Draft Decision: 44 COM 8

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/21/44.COM/8,

2. Recalling Decisions 35 COM 9A, 40 COM 11, 42 COM 5A, 42 COM 8, 42 COM 8B.24, 43 COM 8 and 43 COM 12 adopted at its 35th (UNESCO Headquarters, 2011), 40th (Istanbul/UNESCO Headquarters, 2016), 42nd (Manama, 2018) and 43rd (Baku, 2019) sessions respectively, as well as Resolutions 18 GA 8 and 22 GA 9 adopted by the General Assembly at its 18th (UNESCO, 2011) and 22nd (UNESCO, 2019) sessions respectively,

3. Expresses its appreciation for the work of experts from all regions that participated in the Meeting in Paris, to the experts that have prepared the independent study, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their work on the reflection on sites associated with recent conflicts [Uganda, South Africa];

4. [Uganda, South Africa] Takes note that some properties associated with memories of recent conflicts have been previously inscribed on the World Heritage List on an exceptional basis and also takes note of the outcome of the detailed reflection process in which some experts considered that sites associated with recent conflicts do not relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines;
5. [Uganda, South Africa] Takes note of the meeting of the African experts and the Inter-Ministerial meeting hosted by South Africa, 6-9 April 2021, which reviewed the reports and the recommendations of the experts meeting of the sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, (Paris, 4-6 December 2019), the ICOMOS updated paper on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts and the World Heritage Convention (ICOMOS 2020) and the study on sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories (Beazley and Cameron, 2020), concluded that sites associated with memories of recent conflicts do relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines;

6. [Uganda, South Africa] Further takes note of the experts’ suggestion that sites associated with memories of recent conflict which may not demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value could be considered by other international fora;

7. [Uganda, South Africa] Acknowledging the persistent divergent views among [Norway] States Parties, experts, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre regarding how sites associated with memories of recent conflicts relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines,

8. [Brazil] Considering that it pertains to the States Parties, by means of the statutory bodies of the Convention, to express themselves on the definition of possible eligibility criteria for certain typologies of sites, such as sites [Australia] that may be considered sites associated with memories of recent conflicts [Uganda, South Africa], and other negative and divisive memories;

9. [Uganda, South Africa, Brazil] Decides to establish an [ad-hoc] open-ended working group of States Parties to the Convention, in order to broaden the scope of the reflections on sites of memories of recent conflicts, accommodating other views not currently reflected in the existing report, [South Africa] and to consider whether or how the “sites associated with recent conflicts” relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention;

// [Australia: replace para 9] [Ethiopia, Egypt: delete] Requests the Committee to establish a geographically [Russian Federation]and gender balanced open-ended working group of States Parties to the Convention, with the mandate of advising on whether or not “sites associated with recent conflicts” relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention, and requests this working group to provide a progress report to the 45th session of the Committee;

10. [Australia, Norway, Spain, Hungary] [Ethiopia, South Africa: delete] Acknowledging that the question of whether and how “sites associated with recent conflicts” relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention have not yet been resolved,

11. [Brazil] Requests this open-ended working group of States Parties to incorporate the outcomes of all the reflections in their final report, to be presented for [Uganda, South Africa] consideration by the 45th session of the World Heritage Committee;

12. [Australia, Norway, Hungary, Spain] Suggests the World Heritage Centre include an item on the agenda of the 23rd Session of the General Assembly of States Parties to reflect on “sites associated with recent conflicts” and create uniform modalities for regional expert consultations in each electoral group; and further suggests, the reports from these consultations, together with the report of the 45th session of Committee, be considered at the General Assembly of States Parties.

13. [Brazil, Uganda, South Africa] Finally calls on States Parties to the Convention to contribute to the work of this open-ended working group, including through voluntary contributions;

ANALYSIS OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY
14. Welcomes the independent study analysing the impact of the Global Strategy on the World Heritage List and notes its findings, which serve as a basis for a reflection on the Global Strategy to be undertaken on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 2022;

CRITERIA TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PAR. 61 OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

15. Endorses the proposed criteria to be used to assess the impact of the application of the mechanism foreseen in Paragraph 61 of the Operational Guidelines in view of its examination at its 45th session;

BUFFER ZONES

16. Urges States Parties to ensure that well designed, effectively legally protected and managed buffer zones are considered when submitting nominations;

PROTECTING SITES OF POTENTIAL OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE IN MARINE AREAS BEYOND NATIONAL JURISDICTION

17. Also takes note of the ongoing reflection on means to preserve sites of potential Outstanding Universal Value in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction.