conservation and decides to keep the number of 150 State of Conservation Reports per annum'. Thus, the Committee had 19 more reports than originally decided in Bonn.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** remarked that it was obvious that a sizeable number of properties had been on the World Heritage List in Danger for 20 years or more for various reasons. They were discussed regularly by the Committee, but the respective decisions remained more or less similar, except for minor amendments. For example, the causative factors that compelled these properties to danger listing, i.e. wars and civil unrest, had remained more or less the same as at the time of danger inscription. The delegation was of the view that there was a need to reconsider the time factor, as well as the way these sites were treated as they remained on the danger list. After such a protracted duration on the danger list, and without sufficient improvement to warrant their

removal, could the Committee confidently consider their OUV to be intact? The delegation proposed a new reflection on this undesirable scenario as to consider a better way of treating these types of properties.

La **Délégation du Liban** remarque qu'à Bonn, 150 état de conservation ont été déclarés. L'année passée tous les sites du Yémen et de la Libye ont été inscrit sur la liste du patrimoine en danger. Il se trouve qu'il faut d'adapter à ce qui arrive dans le monde et qu'à partir du moment où le patrimoine devient de plus en plus menacé, le Comité se trouve obligé d'accepter davantage d'états de conservation.

The **Delegation of Portugal** remarked that unfortunately these things are what they are, and not what we want them to be, adding that it was true that certain properties were left lingering [on the List] due to the Committee's generosity to grant another year, followed by another, and so on. There were however properties that for very objective reasons should unfortunately remain on the danger list, such as Palmyre and the National Parks in the Congo. Nevertheless, the delegation wondered whether some of the other properties could be streamlined for which the Committee shared this collective responsibility, adding that the Committee should be cognizant of the fact that Member States participate in the systematic adjournment of some of these cases.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** found the debate very important as it was absolutely clear that this Committee shouldered the responsibility, but she also took note the comments made by Tanzania by saying that it was important to continue this reflection. It was recalled that the Committee had adopted in the previous decision a paragraph related to this point on danger listing, and she would be very happy to continue this debate.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** a suivi avec attention les différentes interventions et reconnaît que dans certaines situations ce sont des faits concrets et ainsi la nécessité de garder ces biens sur la liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, mais il y a d'autres situations qui méritent d'être vérifiées. Cette réflexion doit être faite par le Comité parce qu'il y a des sites qui peuvent sortir de la liste du patrimoine en péril.

The **Representative of the IUCN** remarked on the valid point raised by Tanzania, adding that the matter of a stronger approach to support sites on the Danger List was partly discussed in the Ad-hoc Working Group, and there was a proposal for a more active approach on the Convention's requirements for costed action plans for sites on the Danger List that would be put forward in the budget decision [under agenda item 14]. This concrete proposal was said to be in line with a point that IUCN had been advocating in that there were certainly a range of sites where it was hard to see the intervention because of the difficulties associated with conflict situations, but there were also a number of sites on the Danger List where a more purposeful set of actions through the Convention could be realized in a more active approach. Thus, action plans in that regard would help and would be discussed later under agenda item 14.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** took very good note of the statement by Tanzania, and also shared the view, as mentioned by IUCN, that danger listing should have a more action-oriented approach and a long term goal, and that goal would be to increase conservation within a certain time span with actions as a catalyst for support. The support should thus be much more tangible and concrete, as discussed in the Budget Ad-hoc Working Group, and indeed there was a proposal in the decision in this regard, particularly in paragraph 36. The aim was to move in the direction where sites on the danger list could access financing and support by preparing costed action plans that are reported back to the Committee. In turn, the Committee, when looking at item 7, could take note of these action plans and try to put into place a momentum where the sites on the danger list are being reinforced such that there is a light at the end of the tunnel rather than adopting the same decisions year after year.

The **Chairperson** noted that an NGO wished to speak, and having discussed the relation between heritage and society, gave the floor to the NGO for a short intervention on climate

change.

A **Representative of the Australian Marine Conservation Society**, Ms Imogen Zethoven, remarked that although her organization was focused on the Great Barrier Reef, it was concerned about the survival of all World Heritage coral reefs. She commended the work of UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre for publishing the First Global Scientific Assessment on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Coral Reefs. The [report](#) shows that many of the 29 World Heritage reefs are already in serious trouble. During the recent global bleaching event, five World Heritage properties suffered severe coral bleaching and mortality. The assessment shows that the outlook for World Heritage coral sites is grim; unless we take urgent and decisive action to significantly reduce global carbon emissions. If we remain on our current emissions trajectory, in the next two decades, 25 out of the 29 World Heritage sites will suffer stress twice a decade, a rate from which they will be unable to recover. By 2040, the loss of OUV in these 25 properties will be catastrophic. We could all witness this in our lifetime. Ms Zethoven therefore strongly welcomed the decision by the Committee to urge countries to undertake the most ambitious implementation of the Paris Agreement. However, this would mean limiting global temperature rise to no more than 1.5°C by the end of the century based on pre-industrial levels. Even at 1.5°C, corals will be lost, however the world might have a chance to retain the ecological and biological processes of these magnificent World Heritage properties.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 8C.1, Decision 41 COM 8C.2 and Decision 41 COM 8C.3 adopted.

The Secretariat noted two evening side events, one on 'Gyeongju, Your Next Destination' organized by the Organization of World Heritage Cities and the Korean Cultural Centre in Warsaw, and the other event organized by Lithuania and the Kaunas City Municipal Administration and the Kaunas Architecture Festival, 'Kaunas 1919-1939, the Capital inspired by the Modern Movement'.

The **Chairperson** adjourned the day's session.

[Close of afternoon session]

NINTH DAY – Tuesday 11 July 2017

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 13: INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/13](#)

Decision: [41 COM 13](#)

The **Chairperson** greeted everyone and then turned to the next item 13 on international assistance, inviting the Secretariat to present the item.

With regard to international assistance requests approved in 2017, **the Secretariat** noted that the preparatory assistance budget had been fully used, but it was not the case for the international assistance budget for conservation and management, which had 23 per cent of funds remaining. It was noted that emergency assistance did not appear [in that budget line]. The Secretariat drew attention to the [Marketplace](#) for international assistance, recalling that World Heritage Centre had created in 2016 a ‘marketplace’ platform on which it advertised international assistance projects that had been discussed by the international assistance panel and recommended for approval but had no funds available for implementation. It was noted that three very good projects had been placed on the marketplace and had found donors very quickly. Currently, there were no further projects recommended for approval because there were still some funds remaining for international assistance for conservation and management. The Secretariat remarked on the donors already found: i) the Netherlands Fund-in-Trust had provided funds for the assistance request of Mongolia; ii) Japan had provided funds for the Barbados project via the Japanese Funds-in-Trust; and iii) Germany had funded Chile’s request concerning the development of a National Action Plan. The Secretariat was happy to note that this approach really worked and the reason why it was further developed in consultation with the Ad-hoc Working Group that met between the 40th and 41st sessions. The Marketplace had now been enhanced as a much larger webpage that now includes projects on priority heritage protection, on state of conservation, on upstream projects, and of course on priorities for UNESCO and the Committee, such as Africa, SIDS and the Youth Programme. With regard to agenda item 9A, the Secretariat remarked that the questions to the survey, which was organized in the beginning of 2017, concerning the processes and issues of the upstream procedure, was very closely related to the item on international assistance, and more specifically preparatory assistance. The question was whether the Committee considered that international assistance should prioritize preparatory assistance requests for upstream support, as this would ensure a more efficient use of the assistance provided. The Secretariat noted that in response to that question, an overwhelming majority of responding States Parties, i.e. almost 80–90 States Parties, or half of all Member States Parties, replied positively with a ‘yes’. This was said to be very important, and she drew the attention of all the States Parties that were eligible with priority for international assistance, i.e. least developed countries, developing countries and SIDS, to orient their draft plan for international assistance requests in such a way as to involve the upstream aspect so that these requests could really contribute towards elaborating better Tentative Lists, and consequently better nominations.

The Secretariat then turned to paragraph 241 of the Operational Guidelines, as amended in 2012, which would grant priority for requests involving advice at an early stage in the nomination process, namely “for sites recognized in approved thematic advice as corresponding to gaps on the List and/or for sites where preliminary investigations have shown that further enquiries would be justified, especially in the case of States Parties whose

heritage is un-represented or under-represented on the World Heritage List". The survey thus confirmed what was already provided for in paragraph 241, which was itself based on the language of the Convention, i.e. that preparatory assistance requests should actually concern preliminary investigations that had shown a potential for OUV. The Secretariat thus reiterated its importance for all those countries planning to request preparatory assistance, especially with regard to Tentative Lists and nominations. The Secretariat then spoke of a comparative mapping study with regard to the use of IOS advisory services, as requested by the Committee at its 40th session, in which IOS made a number of recommendations. Among the findings was one particular recommendation concerning international assistance based on a comparison with other Conventions and programmes where approvals in panels and so on was quite different depending on the number of international assistance requests [submitted]. The Secretariat did not dwell on the findings, suffice to say that the Ad-hoc Working Group would be looking into those issues if its mandate was extended and the Committee would also examine the IOS findings and recommendations at its next session. Thus, further to these recommendations, there may be ways to improve, optimize or simplify the handling of international assistance processes in the future.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Finland** thanked the Secretariat for a clear and informative document on international assistance, adding that often these annual reports were repetitive but it was happy to note this year the promising start of the new Marketplace webpage through which many potential projects in need of international assistance had found donors. The delegation stressed the need for efforts to make good use of the marketplace in future, as well as finding other efficient means of financing World Heritage activities. Regarding the budget situation for international assistance, the delegation regretted the low level of funds available for this purpose. At the same time, it noted from the Secretariat's report that there was a discrepancy between needs, particularly for natural heritage sites and especially in Africa, as well as the low number of funding requests submitted in support of natural conservation, which actually have some unused funds. This was an issue that Finland had previously raised, and the delegation wished to hear from the Secretariat on how to ensure that the needs and resources for natural heritage were better met. Concluding, Finland supported the draft decision and hoped that many more and new countries listed as contributors to international assistance would join the list in paragraph 2 in the future.

La **Délégation du Koweït** estime qu'il y a grand nombre de pays, comme par exemple les pays au Moyen-Orient tel l'Iraq, la Syrie, le Yémen ou la Libye, qu'aurait beaucoup de demandes d'assistance internationale. La délégation invite le Secrétariat à mettre en place un plan constructif pour traiter ces demandes multiples.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the World Heritage Centre for the overall report presented, particularly on the positive feedback of the international assistance programme on the Marketplace webpage. It noted the obvious pressure on World Heritage with respect to both the volume of work and the insufficient budget. With this in mind, the delegation did not see a time in the foreseeable future when the Committee would not need to draw on international assistance to supplement the work of the Centre. It therefore believed that every effort should be made to maintain active interest among donors that included activating the proposed comprehensive strategy for resource mobilization and communication as a matter of urgency, which was intended to support continuity and strengthen fundraising capacities to support the implementation of the Convention. The delegation submitted a proposed draft amendment to reflect this issue.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** reaffirmed its support for strengthening international assistance. It was noted however that although the budget had increased compared to recent years, it was still not enough to fund the growing number of requests from States Parties. The delegation further noted the launch of the Marketplace for international assistance and it encouraged all States Parties to contribute towards funding such requests,

with priority to sites on the Danger List and those in need, as well as for preparatory assistance.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** note le thème intéressant et souligne que l'Afrique est sous-représentée. Chaque fois, il y a beaucoup plus de besoin d'inscription, et elle aimerait demander dans quelle mesure ce processus entre en communication avec le Fonds du patrimoine africain. Cela est reporté parce qu'au sein du Fonds du patrimoine africain il y a une démarche de définition d'une stratégie de levée de fonds qui prend en compte la nécessité de trouver des voies et des moyens d'intéresser les États membres et les secteurs privés dans les secteurs clés des économies de ces pays. La délégation demande dans quelle mesure il est possible de créer une synergie entre ce mécanisme et le Fonds du patrimoine africain qui dispose de beaucoup d'informations utiles.

The **Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania** thanked the States Parties of Italy, India, Republic of Korea, Finland, Philippines and Turkey for their [funding] support, and it encouraged other States Parties to continue contributing, particularly with compulsory contributions. Tanzania noted with pleasure that about two-thirds of the budget supported activities in Africa, including Cabo Verde, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Nigeria, Botswana, Malawi, Senegal, Mali, Kenya, Madagascar, Gabon and others. Tanzania thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Committee for this consolation and encouraged the World Heritage Centre to work on supporting Eritrea for an awareness workshop on the Convention with regard to the roles and responsibilities of the State Party concerning the remedial measures attached to the inscription of Asmara. The delegation highlighted the importance of working together with the authorities and governments so that they are aware of their responsibilities after inscription. The delegation noted that Ghana's National Park nomination had been withdrawn and it encouraged the World Heritage Centre to work together with the Advisory Bodies and the State Party to ensure that the nomination is submitted in 2018. It supported the amended decision by Jamaica.

With no further comments, the **Chairperson** invited IUCN to comment.

The **Representative of IUCN** wished to intervene to compliment the very welcome Marketplace initiative, adding that there should be some space afforded for creativity in terms of fundraising efforts and it was thus important to expand the scope to allow good prospects to come forward. The Representative referred to the comment regarding making connections, for instance, with projects of the category 2 centres, suggesting that the Marketplace could provide that. It was also important to carefully monitor, as noted in the upstream process, the definition of 'needs' to market forces in terms of fundraising so that the projects coming forward through the Marketplace were equitable and balanced. On the point regarding natural heritage, the Representative remarked on the absence of nature conservation staff in the World Heritage Centre, as confirmed by the World Heritage Centre in item 5A, and therefore he welcomed the re-establishment of the senior nature position in the World Heritage Centre. He reiterated the need for more sustained capacity in the regional units that have nature conservation expertise to facilitate the sites' contact vis-à-vis the international assistance process, which is quite complicated, and needs were thus best identified at site level. He acknowledged the comment made by Tanzania regarding the Ghana site that was withdrawn, adding that in the particular instance, the question of the upstream process focused on the Tentative List should be addressed, while looking at the best prospects for success for natural heritage conservation in Ghana. IUCN would be pleased to take that point further with the State Party concerned.

The **Delegation of Portugal** warmly thanked the States Parties for their generous contributions that enabled several assistance requests to be met. On a more general note, Portugal, as other States Parties, would be leaving this Committee at the end of the 41st session and it took the opportunity to thank the Polish presidency, as well as Turkey, Germany and Qatar, for their diligent and kind hospitality during its 4-year mandate. The delegation hoped that it deserved the trust vested upon Portugal by the States Parties to

whom it was accountable. Portugal carried out its mandate in a responsible, transparent and cooperative way and sought to find consensus, helping to build bridges between conflicting perspectives. However, the delegation conceded that it was often very difficult to conciliate deeply opposing perspectives. Nevertheless, it always sought to uphold the principles and values of the Convention so as to preserve its integrity, credibility and its objectives. The delegation spoke of the issues that it believed posed serious challenges to the World Heritage system. The first was related to the ever-growing number of nominations to the World Heritage List, which comes with huge management problems. It believed that beyond statutory limitations, States Parties should occasionally refrain from their ravenous appetite [to inscribe]. The delegation strongly believed that Members should refrain from presenting a nomination during their mandate in the Committee. However, other solutions should be found to limit the negative consequences of the present trend. Secondly, this trend accentuated regional imbalances and did not contribute to a converging evolution on the geographical distribution of national inscriptions. This was obviously not a good thing and did not reinforce the cohesion between States Parties, quite the contrary. Thirdly, there were negative consequences of the present situation on the allocation of already scarce financial resources to cover protection and consultation, while still ensuring technical assistance to States Parties, all of which were essential dimensions of the Convention that should be effectively upheld otherwise the system would collapse. The fourth point was related to rebuilding confidence and trust between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies, and reinforcing the leading role of the World Heritage Centre. The delegation added that it was not comfortable when the Committee did not follow the advice given. Nor was it comfortable when it was perceived that the Advisory Bodies did not take the sufficient steps to address the legitimate concerns of States Parties or had refused to acknowledge the validity of different perspectives or sometimes even uncontroversial facts. The current situation affected the credibility of the Advisory Bodies, the States Parties and the Committee itself. In this regard, the delegation believed that the work of the Advisory Bodies and their articulation with the States Parties should be reviewed in order to strengthen transparency, dialogue, predictability and credibility, as well as mutual trust. States Parties should also show some reticence and occasionally a more constructive approach, taking on board the many useful suggestions put forward by the Advisory Bodies during the preparation of the nominations. During Portugal's four years in the Committee it had seen many high-spirited debates and even the exchange of some harsh words, but never had it seen such an ugly moment as the one witnessed a few days ago. It hoped that such a demeaning situation would never happen again. In that regard, the delegation congratulated the Chairperson on the efficient and mindful way in which he dealt with that very awkward moment, expressing its full and unreserved solidarity and condemnation of such a despicable and unjust personal attack on the German Permanent Delegate to UNESCO. The delegation concluded by speaking of the honour of having served in this Committee and participating in the very noble task of upholding, protecting and preserving this irreplaceable treasure that is our common heritage.

The **Chairperson** thanked the delegation for the very kind words but for the essential contribution made by Portugal in this very session, also as Vice-Chairperson.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** remercie l'Ambassadeur du Portugal pour son très beau et touchant discours. Elle prend l'opportunité pour féliciter le Centre du patrimoine mondial d'avoir initié et réussi la 'Bourse aux projets', heureux de constater que des bailleurs de fonds y aient souscrit. La délégation encourage d'autres bailleurs de fonds à faire de même. Par ailleurs, la Tunisie remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'appui apporté au processus en amont pour l'inscription de l'île de Djerba. Elle est sûre que le Centre poursuivra l'effort pour la préparation du dossier d'inscription de cette importante île. La Tunisie appuie l'amendement proposé par la Jamaïque.

The **Chairperson** invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre to respond.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the Marketplace was an idea borne by the creative team under the leadership of Ms Petya Totcharova. She nevertheless wished

to thank the Ambassador of Portugal, who would be very much missed, for his absolutely correct observations that this Convention established a very unique system of international cooperation with international assistance at its heart, and if this mission could not be achieved then the Committee would have failed this Convention. With regard to the comments by Finland, the Director concurred that the World Heritage Centre was reinforcing the natural heritage team, considered absolutely crucial and for which she called upon other States Parties to help in this regard given the limited resources at the World Heritage Centre. With regard to the very important intervention by Kuwait on the situation in the Middle East, which was especially dramatic, the Director explained that the World Heritage International Assistance system was not able to address those types of situations, for example, in the case of Mosul and the site of the [ancient city of] Nineveh on the Tentative List of Iraq, as well as sites in Syria. The dimension of the destruction were too great that other means have to be explored. For example, there is a major project with the European Union and the European Commission for the safeguarding of the heritage in Syria, and action plans had already been established for the heritage in Iraq. Thus, these examples would not come under the system of international assistance from the World Heritage Fund but from funding by the international community, as was done in the early days before the Convention. The Director also acknowledged the points raised by Jamaica on the pressure on the system, and by the Philippines on the priorities that need to be drawn. Angola and Tanzania also mentioned issues related to the African World Heritage Fund. The World Heritage Centre tries very much to coordinate with UNESCO's category 2 centres, especially to ensure that the organizations did not compete with one another for the same donors. A system of coordination meetings with category 2 centres and universities had been set up with this in mind. There were also a number of other comments concerning the Marketplace. The Director remarked that the budget situation would be addressed under agenda item 14, however, she appealed to the States Parties to settle their contributions if they had not already done so, as the budget situation was very dramatic.

The Secretariat thanked the Director for having addressed most of the questions, but wished to add that requests for international assistance, whether for culture or nature, depended on the States Parties themselves, as they were the ones initiating them. However, States Parties need the support, encouragement and accompaniment of the World Heritage Centre. As mentioned by IUCN, the World Heritage Centre had issues with the absence of nature specialists, but a new position had been re-established since autumn and it was hoped that the Centre may assist States Parties in developing their nature heritage-related proposals [in the future]. The Secretariat wished to address the amendment by Jamaica, supported by Angola and Tanzania, where it recommended to the World Heritage Centre to 'be proactive in its marketing of the Marketplace', which was fully understood, to which was added, 'by urgently developing the proposed comprehensive strategy for resource-mobilization and communication'. The Secretariat explained that the working document in the next agenda item 14 on the budget, and also Decision 12A, which addressed the mandate of the extended Ad-hoc Working Group, was concerned with the comprehensive resource mobilization and communication strategy, i.e. it was the mandate of the Budget Working Group to develop the strategy [not the World Heritage Centre]. The Secretariat suggested that Mr Jesús Enriqu e Garc a (Delegation of the Philippines) and Chair of the Budget Working Group during this session, provide further details as how this could complement the work.

The **Delegation of Philippines** welcomed Jamaica's amendment, and in regard to the second part of the amendment (where the World Heritage Centre was asked to develop the comprehensive strategy for resource mobilization in the draft decisions for 12A as well as 14) explained that the extended Ad-hoc Working Group was indeed given the mandate to develop this strategy. The delegation suggested adjusting the language of Jamaica's amendment, to read 'by urgently supporting the development of', on the understanding that it is the Ad-hoc Working Group taking the lead role in developing the draft strategy.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** thanked the Philippines and the World Heritage Centre for the clarification, adding that it fully supported the proposal, as it was important to clarify who is leading this process.

The **Chairperson** noted a temporary technical problem with the projector and he thus suspended agenda item 13 and moved to agenda item 14.

ITEM 14: REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2016–2017 AND PREPARATION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2018–2019

Documents: [WHC/17/41.COM/14](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.14.I](#)
[WHC/17/41.COM/INF.14.II](#)

Decision: [41 COM 14](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to item 14, recalling that Budget Working Group met at the beginning of the present session and he invited the Chairperson of the Working Group, Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia (Delegation of the Philippines) to present the report and the proposed draft decision.

Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia, Chair of the Budget Working Group, was pleased to present the results of the Working Group and the draft decision, and thanked the Philippines for having elected him as Chairperson of the Working Group. The Working Group met twice on the 4–5 July [2017] and he thanked the Committee Members, States Parties and other observers, as well as representatives of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM who attended the meetings. Their cooperation and support allowed the Group to conclude its work in a very efficient manner. The Group agreed to work on the basis of the draft decision of the Ad-hoc Working Group found in document 41COM 12A, incorporating its recommendations on the sustainability of the [World Heritage] Fund, and the draft decision prepared by the World Heritage Centre under item 14. The carefully balanced and comprehensive draft decision of the Ad-hoc Working Group was the result of intense negotiations over the course of eight months, including seven meetings of the Working Group and two open-ended meetings in which all States Parties were invited. The draft included valuable inputs from Member States, the World Heritage Centre and all the Advisory Bodies, with whom substantive dialogue and open lines of communication were open throughout the entire process. A constructive team spirit characterized the work and this inclusive approach reflected the importance of working between sessions of the Committee on the more difficult and complex items, as opposed to rushing against time to adopt decisions during Committee sessions. To present the draft decision, Mr Garcia wished to summarize its main elements in the following seven points. First, as the demand for World Heritage increases with more sites inscribed each year, as well as more challenges threatening each site, paradoxically, the funds available for the Convention were decreasing alarmingly. The draft decision therefore recognized the dire financial situation confronting the Convention and its statutory activities and it emphasized the necessity of timely contributory payments by all States Parties. It also welcomed enhanced extrabudgetary contributions, while noting that calls and measures to increase voluntary contributions have not changed the difficult financial situation. Second, the delegation took into account that promoting the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund required a more long-term, forward-looking and strategic approach across Committee sessions and cycles, and hence a paradigm shift in the way the Committee should look and work on the budget, and how to encourage the development of measures to augment [the budget]. Third, more effective resource mobilization and efficient resource allocation were complimentary measures that should not be seen in isolation but as mutual reinforcing parts of an holistic approach to sustainability, as well as its development in UNESCO and the UN system as a whole, while examining and considering all sources of funding. Fourth, to implement Article 13 of the Convention,

requiring a more proactive role for the Committee to help expand the donor base and the relevant actors involved in World Heritage protection. Fifth, since sustainability depends on the sustainability of efforts, the Working Group recommended the adoption of a roadmap for sustainability of the World Heritage Fund that integrates a set of short, medium and long-term measures and actions that would hopefully lead to a more desirable level of funding and efficiency. In essence, it is a changed management plan that includes measures to launch the forum of partners based on the World Heritage Centre's Marketplace website, and Mr Garcia congratulated the World Heritage Centre for the successful side event on this issue. Other recommendations include the development of a comprehensive resource-mobilization and communication strategy, as discussed under item 13, voluntary contributions from World Heritage sites in a position to contribute to the Fund, and consideration of a possible optional protocol as a long-term measure to increase the statutory limits for contributions defined by the Convention. These should present significant progress, say, in 5 years time for the 50th anniversary of the Convention.

In order to prioritize conservation, **Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia** spoke of how the States Parties concerned are encouraged to develop costed action plans for sites-in-need and on the Danger List, which can be linked to the forum of partners and international assistance, and reported, as appropriate, back to the Committee. Sixth, the Working Group identified some issues that still need further time for in-depth discussion and it thus recommended that the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group be extended for another year to develop, among other things, a proposal to establish an informal core group on resource mobilization, and also to analyse the findings of the comparative mapping study on advisory services. Seventh and finally, the draft decision proposed to adopt the budget proposal for 2018–2019 and its breakdown found in Annex 4 of working document 41 COM 14. Mr Garcia hoped that the Committee would adopt this draft decision that is the product of an immense collective effort. It aimed to set the Committee on a path of greater sustainability, and hopefully, in time, more meaningful impact on the ground for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission of world cultural and natural heritage to future generations in accordance with the Convention. In conclusion, Mr Garcia personally thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre, Ms Petya Totcharova, Mr Abdelghani Baakrim and Ms Sonia Zerroualy from the World Heritage Centre for their support and professionalism, as well as IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM for their constructive engagement and openness to dialogue that enriched the Group's work throughout the entire process. He also thanked all those who participated in the meetings, both in Paris and in Krakow, and concluded by thanking the Chairperson and the entire Polish delegation led by Ambassador Ms Krystyna Żurek for their noble and humble leadership, patience and dedication. It was truly a pleasure and honour working closely with the Chairperson over the past months. Mr Garcia submitted the draft decision on item 14, adding that since it was the last session for the delegation, he hoped that this would be seen as Philippines' humble contribution to enhancing sustainability of the World Heritage Fund and the system of World Heritage protection.

The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Garcia for his personal contribution, skills, dedication and efficiency. The Chairperson announced a 15-minute break in order to resolve the ongoing technical issues.

[Pause in the proceedings to deal with the electrical problems affecting the projector]

The **Chairperson** resumed the session on the discussion of agenda item 14.

The **Delegation of Poland** wished to thank Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia, Chair of the Budget Working Group, for the comprehensive report and to support the draft decision prepared by the Group. The delegation expressed deep gratitude to Mr Garcia who chaired deliberations on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund during a long 8 months, as well as for his commitment and creativity that made the impossible, possible, on such difficult issues. The delegation was convinced that the draft decision would contribute to the enhancement of the system of World Heritage protection, and strengthen the implementation of the Convention

sustainably and equitably.

The **Delegation of Portugal** remarked that the budget had been at the core of the Committee discussions, as indeed during the several meetings in Paris, with the main task of addressing the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. The delegation congratulated the Chairperson for his chairmanship of the Ad-hoc Working Group, and warmly commended the Chair of the Budget sub-group, Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia, for his tireless efforts in this endeavour, adding that it was a privilege and an enormous pleasure to have worked with him. The delegation spoke of the responsibility of States Parties to first and foremost pay their compulsory and voluntary contributions in full, agreeing that innovative ways were needed to bring fresh money into the Fund but that the basic principles and obligations had to be upheld. The discussion this year was even more critical as the Committee had to examine and approve the World Heritage Fund for the forthcoming biennium. It had become an unfortunate routine of assessing an approved budget for the World Heritage Fund only to note the reality of a reduced expenditure plan as a result of non-payment of compulsory and voluntary contributions by States Parties. This added an unnecessary burden to the World Heritage Centre to what was already a rather difficult and challenging process. In this challenging framework, the delegation commended the Chairperson's efforts and those of Mr Garcia, and it fully endorsed the pragmatic and logical recommendations in the decision.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** thanked the delegates who had led the deliberations on this important subject, particularly the current Chair, Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia, for his extremely diligent work. The delegation had engaged in the process during the last 4 years, though it was unable to participate in the Ad-hoc sessions in Paris. Nonetheless, it was pleased with the progress and the comprehensive plan that allowed for a sustainable budget programme to support the Convention. It thus fully endorsed the draft decision. On behalf of the Jamaican Government, the delegation expressed sincerest thanks to the Chairperson and the Committee for entrusting Jamaica with the responsibility to undertake its very first mandate, described as a humbling experience, as it leaves its mandate richer in knowledge about the world's diverse and outstanding heritage. More importantly, this mandate was a voice for Small Island Developing States and it was hoped that it was heard given the extreme vulnerabilities faced by SIDS. The delegation thanked the Director, Ms Mechthild Rössler, and the entire World Heritage Centre team, as well as members of the Advisory Bodies and the Committee who had welcomed and guided Jamaica in this process.

The **Delegation of Republic of Korea** fully supported the amendment proposed by the Chair of the Budget Working Group, which was the outcome of extensive and intensive discussions on enhancing the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. In particular, the delegation recognized the adoption of a roadmap that clearly showed the short, medium and long-term approach to secure the Fund in a concise and systematic manner. It expressed appreciation to the Chair of the Budget Group for his dedication and contribution, and it looked forward to the implementation of these valuable ideas and recommendations. In this regard, the establishment of an informal core-group was a good idea, even though the details were to be further discussed. This Group could perhaps be given the role of monitoring and encouraging the implementation of this roadmap.

La **Délégation du Koweït** remercie M. Garcia pour la présidence du groupe, et soutient les recommandations de ce groupe. La délégation constate que le monde fait face à des transformations plus agressives, plus accélérées, qui touchent négativement le patrimoine mondial. C'est la raison pour laquelle il soutient la mise en élaboration d'une stratégie de la mobilisation de ressources financières et de communication afin de satisfaire aux demandes futures qui seront multipliées, pour que le Comité puisse financer la restauration de ce patrimoine.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** thanked the Philippines and especially Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia for leading the Working Group and for bringing into focus the problems of resource mobilization and the sustainability of the World Heritage Centre. The delegation also thanked

the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for joining the States Parties in finding a solution, which had resulted in the creative solutions that the Committee now sought to carry forward. It fully endorsed the draft decision and it looked forward to continued work under the leadership of the current chair, Mr Garcia.

The **Delegation of Vietnam** attached great importance to the preservation of heritage and always fulfilled its financial commitment. It supported the draft decision and congratulated the Philippines for its excellent work in chairing this Working Group,.

The **Delegation of Finland** warmly thanked the Chair of the Budget Working Group, Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia, for chairing the budget sub-group in Paris, and it extended thanks to all members of the Group, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their active participation in the meetings. The Ad-hoc Group worked extensively addressing very challenging questions. An holistic, long-term and strategic view to the sustainability of the Fund was adopted whose fruitful discussions in Paris greatly facilitated the Committee's work during this session. Indeed, the delegation considered that it was important to look at the issue of the sustainability of the Fund in a broader picture also taking into account UNESCO's house-wide process towards better alignment and predictability of resources, as well as the effort to diversify the donor base. The delegation invited the Convention to actively take part in addressing the question of financing in an overall resources modelization framework. Among the specific measures, it commended the interesting Marketplace tool for international assistance projects developed by the World Heritage Centre, which deserved to be developed further, building on the views expressed in the Ad-hoc Working Group. Regarding the overall budget situation, the delegation wished to see more States Parties making voluntary contributions and it stressed the importance of paying the assessed contributions in full and in a timely manner. Finland supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Indonesia** warmly thanked the Philippines and Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia for his efficient chairing, as well as the Committee Members for the constructive discussion during the process. It appreciated the long process involving all the members of the Working Group and it supported the draft decision.

The **Delegation of Tanzania** commended both the Working Group and the World Heritage Centre, and it supported the draft decision. However, it raised a minor procedural observation regarding information on compulsory contributions, noting that the financial statement dated 31 December had not provided updated information on the World Heritage Centre's website, which was dated 31 May 2017. As a result, there was a discrepancy in the actual updated information on States Parties, including Tanzania. The delegation asked the World Heritage Centre to explain why it would not have been better to update this information in item 41COM 14 so that it depicted the real-time status.

The **Delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked Mr Garcia for his efficient chairmanship of the Ad-hoc Working Group throughout the year during the work on budget during the present Committee session, and the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies for their support as well. The delegation believed that the initial draft proposed by the Ad-hoc Group was solid, encompassing and inclusive, and enabled the consultative body during the Committee to smoothly agree on the proposed draft decision. The draft recognized the existing financial problems, namely, the rising demand for services of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, but also the declining financial means. In this regard, the current comprehensive draft decision proposed solutions, namely, short, mid-term and long-term tools. Azerbaijan therefore supported this draft decision.

La **Délégation de l'Angola** félicite les Philippines et en particulier M. Garcia pour sa présidence et la lucidité avec laquelle il a conduit les travaux depuis Bahreïn et l'efficacité avec laquelle le Comité se retrouve avec pour fond une stratégie de mobilisation sur la durabilité du Fond. Elle remercie tous ceux qui ont contribué au travail. La délégation est lésée que les États parties sont à chaque fois rappeler de contribuer à ses obligations

statutaires, ajoutant que c'est une question de conscience. Elle soutient le projet de résolution proposé.

The **Delegation of Turkey** thanked Mr Jesus Enrique Garcia for having accomplished a very challenging task in a very talented, truthful and devoted way. The efforts of the contributing States Parties in achieving substantial outcomes during the discussions was also noted. The delegation believed that the Convention had already proved its leading role in the conservation and promotion of heritage. However, the technical and economic support that the Convention provided to States Parties-in-need should be further enhanced. It was aware of the increasing workload and the declining allocation of resources, but noted some of the efforts to overcome this deficiency through additional resources or volunteer contributions with the possibility of solving the problem, to a certain extent, through efficient use of the existing resources. In this regard, it welcomed the report on comparative mapping of the advisory services of international conventions and programmes conducted by World Heritage Centre's Internal Oversight Service. The demand for such a report had already been demonstrated, as well as the need for further investigation on the reasons behind these economic problems. However, the outcome of this report underlined the very crucial policy gaps that required serious consideration. The delegation also welcomed the report recommendations, particularly the need for transparency on the actual amounts needed for evaluation services, for the consultancy between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as well as reconsidering the budget items of such advisory services. The need for further analysis and examination of these recommendations, as well as the possible adaptations or modifications to the mechanism as a whole should be the next step moving forward. Therefore, it supported the draft decision to include this issue in the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group, together with the other recommendations proposed by the Working Group.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to respond to the question by Tanzania.

Le **Secrétariat** comprend tout à fait la remarque faite par la Tanzanie en ce qui concerne la différence entre ce qui a été publié dans le document et la mise à jour des contributions. Il explique que l'état de contribution varie d'un mois à l'autre voire d'une semaine à l'autre. Le Centre reçoit les informations formulées par le bureau de la gestion financière (BFM) qui publie chaque fin de mois la situation de contributions des États parties. Le Secrétariat d'ailleurs a reçu la situation à la fin de juin et un nombre de États parties qui figurent dans le document initial n'ont pas payés aujourd'hui. Cette information a été mise à jour, mais le document évolue. Le Secrétariat explique qu'éventuellement il peut rajouter l'information pour une meilleure information comme annexe au rapport final si le Comité le souhaite.

The **Delegation of Poland** joined in the remarks made by the Members in sharing the concerns on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, and it thanked the Ad-hoc Working Group for the marvellous work. It also thanked the Secretariat for the implementation of the recommendation of Decision [40 COM 15](#) to prepare the comparative mapping of forms and models for the use of advisory services by other international instruments and programmes. However, the delegation turned the Committee's attention to the content of Table 2 on the proposed changes in working in evaluating nominations, adding that the Group should keep in mind in its future work that the change in procedure was not going in the best direction.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to IUCN.

The **Representative of IUCN** remarked that he had been serving the Convention under IUCN for ten years, but that the only place where he felt really depressed in his time on the Committee was during meetings of the Budget Working Group, adding that efforts to solve problems at each Committee invariably ended up at the same situation. Thus, it was really important to understand how optimistic he felt for the first time as the Ad-hoc Working Group had done good work to suggest a different approach to mobilizing resources for the Convention. He thanked Poland for convening the Ad-hoc Working Group and especially the

Philippines and Mr Enrique Garcia for convening and steering the discussion. He referred to IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM as Advisory Bodies to the Convention, but also that they were much larger organisations than that. They were all ready to work as partners to support the World Heritage Convention in ways that went beyond their specific mandates. In the case for IUCN, it has large regional programmes and country programmes that raise large amounts of extra budgetary funding, also as an implementation agency of GEF [Global Environment Facility] and GCF [Green Climate Fund]. He added that he could not recall a moment where the collegiate spirit between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre had been as strong as the present. It was thus a very auspicious opportunity to take a different approach. In addition, it was considered extremely important for the Parties to the Convention to sustain the conversation between the meetings of the Committee. In this way, the Ad-hoc Working Group had provided a welcome forum, which had not previously existed, that enabled the pragmatic and practical conversation so as to share ideas in a different spirit. The question was how to sustain the possibility of working differently now that the Committee had a plan on its hands. Lastly, IUCN welcomed the inclusion in the draft decision of the recommendation for costed action plans for sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This was in fact a requirement in the Convention itself, but the mechanism had never been put in place, and thus the decision of the Budget Working Group to set up that mechanism for the first time was extremely important. He concluded in an optimistic mood as the Committee moved forward with this strategy.

The **Chairperson** shared the optimism, and invited ICCROM to take the floor.

The **Representative of ICCROM** agreed with IUCN, and wished to thank the Ad-hoc Working Group, the delegation of Poland and the Philippines for the excellent work, adding that all the Advisory Bodies were very strongly behind this and were all optimistic.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated Mr Garcia for his excellent work and achievement, joking that he would be kidnapped by the World Bank for his achievements. He was happy to note the real consensus concerning the draft decision, which was duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 14 adopted as amended.

ITEM 13 [Continuation.]: EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

The **Chairperson** returned to agenda item 14, inviting the Rapporteur to present the amendments.

The **Rapporteur** noted amendments from Burkina Faso and Jamaica. Paragraphs 1–4 remained unchanged. There was a slight addition at the end of paragraph 5, which acknowledged the donor forum website, the Marketplace. Two new paragraphs 6 and 7 from Jamaica would read, 'noting that International Assistance covers funding support to States Parties for emergency assistance, preparatory assistance and conservation management assistance to include training and research, technical cooperation and promotion and education, recommends that the World Heritage Centre be proactive in this marketing of International Assistance Marketplace by urgently developing the proposed complete strategy for resource mobilisation and communication, which is intended to promote continuity and strengthen fundraising capacities to support the implementation of the Convention'. The last paragraph 7 would read, 'encourages the World Heritage Centre to identify means of providing incentive for private and public institutional support to ensure buy-in among potential donors and continuation of donations to International Assistance programme'.

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–4 were duly adopted.

The **Delegation of Philippines** supported Burkina Faso's amendment, but sought to be

more precise and to replace 'donors forum' with 'Forum of partners'.

The **Chairperson** concurred and paragraph 5 was duly adopted.

The Secretariat referred to the proposal by Jamaica, which was clarified by the Chair of the Budget Group, and suggested [deleting the latter part of paragraph 6]. Or alternatively present a different proposal, which would read 'recommends that the World Heritage Centre continue to market and enhance the "Marketplace for World Heritage" [...]'. The Secretariat explained that the strategy was the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group, but the World Heritage Centre could be *encouraged* to continue the marketing and the enhancing of the Marketplace for World Heritage.

La **Délégation du Koweït** propose un point de réflexion concernant le forum de donateurs, ajoutant qu'il n'y a pas que de caractère international. [In English] The delegation explained that the regions should have the freedom to also seek regional and national donors.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** returned to paragraph 6, remarking that the World Heritage Centre was not the entity driving this process, which would actually be led by the Ad-hoc Working Group. In this regard, the delegation proposed to amend the paragraph.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** noted the clarification by Jamaica and proposed instead that the World Heritage Centre *contribute* to the development of the Comprehensive Strategy.

The **Delegation of the Philippines** suggested merging the proposals, which would now read, 'recommends that the World Heritage Centre continue to enhance the "Marketplace for World Heritage"', 'and contribute to the development of the proposed Comprehensive Strategy [...]', as proposed by Zimbabwe.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** accepted the recommendation.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the Ad-hoc Working Group would take the lead, while the World Heritage Centre would contribute in providing the information required by the Group.

The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraphs 6 and 7 adopted as amended.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 13 adopted as amended.

ITEM 12A [Continuation.]: FOLLOW-UP TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF EVALUATIONS AND AUDITS ON WORKING METHODS: OUTCOMES OF THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP

The **Chairperson** noted that item 12A had been opened in a previous session, and the report by the Ad-hoc Working Group had already been presented by Poland. He recalled that the item was left open to allow for questions during the discussions of the subgroups on the Budget and the Operational Guidelines, which would consequently have an impact on the draft decision 12A and notably decision 9A. The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to explain.

The Secretariat recalled that in the discussion under agenda item 9A on the upstream processes, the Committee adopted paragraph 16 in the Decision 41 COM 9A that proposed the inclusion 'in the mandate of the extended Ad-hoc Working Group an item on the definition of the upstream process and the effectiveness of the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List'. In this regard, given that the Committee had already taken a decision for an additional item to be included in the mandate of the Group, the Secretariat had included this point in the list of tasks mandated to the Group in the text of the decision.

With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the proposed amendment was under paragraph 4.

The **delegation of the Philippines** had a remark on paragraph 4 on the mandate of the extended Ad-hoc Working Group in which the first two bullet points stated '*elaborate* a comprehensive resource mobilization [...]', followed by '*develop* the proposal'. For the sake of consistency with the Decision 41 Com 14 just adopted, the delegation suggested replacing 'elaborate' with 'develop', and 'further examine' also with 'develop'.

The Secretariat explained that Mr Garcia had clarified that there was a different text adopted in Decision 41 COM 14 concerning the mandate of the Working Group. Additionally, the Secretariat asked the Committee whether it wished to reflect this additional item in the mandate of the Working Group in Decision 41 COM 14 for the sake of consistency.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** propose une correction dans l'alinéa 3 du paragraphe 4 en anglais « maximiser » par un traduction en français « optimiser » .

The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 12A adopted as amended

ITEM 15: OTHER BUSINESS

The **Chairperson** opened agenda item 15 for any comments or proposals.

The **Delegation of Finland** had a strong feeling of nostalgia after four years in the Committee where a lot had been achieved together with other Committee Members. During these four years, Finland had been an active member with a strong commitment to serve the aims of the Convention with a credo of expert mindedness, transparency and constantly seeking partnerships among Members. The delegation hoped it had been successful and it warmly thanked fellow Members, all States Parties, the Secretariat, and Dr Mechtild Rössler for heading her very able team, the Polish authorities for their excellent organization and hospitality, and last but not least, the Chairperson for his strong leadership and vision, and his inimitable style of chairing. The delegation wished him and the Bureau Members the needed stamina to take the Committee to the 14th November when the new Committee would be elected. Special thanks went to the delegation's dedicated and professional team; most of whom had followed the Committee from the very beginning. The delegation ended by stressing the very unique nature of this Convention in that it was created to protect and preserve our common heritage. It was thus the Committee's responsibility to preserve its nature and spirit in the future, and it was happy to pass this legacy to those who would follow.

The **Delegation of Croatia** also wished to thank all the Members of the Committee with whom it had worked for these four years, including the Members who had left in 2014 and 2015. It was particularly thankful to all the host countries: Qatar, Germany, Turkey, and Poland in the beautiful city of Krakow. The delegation was also thankful to the Advisory Bodies and to UNESCO as a whole. It was fully aware of all the challenges faced by the Committee and UNESCO as an UN organization, and it wished the new Members of the Committee, the Committee and the Advisory Bodies much success in the years to come.

ITEM 16: ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE 42nd SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2018)

Document: NONE
Decision: [41 COM 16](#)

The **Chairperson** turned to the next item concerning the election of the next Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur of the 42nd Committee in 2018. However, as indicated

to the Bureau, no invitation had yet been received to host the next session of the Committee. The Chairperson gave the floor to Dr Mechtild Rössler to expand on the situation.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that no formal invitation for the next meeting of the Committee had been received. One option was not to have a Committee at all, as had been discussed before in some of the working groups. However, the best option was to await the General Assembly of States Parties on 14 and 15 November 2016 at UNESCO headquarters. Elections would take place on the 14 November to replace the outgoing members of the Committee, and on 15 November the General Assembly would elect the Chair, the Rapporteur and the Vice-Chairs at an extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee. This had been done before and was in any case necessary because there were no remaining Committee Members in some Electoral Groups. This was therefore the proposal in the draft decision, which would also mean that the Chairperson, Vice-Chairs and the Rapporteur would have to stay on until then.

The **Chairperson** replied that he was prepared as far as the Chairmanship was concerned.

The **Delegation of Canada** asked about obstacles of holding the next Committee meeting in Paris.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** remarked that this situation had occurred before, but with the current budgetary and financial situation at UNESCO it was simply impossible for the Secretariat to host a session due to the rising costs that had not been foreseen in the budget. Although it would be the last option, it would be a very difficult option for the World Heritage Centre. However, it had been done in 2003 when the Committee session could not be held in China, and in 2011 when it could not take place in Bahrain. However, this year the Committee had 2,500 registered participants with the considerable preparation that this entailed. The World Heritage Centre would therefore prefer to have a country offering to host the Committee session elsewhere in the world.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** demande si l'État partie qui se serait proposé en novembre pour la tenue de la session prochaine aura le temps suffisant pour être prêt pour le mois de juillet 2018.

The **Chairperson** remarked that this was to a certain extent the case of Poland, and in its experience it was thus possible, albeit it required strength in terms of preparation, logistics and bureaucracy. The Chairperson recalled that he had started his presidency in late October in Paris.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** replied that the Secretariat was well prepared to share draft host country agreements with all interested States and of course to then directly work with the country after the November decision.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to adopt the draft decision, and with no amendments presented, he pronounced paragraphs 1–4 adopted.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 16 adopted.

ITEM 17: PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 42nd SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2018)

Document: NONE
Decision: [41 COM 17](#)

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** turned to agenda item 17 on the provisional agenda for the 42nd session, and the draft decision that detailed the opening session, followed by the different reports of the Rapporteur, the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, and so on. This would be followed with the item on the examination of State of conservation reports, then Danger List sites and World Heritage List sites. This would be

followed by the item on nominations, the Global Strategy, the third cycle of periodic reporting, and item on the working methods with the different sub-items, as requested by the Committee, and also the follow-up on the recommendations of the Working Group on Governance, as approved by the General Conference. Finally, the item on financial and administrative questions, and the closure of the session.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Committee Members for comments.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** remarked that Portugal's Ambassador in agenda item 9 had a proposal related to the issue of a global strategy for a representative, balanced and credible list, while the agenda item [as proposed] was solely focused on the upstream process: the delegation suggested that an item 9B could actually touch upon the issue of balance and representativeness.

The **Delegation of Portugal** confirmed that the Ambassador did indeed strongly underline the need for collective commitment, not only in the Committee but in the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. The delegation however understood that the extended Ad-hoc Working Group would also work on this very important question over the next months, as it had most probably done over the year, so as to deliver on this challenge, adding that the Ad-hoc Working Group would no doubt present some innovative recommendations on this issue next year.

The Chairperson declared Decision 41 COM 17 adopted.

The **Chairperson** proceed with some announcements, reminding the delegations that the closing ceremony would take place later in the evening. He also informed the Committee that the report of the decisions would be available in paper copies in the plenary tomorrow morning so that they could be reviewed before their adoption at 10 a.m when the session would start. He then gave instructions about transport to the evening's ceremony before adjourning the session.

[Close of morning session]

TENTH DAY – Wednesday 12 July 2017

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Jacek Purchla (Poland)

ITEM 18 – ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF DECISIONS

Document: [WHC/17/41.COM/18](#)

The **Chairperson** greeted the delegations before turning to the introduction of the formal adoption of the Report of Decisions. He expressed special thanks to Ms Petya Totcharova and her team and congratulated the Rapporteur and the entire Secretariat. The report is divided into two parts; the decisions included in the report had already been adopted by the Committee and thus the task was largely editorial in that the debates would not be reopened. The Chairperson invited the Rapporteur to briefly explain the process and to provide editorial guidance for consideration.

The **Rapporteur, Mr Muhammad Juma**, wished to first express his sincere gratitude to the Members of the Committee for their trust and confidence. He also thanked the Advisory Bodies, Observers and members of civil society. He remarked that if he had been able to perform his task efficiently, it was for three reasons. First, he had been warmly welcomed in Poland and in Krakow, and he thanked the host country for its generosity and hospitality. Second, for being under the guidance of Mr Jacek Purchla for the last ten days, for his kindness, tolerance and wisdom, which was exactly what one son of Africa by the name of Madiba had showed 17 years ago. Last but not the least, his work was made easy because of the extraordinary Secretariat team under the leadership of the Director, Ms Mechtild Rössler. He spoke of the privilege to have worked with her and her team. Mr Juma also spoke of his role as Rapporteur, which had been simplified by a good system that was developed by the Committee and the Secretariat. Essentially, he collected the proposed amendments from Members of the Committee and integrated them into the draft decisions. At the end of each session, all the decisions taken by the Committee during the plenary sessions were correctly registered. With regard to Part 1 of the report, the Rapporteur reported that during the last ten days, the Committee had accomplished an important milestone towards the protection of world culture and natural heritage. In totality, it had deliberated on 235 decisions, which was one decision less than was deliberated during the 40th session in Istanbul and Paris. Part 1 of the report contained all the State of conservation reports that were examined. In total, the Committee examined 154 SOC reports but only 47 reports were opened. Although the Committee kept 54 properties on the World Heritage List in Danger, it had removed three properties from the List. There was also good news. In this 41st session, the Committee had inscribed 21 new properties and extended the boundary of five properties. Hence, following fruitful debates and intensive work in Krakow, the World Heritage List has a total of 1,070 properties of which 832 are cultural properties, 206 are natural properties, and 35 mixed properties. However, there were still 54 properties on the Danger List. The Committee had removed only three properties, so there was still some work to do. The Rapporteur would later present comments on Part 2.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for all his efforts and for his friendship, and he asked the Committee Members to indicate any factual or editorial errors that needed correcting. It was noted that formatting issues would be fixed at a later stage by the Secretariat during the finalization of the report. The Chairperson then suggested adopting part 1 of the report, starting from Decision 41 COM 2 to 41 COM 7B.99. He opened the floor for comments.

The **Representative of IUCN** noted three minor issues in Section 1. One was a typo in paragraph 7 of Decision 41 COM 7 82, which should read 'its request to the State Party [...]'. The second error was found in Decision 41 COM 7A.5 Comoé Natural Park in paragraph 9 in the English version, which had a couple of translation issues with the French version. Finally, in Decision 41 COM 7B.15 in paragraph 6, the spelling of one of the two foundations was incorrect.

The **Chairperson** thanked IUCN as the highest linguistic quality was essential, adding that the Secretariat had taken note. With no further comments, he declared adopted part 1 of the Report of Decisions. He then gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** referred to corrections in the Decisions in Part 2 of the Report in the French version. The first one was on page 13 with the addition of *de* in Parc national de Los Alerces, Argentine. The second correction was on page 31 in Decision 40 COM 8B.19 with the addition of *dans* to complete the title, l'Île sacrée d'Okinoshima et sites associés dans la région de Munakata, Japon. The next correction concerned Decision 41 COM 8B.23 with the addition of '*en tant que paysage culturel*', as this was not noted as a cultural landscape in the original draft. It was noted that 'as a cultural landscape' was also added in the English version.

The **Chairperson** noted that these were simple editorial errors. Noting no forthcoming comments, he turned to the second part of the Report and Decisions 41 COM 8A to 41 COM 17.

The **Delegation of Finland** referred to Decision 41 COM 8B.15 on the Temple Zone of Sambor Prei Kuk, Archaeological Site of Ancient Ishanapura, Cambodia, recalling a question posed to ICOMOS that had provided some good advice. The delegation had a proposal in this regard, adding that both ICOMOS and the State Party agreed to the proposal. The delegation proposed to add in paragraph 4 after 'requests the State Party', the following sentence, 'to confirm that the boundaries of the Temple Zone will be in line with the area protected by Royal Decree NS/RKT/1214/1488 dated 24th of December 2014, and that the buffer zone will be as proposed in the nomination dossier and to submit [...]'. An addition in paragraph 5. d) would read after 'carrying capacities', 'if possible in liaison with the tourism team at Apsara authority'.

The **Chairperson** thanked Finland but remarked that the item had already been discussed, but the text could be added should the Committee feel that this had been omitted from the draft decision.

La **Délégation du Liban** comprend que la Finlande veut proposer cette texte en accord avec l'État partie et l'ICOMOS, mais cela doit rester une exception. Le Comité ne peut pas revenir à une décision pour ajouter des textes sur une décision déjà approuvée par le Comité. La délégation n'est pas contre cette idée mais uniquement en cas d'exception et pour que cela ne se répète pas dorénavant.

The **Chairperson** understood that this would be an exception in Finland's attempt to improve the quality of the decision, even against the rules that had just rightly been mentioned.

The **Delegation of Lebanon** insisted that it was a question of principle because otherwise any State Party could at a certain point choose to reopen a debate, which would not be possible in principle. It preferred to leave this as an exception so it would not be repeated in the Committee.

The **Chairperson** concurred and adopted the principle, adding that it should remain an exception.

The **Representative of IUCN** had a remark in paragraph 13 of Decision 41 COM 9A to correct 'GAP analysis' to 'gap analyses' (in the plural form).

La **Délégation du Koweït** partage la même préoccupation qu'a exprimée la délégation du Liban, que le Comité ne peut pas modifier une résolution déjà adoptée à cette session

consacrée aux révisions d'une résolution. Cela ouvre la possibilité à d'autres pays a refaire cette experience.

The **Chairperson** assured Kuwait that he would adhere to the principles.

La **Délégation du Cuba** exprime la même préoccupation que le Liban, mais souhaite que cela soit reflété dans le résumé des interventions qu'il s'agit d'une exception et que ce n'est pas la méthode de travail correcte. D'ailleurs le Comité devrait faire une réflexion collective en ce qui concerne la gouvernance sur ce type de pratique.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for its support, which would be in the summary records.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** exprime la même inquiétude que la délégation libanaise car effectivement, dans le futur, un État partie pourrait ajouter quelque chose [dans la décision] après les séances plénières, et il le fera. La délégation explique qu'il n'y a plus de journalistes au session d'aujourd'hui. Il y a très peu d'observateurs et, par conséquent, les journalistes pourront dire « on a attendu cette séance de clôture pour faire passer des choses ». Ça serait donc un mauvais précédent. Elle demande si la Finlande peut revoir sa position.

The **Delegation of Finland** completely understood the point of view and withdrew its proposal.

La **Délégation du Liban** a voulu également demander à la Finlande de retirer sa proposition.

The **Delegation of Cambodia** expressed heartfelt thanks to the Chairperson, the entire team of the Secretariat, and the Committee Members, especially those who supported the draft nomination for the inscription of the Temple Zone of Sambor Prei Kuk, Archaeological Site of Ancient Ishanapura. Regarding the proposed editorial changes by Finland, the delegation understood that the intention was to reflect the comments by ICOMOS and it had thus agreed with the amendment, but it also understood that this was not the right procedure and it was happy that Finland chose to withdraw the proposal.

The **Chairperson** thanked Cambodia for its understanding, as it was essential to follow the principles. He then turned to the adoption of the Report of Decisions concerning part 2, which was duly adopted.

The Chairperson declared the Report of Decisions of the 41st session of the Committee adopted.

ITEM 19 – CLOSING SESSION

The **Chairperson** wished to say a few words before closing the meeting, noting that it was a successful marathon with the inscription of 21 new sites to the World Heritage List, 18 cultural properties and 3 natural properties. Discussions over certain items occasionally took hours to conclude and proved how multi-layered and complex heritage issues may be. The properties include two new inscriptions from Angola and Eritrea, to whom the Chairperson expressed warm congratulations. He was certain that they would do their utmost to ensure that these sites would retain their outstanding universal value, integrity and authenticity for which they were inscribed. The 41st session of the World Heritage Committee attracted enormous attention. It was attended by almost 2,000 participants including States Parties to the Convention, observers from civil society and NGOs, as well as 200 press representative. It was widely covered by the media from all over the world. He was happy that the session articulated the significance of three major actors of heritage: the site managers, civil society and the youth. The Site Managers World Heritage Forum, organized for the first time in Poland, offered a platform for heritage professionals to address issues implicated by

inscriptions to the World Heritage List. Three days filled with presentations and discussions demonstrated that despite geographical distance and typological differences, the various heritage sites are incredibly close to each other. This session was an important step to empower representativeness of civil society at the forum of the World Heritage Committee. The side event, 'For a Structured Dialogue with Civil Society' opened up the discussion among non-governmental organizations and initiated the process of challenging the voice towards partnership with World Heritage experts. And finally, the youth – the future. The competence of this year's Young Professional World Heritage Forum was extremely high. Young experts from 32 countries proved that inscriptions to the World Heritage List would be in good hands. Wise and thoughtful people, caring for value and substance. The Chairperson hoped that these topical discussions initiated in Krakow will be continued after the 41st session is over, and that they would lead to structural solutions that would be beneficial for all heritage sites. Another success of the Krakow session was the establishment of the International Indigenous People's Forum on World Heritage, a platform for involvement in the identification, conservation and management of World Heritage properties. These past 10 days were intense, inspiring, enriching and constructive. The Committee took its decisions in the best interest of the implementation of this almost universally ratified normative instrument, the World Heritage Convention, as well as in the best interests of the sites inscribed in the World Heritage List. Nevertheless, the Chairperson was concerned by the way politicization within the assembly had taken over expertise and technical and scientific-based decisions that should be adopted in a spirit of dialogue and mutual understanding. This is a very serious matter that is endangering not only the Committee's work but also the credibility of this Committee and the Convention, undermining its spirit and values. Therefore, delegations should do their utmost to ensure that the debates, discussions and decisions are held and taken in a cooperative way and in a transparent manner in full respect of the Operational Guidelines and provisions.

The **Chairperson** offered sincere thanks to all for their trust during his time as Chairperson. He was grateful for the assistance and support in the challenging task of chairing the daily sessions. He gave special thanks to the Vice-Chairs and Ambassadors of Portugal and the Republic of Korea, expressing his deepest gratitude for the great support from them. He spoke of the pleasure working with all the Committee Members and Members of the Bureau, States Parties, and the Advisory Bodies towards the implementation of such a prestigious instrument as the World Heritage Convention. The Chairperson expressed further appreciation for the continuous commitment of the Director-General of UNESCO, the Assistant Director-General for Culture, the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Deputy Director of the Heritage Division, as well as all their devoted staff. He was personally grateful to Dr Mechtild Rössler for her professionalism in leading the session, for her openness to embrace voices coming from all actors of heritage, and for her true friendship. Further gratitude went to the Policy and Statutory Meeting Unit headed by Ms Petya Totcharova, and a special tribute was paid to the Rapporteur, Mr Muhammad Juma, for his efficiency and reactivity in guiding the Committee through the examination of amendments. He expressed gratitude to the Government of Poland and the City of Krakow for having invested considerable effort in the preparation of this 41st session and for making it a success. He paid tribute to all those behind the scenes: interpreters, technicians, media centres, volunteers, and all the other services. The presence of 124 respected delegations over 10 days had made Krakow the heritage capital of the world and confirmed that Krakow is located at the crossroad of cultures and different traditions. He concluded by wishing everyone a safe journey home.

The **Delegation of Philippines** congratulated the Chairperson and the Secretariat for the tremendous dedication shown during the Committee and to UNESCO as a whole. It thanked Poland for the gracious hospitality and excellent organization. No stone was left unturned in making the delegates feel at home in Krakow where delegates were privileged to experience the exceptional World Heritage of Poland and the warmth and kindness of its people. The delegation congratulated the Chairperson for allowing the active participation of civil society,

which had been a good practice that should be continued and built upon in future sessions. The delegation recalled that despite the celebration of new inscriptions and removals from the World Heritage List in Danger, the Committee also witnessed some difficult, indeed painful discussions and unfortunate politicization. It was hoped that this not be repeated again as it seriously affected the objectives and credibility of the Committee's work. As the last session of the Philippines as a Member of the Committee, it called upon the remaining and future Members, the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and all States Parties to promote the highest standards of professionalism, integrity and transparency to enhance the credibility of the Committee and reinforce the collective responsibilities for the conservation of World Heritage. The follow-up to the recommendations of the Working Group on Governance would provide an opportunity to enhance transparency, credibility and efficiency within the Committee. All States Parties had the responsibility to uphold the vision and ideals of the 1972 Convention and UNESCO. Important questions persisted such as the need for more balance on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage affected by conflicts, climate change and natural disasters, and how to promote a more constructive perception of the World Heritage List in Danger. The upstream process and sustainability of financial resources all remain on the agenda and were crucial to effectively fulfilling the Committee's mandate. The roadmap for sustainability of the World Heritage Fund and the extended Ad-hoc Working Group provided further mechanisms to improve its work, and the Philippines, as a departing Committee Member, was open to share its experience and advice, if requested by colleagues.

The **Delegation of Turkey** remarked that the 41st session was already the last session for Turkey as a Committee Member and it thus took the opportunity to thank the Polish authorities for the excellent hospitality, and the Chairperson for his savvy and tolerance. The delegation thanked the Rapporteur for his hard work, and the Advisory Bodies who added real substance to the meetings. These past four years had been very enriching for Turkey and it was now more aware of the capacities in protecting and conserving the unique properties nationally, while widening the angle and raising awareness at home on the importance of UNESCO's work. The delegation thanked Ms Mechtild Rössler and her dedicated team, adding that it was not only enriching but a pleasure to work with such a professional team. Turkey would continue to contribute efforts in strengthening the implementation of the 1972 Convention.

Comme c'est la dernière session du Viet Nam au Comité, la **Délégation du Viet Nam** exprime ses remerciements sincères au Président pour son excellente direction. Elle exprimer sa gratitude profonde à la Pologne pour son hospitalité et remercie Mme Mechtild Rössler et tous les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial, ainsi que les organes consultatifs pour leurs travaux merveilleux. La délégation remercie également les membres du Comité qui ont collaboré étroitement avec le Viet Nam au cours de ces quatre années, ajoutant que ce fut un grand plaisir de servir à ce comité et le Viet Nam est prêt à renforcer la coopération avec tous les États parties pour la conservation et le développement du patrimoine mondial dans l'harmonie.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** thanked the Chairperson for the brilliant way in which he managed this session as a diplomat, a comedian and a disciplinarian that enabled the Committee to reach its decisions and work on time. It also thanked the staff of the Secretariat under the Director, Ms Mechtild Rössler, for their hard work. The delegation was particularly proud of the Rapporteur as a neighbour and friend, and thanked the colleagues who were leaving the Committee who served as mentors and helped Zimbabwe gain the knowledge and skills in its participation in this Committee. It was hoped that they would continue to be relied upon as friends and to seek advice at different times in its remaining mandate.

La **Délégation du Koweït** est également sur le point de terminer ses travaux, et tiens à remercier le Président, ainsi que le Ministère de la culture et la mairie de cette ville culturelle de Cracovie. Ses remerciements vont aussi aux membres du Secrétariat, à Madame Mechtild Rössler et aux techniciens, aux traducteurs et à tous ceux qui ont contribué au

succès de cette session. Le Koweït renouvelle son engagement à soutenir le Comité du patrimoine mondial pour faire face aux défis qui suivent.

The **Delegation of Poland** spoke of the pride of the Chairperson's leadership and warmly thanked the Members of the Committee and the States Parties for their valuable contribution to the successful work. This fruitful work would not be possible without the great devotion of the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to whom it was grateful. It had been an exceptional experience for the delegation as organizer of this session. From the outset, the goals of the Convention were to protect our common heritage. However, for different reasons, it had not always been successful, and hence the urgent need to raise awareness among the communities on the ground in terms of appreciating this cultural and natural heritage. Protection and conservation of World Heritage sites is indeed a common responsibility. The delegation hoped that the initiative launched in this session on the Site Managers Forum and Civil Society meeting, as well as the Young Professionals Forum would become a permanent platform for all citizens to make the principles of the Convention, their own principles. Finally, the delegation hoped that the delegations would meet next year in Warsaw to discuss the problems of reconstruction. The findings of this conference would be helpful, not only for the Committee but also for sites damaged by armed conflict and natural disasters.

Ms Katarzyna Piotrowska of the Delegation of Poland remarked that the end of the meeting had arrived, recalling only two weeks ago the finalisation of last minute preparations. On behalf of the National Heritage Board of Poland, the main organizer of this session and partners, she thanked the World Heritage Centre and the entire UNESCO team for their commitment and professionalism that had guided the Committee through the not-so-easy process of preparing this session. Ms Piotrowska expressed sincere thanks to the German National Commission for UNESCO who shared valuable experience with the delegation in organizing the more than 1,000 people who worked behind the scenes to make this event happen. She also took the opportunity to thank all the professionals from various fields responsible for the entire organization, both logistical and content wise, with whom she had the pleasure to lead. Special thanks went to the members of the World Heritage Unit with whom she worked daily and who were responsible for the preparation of the content of this year's session, and to the members of the Task Force for their organization of the 41st session of the Committee, which was set up especially for the purpose of this session. She explained that the past several months had been tough with little sleep. Along this journey, there were many challenges and unexpected turning points that had hopefully passed unnoticed. Youth is at the heart of most UNESCO activities and this approach was adopted. Students from the Polish-Japanese Academy of Information Technology created the logo and visual identity of this session and she thanked them for bringing forward their creativity and enthusiasm. Of course, none of the above would happen if it wasn't for UNESCO as well as the delegates from the world over. Ms Piotrowska thanked them for their presence in Krakow and for sharing their concerns and joys. She felt both honored and happy to have hosted the delegates for the past 10 days and she wished everyone a safe journey home.

La **Délégation de Cuba** remercie la Pologne pour tous les efforts dans l'organisation de cette excellente réunion. Le Comité a eu un appui exceptionnel, et elle remercie toutes les autorités de Cracovie qui font beaucoup d'efforts dans l'organisation de cette session. La délégation remercie également le Président pour sa patience et sa façon intègre de conduire tous les travaux de ces réunions et tout l'aplomb qu'il a dû avoir dans les moments les plus difficiles de ces réunions et aussi dans les moments les plus agréables. Le Comité a fait un grand travail et les résultats et les décisions qui venaient d'être adoptées sont le reflet de cet excellent travail. La délégation remercie aussi le Rapporteur pour son excellent travail, et aussi tout le Secrétariat, Mme Mechthild Rössler, les organes consultatifs et aussi les conseillers juridiques qui ont accompagné le Comité pendant ces jours. Cuba veut réaffirmer les compromis avec l'implémentation de ces conventions, et de la même façon elle réaffirme aussi l'importance de ce Comité et les travaux qu'il fait pour l'humanité, pour la préservation et la conservation du patrimoine.

The **Chairperson** thanked Cuba for the kind words and agreed that the legal advisers should not be forgotten. He also thanked the delegation for its essential support during the critical moments.

The **Delegation of Angola** thanked all those involved in the organization of the session, from the Polish Government to the drivers, to security, and the ladies who provided food and kept the delegations going, and to the City of Krakow for the changeable weather. The session was also a very special session for Angola that inscribed its first cultural property, and it thanked Poland for its support. The delegation wished to highlight the involvement of three different stakeholders in the session: the youth, civil society and the site managers who are responsible for keeping the sites safe, concurring that it was one of the great achievements of this Committee. The delegation also thanked the outgoing Committee Members for their important work over the past 10 days. This was the second second year that Angola served as a Committee member and it hoped that for the next two years it would also be able to provide its expertise on the matters to come. The delegation concluded by highlighting the difficult issue in Africa in maintaining the balance between development and conservation, which it felt deserved to be analysed from different standpoints, as was discussed a great deal in this session. The delegation believed that this was likely a topic for discussion in future Committees as this was a very important aspect for Africa. It concluded by thanking the Chairperson for his leadership, the Secretariat and the Rapporteur.

La **Délégation de la Tunisie** présente ses vifs remerciements à Mme Mechtild Rössler pour avoir permis aux deux représentants de la Tunisie de participer à cette session. Ses remerciements vont également au Gouvernement polonais pour l'excellente organisation, l'accueil chaleureux, le grand sens des responsabilités et la disponibilité de la part de l'ensemble du personnel et des collaborateurs mis à la disposition de cette session pour rendre pratique et efficace son participation dans cette belle ville de Cracovie, mais aussi lors de ses visites du magnifique patrimoine de la Pologne. Cette session n'aurait pu connaître cette réussite éclatante sans la perspicacité, la sagesse, l'intégrité à toute épreuve mais teintée aussi d'humour de l'excellent Président à qui elle est reconnaissante, et également pour son contribution très largement à la promotion du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** thanked Tunisia, explaining that ironic humour was an essential part of Central European identity and its intangible heritage.

On behalf of the Government, the **Delegation of Croatia** thanked the Chairperson for the warm welcome and excellent organization under his capable leadership that guided the Committee with wisdom, confidence and humour. It also thanked UNESCO, Ms Irina Bokova, Mr Francesco Bandarin, and Dr Mechtild Rössler and her hard-working and capable team. The delegation also thanked the legal advisers and Mr Muhammad Juma, the Rapporteur, for his efficiency and hard work. The delegation spoke of its privilege to have worked closely with all the Members of the Committee, the States Parties and Advisory Bodies on preserving and celebrating the world's most outstanding heritage. It noted the many positive steps forward in the dialogue with States Parties and Advisory Bodies, and wished for this dialogue to continue into the future. The delegation thanked everyone for the enriching debates and it looked forward to coming back to beautiful Poland and to enjoy once again the hospitality and warmth of the people of Krakow.

La **Délégation du Burkina Faso** fait écho aux félicitations qui ont été exprimées pour la qualité de la présidence du Comité durant cette 41^e session. Elle veut également réitérer sa gratitude à la Pologne pour tous les efforts dans l'organisation réussie qui a été bien riche et fructueuse, particulièrement pour l'Afrique. Néanmoins, la délégation est consciente que bien des efforts devront être poursuivis pour la conservation de ces sites qui ont été inscrits. La délégation remarque que plusieurs de ses collègues quittent le Comité après avoir apporté une contribution significative. Elle saisit l'occasion pour leur traduire sa sincère appréciation de la bonne collaboration et leur redire tout son souhait de pouvoir compter sur eux pour poursuivre les réflexions sur ces sujets qui n'ont pas été épuisés. Enfin, au nom de son

gouvernement, la délégation remercie tous les États qui ont apporté leur soutien pour son dossier conjoint porté avec le Bénin.

The **Delegation of Tanzania** joined fellow colleagues to personally thank the Director of the World Heritage Centre and its staff, the Advisory Bodies, and all the participants of the 41st session that had made this meeting successful and fruitful. Tanzania also commended and thanked the Polish Government, the City of Krakow and its kind people for hosting the Committee and for their warm hospitality. Tanzania commended the Rapporteur, the son of the United Republic of Tanzania, for his performance. Indeed, it thanked everybody who had a role in this 41st session. Finally, Tanzania wished to commend the Advisory Bodies for their close collaboration with the States Parties and the national experts, and it sincerely commended them for that work. However, it encouraged the Advisory Bodies to enhance such consultations and collaboration because of the usefulness of such an endeavour. Tanzania wished everyone safe travels home.

The **Chairperson** concurred that no doubt Tanzania should be proud of Mr Muhammad Juma.

La **Délégation de Liban** joint également sa voix pour remercier tout d'abord la Pologne et la ville de Cracovie pour l'excellente organisation de cette session du Comité et pour l'hospitalité généreuse qui a été offerte à toutes les délégations présentes à cette session. La délégation remercie également le Président et dire combien elle a apprécié son direction sage et tranquille malgré tous les problèmes qui se sont posés et parfois les agitations qui sont apparues dans cette salle. La Délégation [sur une note personnelle] remercie le Président pour sa patience vis-à-vis de ses interventions personnelles, parfois intempestives et passionnées mais tout ceci n'est que pour l'intérêt de la Convention et l'intérêt du patrimoine mondial. La délégation remercie également le Rapporteur pour son travail excellent et extrêmement précis. Elle remercie la Directrice du Centre, et tous les membres du Secrétariat pour leur travail continu pour faire avancer et améliorer les conditions du patrimoine mondial pour veiller à l'état de conservation des biens, pour veiller à ce que les règles définies dans notre Convention soient appliquées partout et pour que, réellement, le patrimoine mondial devienne de plus en plus une valeur universelle pour l'ensemble des pays du monde. La délégation également remercie les travailleurs de l'ombre, que ce soit pour la partie polonaise qui ont travaillé à organiser cette session, mais aussi les travailleurs de l'ombre du Centre du patrimoine mondial, qui ont fait tout ce travail. Sans eux, rien ne serait possible. La délégation conclut par le fait que le Liban quitte le Comité du patrimoine mondial, et voudrais faire un bilan très rapide. La délégation constate que le monde et confronté aujourd'hui à des défis que jamais auparavant on avait pensé pouvoir envisager. Lorsque la Convention a été écrite, a été créée, a été pensée au début des années 70, personne n'imaginait que les horreurs qui se sont produites pendant la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, que les destructions qui ont touché les villes, les centres urbains, les campagnes pendant la Deuxième Guerre mondiale pourraient de nouveau se reproduire. Personne ne pensait que les drames humains de personnes sans abri, de déplacés, pourraient se reproduire à cette échelle-là. Aujourd'hui, le monde est confronté de nouveau à cette situation. Et ceci pose, pour le Convention, des questions et des défis extrêmement importants. Comment envisager le patrimoine mondial dans des conditions pareilles ? Que veut dire aujourd'hui, par exemple, le patrimoine mondial dans des villes comme Alep détruite, comme Palmyre à moitié détruite, comme aussi des villes qui ne sont pas pour l'instant inscrites, comme Mossoul, comme d'autres villes ? Que veut dire le patrimoine mondial dans ce cas-là ? Et que peut faire la Convention dans ces situations-là ? Ce sont des défis réels qui se posent à tous. Il faut réellement qu'on y pense, qu'on réfléchisse et qu'on voie comment nous pouvons apporter des réponses.

The **Chairperson** thanked Lebanon, but also the Ambassador Mr Jad Tabet for all his efforts and essential support given to him during the sessions, adding that he would try and follow his inspiring standards in the future.

On behalf of the Government and and Ambassador Mr Byong Hyun Lee, the **Delegation of Republic of Korea** expressed deep gratitude to the Chairperson for his excellent leadership throughout the session. Special thanks went to Poland and also to the Secretariat for hosting this meeting in a very efficient way. Even though the Republic of Korea was leaving this year as a Committee Member, it would continue doing its best to be a reliable supporter of the World Heritage Committee and World Heritage Centre.

The **Delegation of Jamaica** expressed its thanks to the host, the Government of Poland, for its organization and warm welcome. It was heartened by the Chairperson's professional chairmanship and easy sense of humour, which especially helped during difficult moments of deliberation. The delegation thanked the Director, Ms Mechtild Rössler, and her team for their continued support. This was Jamaica's final year on the Committee and it was grateful for the guidance and support it received in completing its first mandate. There was much to be done to address the challenges that handicap the work of this Committee and the overall Convention. Nevertheless, it had every confidence that the Members who remain and those to come would realize success with guidance from the Secretariat. Even though the delegation would exit the Committee, this was not the last of Jamaica in relation to WH. Its government had been given a mandate and it was emerging in this area of heritage and would continue to do its part to fulfill its responsibility to the Convention.

The **Delegation of Portugal** recalled the words of the Ambassador of Portugal in emphasizing its thanks to Poland for the organization of this meeting and also to the City of Krakow. It also thanked the Chairperson, adding that his cordial words would be forwarded to the Ambassador. The delegation thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Secretariat, the Rapporteur, the translators, the Advisory Bodies, and all the persons present and behind the scenes who worked for the success of the meeting. The delegation wished the Committee good intersessional work and hoped to see all next year at the next Committee meeting.

The **Representative of IUCN** continued the tradition in making a joint statement on behalf of all the three Advisory Bodies, and on their behalf thanked the Committee, especially the 12 Members who would leave the Committee, for their engagement in the last four years, and hoped that there would be a continued engagement when the Committee changes its membership, adding that perhaps the Ad-hoc Working Group could provide the means for that to happen. The Advisory Bodies also thanked the Committee for all the collegiate discussions both in plenary and outside the hall that had reached decisions in the interest of World Heritage sites. The Advisory Bodies thanked all the States Parties who engaged with them throughout the year, and particular Tanzania for its remarks, adding that States Parties were welcome to contact them. The Advisory Bodies tried their best to always reach out to States Parties, but States Parties should not hesitate to be in touch at any point of the year with questions. The Advisory Bodies thanked the Rapporteur for his great collegiate work and also all the civil society organizations that were present as Observers. They thanked the Chairperson for his consistency and openness to hear their voices. The Advisory Bodies also wished to thank the staff in the World Heritage Centre and Ms Mechtild Rössler for the best working relations around the clock and during the year leading to the Committee. The Advisory Bodies also wished to acknowledge their own hardworking teams and the staff who undertake sometimes gruelling work and who show great commitment to conservation that this World Heritage Convention represents. They also acknowledged the many volunteers who gave freely of their time to enable the Advisory Bodies to bring advice to this Committee, the networks of members and their scientific committees without whom the Advisory Bodies would not be able to bring the technical advice that States Parties need. The Representative closed by thanking Poland for the quality that had been shown throughout this meeting, and also for its innovation and creativity, especially the Site Managers Forum. The Committee meets for 10 days a year but World Heritage sites function for 365 days a year and the site managers make that happen, so special thanks to them were conveyed. The Representative concluded with special thanks to Ms Katarzyna Piotrowska for her

remarkable engagement and collaboration as Executive Officer of the Committee Meeting, Chair of the Ad-hoc Working Group and expert in the delegation of Poland. The final word was reserved for the Chairperson who was thanked for his genial, consistent, and humorous approach and it was thus a pleasure to serve this Committee and to work with him.

The **Chairperson** spoke of the personal debt to the Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM, thanking them and adding that he had learned a lot from them.

The **Delegation of Finland** thanked the host country of Poland for the wonderful arrangements and warm hospitality, and to the Chairperson for his inimitable style of chairing and his guidance. It also thanked the Secretariat, the Rapporteur for his great work. The delegation commended the Committee Members and the States Parties for the wonderful cooperation. It thanked the Advisory Bodies, the civil society organizations, and others who had made these decisions possible. The delegation conveyed best wishes to the remaining Members and all those who would follow.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** spoke of her great honour and privilege to have had this Committee in Poland, in the World Heritage Site of Krakow, which was one of the first sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. She thanked all the Committee delegates for their kind words and for keeping up standards, the Advisory Bodies, all State Party Observers, NGOs and civil society for their work and personal contributions in making World Heritage even more relevant whose heritage is much cherished by many people around the world, local authorities, communities, indigenous peoples and youth. The Director thanked her team from the World Heritage Centre, the regional teams, the Policy and Statutory Meeting Unit led by Ms Petya Totcharova, the Deputy Director, Mr Lazare Eloundou Assomo, and the Convention Common Services Team led by Ms Vesna Vujicic-Lugassy, her last Committee in her function. The Director thanked Mr Francesco Bandarin, the ADG of Culture who would soon retire from UNESCO. She also thanked the Legal Adviser, the excellent Rapporteur, Mr Muhammad Juma, for his close collaboration, the interpreters, all the technical teams, the Press Team, and the interns behind the scenes. The Director also wholeheartedly thanked the Polish team for the excellent organization of this meeting and for their warm hospitality. Most of all, she recognized the excellent work of the Chairperson with whom she taught together 20 years ago. Finally, she had a small gift for the Director, the UNESCO World Heritage atlas, and for the Rapporteur. She then bid everyone safe travels home.

The **Chairperson** closed the session with a final expression of gratitude to his closest colleagues and friends who supported him during this session and in recent weeks and months, Ms Aleksandra Wacławczyk and Ms Katarzyna Zalasńska. He then officially closed the 41st session.

[Close of the 41st session of the Committee]