

**Outcomes of the sixth meeting of the Open-ended working group see pages 2-8**

**Comments/proposals on already agreed parts of the text have been removed to ease the reading**

**Contributions received from States Parties in advance of the third meeting of the Open-ended working group (27 April 2021)**

Following the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group held on 30 March, a number of written contributions was received from States Parties in view of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Group (full contributions are available at <https://whc.unesco.org/en/standards/p=code2021>). As all contributions made references/amendments to the Non-Paper document developed by the Ad-Hoc Working Group (2018-2019) and to facilitate the work of the Open-Ended Working Group, the following document presents the comments and/or proposed amendments received from States Parties in relation with the paragraph of the Non Paper they are referring to.

Key:

In **blue bold** : additions

In ~~red striketrough~~ : deletions

### **General recommendations:**

Some general recommendations have been made in the framework of the contributions by States Parties and are reflected below (in alphabetical order of submitting States Parties).

**Australia** notes that “the draft document [Non-Paper document developed by the Ad-Hoc Working Group] is a strong basis and a useful starting point for codifying our agreed principles. We note the importance of the Code’s development to uphold the credibility of the World Heritage Convention.”

**Austria** “supports the Non-Paper dated 1 June 2019 and elaborated in the framework of the Ad-Hoc Working Group established by the World Heritage Committee and the written contribution by Sweden. We believe that a Code of Conduct, as proposed in the Non-Paper, can serve as a helpful tool to uphold the credibility and integrity of the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage Committee, and its decisions. A Code of Conduct would not entail additional obligations for State Parties but serve as a valuable summary and reminder of the already existing obligations and rules derived from the Convention and the Operational Guidelines.”

**Belgium** considers that “the notion of heritage has broadened considerably since the World Heritage Convention was adopted. The credibility of the World Heritage List requires that the Committee and the international community continue to reflect on what exactly constitutes heritage in a 21st century that strives to be respectful of human rights, gender equality, cultural and natural diversity, sustainable development, and that looks to the future. The 50th anniversary should be an opportunity to be both mindful of the past and forward-looking in that reflection.” Belgium further considers that “the measures will only be implemented if the States agree to them, which is why the Committee might consider revising its working methods. Too much time is wasted

on unnecessary speeches. There is no need for all or almost all members of the Committee to congratulate the State whose nomination has just been inscribed on the World Heritage List or is about to be. This practice is to the detriment of actual work in sessions with an ever-growing agenda.” Furthermore, Belgium raises the issue of “the status of the document and its adoption. As the envisaged Code of Conduct does not only concern the members of the Committee and the work of the Committee, [it questions whether] its adoption [should] be submitted to the General Assembly. This approach is all the more conceivable if the objective is widespread adherence to the Code of Conduct. It will be all the more legitimate if it has been endorsed by the plenary of the States Parties.”

The **Czech Republic** “recalls the long-term and recurring need to respect the highest standards of integrity and transparency of working methods within the process of decision-making of the Governing bodies of the Convention. The Czech Republic appreciates the Sweden submission shared in advance of the 2nd open-ended working group meeting. We consider it a good, clearly formulated contribution to the discussion.”

**Sweden** “notes with appreciation from the second working group meeting that it was agreed to use the Non-paper on Code of Conduct developed by the previous Ad-Hoc Working Group as a basis for the current Open-Ended Working Group on developing a Code of Conduct for decision-making concerning the World Heritage Convention. In our previous submission, we argued that the Non-paper is a useful starting point for three principal reasons. Firstly, it implies efficient use of resources already invested into this matter. Secondly, it is well-structured and organized around the principal actors concerned. Thirdly, the Proposed Draft Code of Conduct makes clear cross-references to the key documents concerned.”

**Switzerland** “supports the elements concerning the rules of conduct of the States Parties contained in the draft Code of Conduct, proposed as a Non-Paper by the ad hoc working group in 2019. This text reflects the main issues to be addressed by the Code of Conduct.”

Non-Paper document developed by the 2018-2019 Ad-Hoc Working Group established by the World Heritage Committee	Comments and proposed amendments by States Parties
<b>Introduction to [Text]</b>	
<b>The Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)</b>	
The Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) (hereinafter: the <i>Convention</i> ) establishes a solid framework for all States Parties for working together to recognise, sustain and protect the world’s universally significant and outstanding value of cultural diversity and natural wealth. The States Parties to the <i>Convention</i> , the Advisory Bodies, and the World Heritage Centre (hereinafter: the Secretariat) have a shared	

commitment to preserving and safeguarding the world's shared legacy of all the nations of the world for future generations. The <i>Convention</i> plays a vital role in generating fruitful dialogue between its constituents and different communities, promoting respect for common heritage and cultural diversity, and is recognised as an important instrument contributing to international peace, sustainable development and the advancement of humanity.	
<b>Purpose and scope</b>	
This [TEXT] is a means to promote the international solidarity and cooperation to preserve the world's natural and cultural heritage of all the nations of the world, the shared commitment of all stakeholders of the 1972 Convention, the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage properties and to uphold the integrity and credibility of the <i>Convention</i> and the World Heritage List.	
The States Parties to the <i>Convention</i> , the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies have a collective responsibility to uphold credibility, integrity and the implementation of the <i>Convention</i> . The [TEXT] expresses a commitment to impartial decision making based on objective and scientific considerations, verifiable technical evidence and elaborated by qualified experts in the fields of natural and cultural heritage, conducting themselves according to the highest ethical standards of professionalism, equity and transparency.	
The UNESCO Constitution, the provisions of the World Heritage Convention, its Operational Guidelines and Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of States Parties and of the World Heritage Committee, the Standards of Conduct for International Civil Service, UNESCO Staff Regulations and Rules, ICCROM Staff Regulations and Rules, ICOMOS Ethical Principles, Code of Conduct and Professional Ethics for the Secretariat of IUCN and Terms of reference for the IUCN World Heritage panel, govern the work of all respective stakeholders. The [TEXT] draws on these documents providing a legally non-binding ethical guideline and statement of good practice principles and commitments for pursuing the highest standards of integrity	

<p>and conduct. This [TEXT] cannot undermine the aforementioned texts and documents in any way nor be a basis for limiting their implementation.</p>	
<p>[Title of the document]</p>	<p><b>Sweden</b> considers that “the name “Code of Conduct” is appropriate. The term signals that the document includes both ethical principles and expected behaviour based on the rules set out in the documents concerned.”</p> <p>See also the contribution submitted by the <b>Russian Federation</b> in advance of the third meeting of the Open-ended working group.</p>
<p>The States Parties to the World Heritage Convention meeting in General Assembly,</p> <p><u>Emphasizing</u> the collective responsibility of all stakeholders – States Parties, World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies – to uphold the integrity and the credibility of the Convention and, as such, expecting all stakeholders to conduct themselves according to the highest ethical standards of professionalism, equity and transparency (Resolution <b>22 GA 10</b>),</p> <p><u>Being mindful</u> that the States Parties are responsible for the implementation of the Convention,</p> <p><u>Recognizing</u> that the States Parties’ decisions and actions should always be governed by the provisions of the Convention, its Operational Guidelines and Rules of Procedure,</p> <p><u>Agreeing</u> that a [Text] is needed to highlight obligations under the Convention and to set out ethical principles and good behaviour,</p> <p><u>Recalling</u> that this [Text] is not legally binding,</p> <p><u>Approve</u> to the following [Text], and <u>call upon</u> all stakeholders to honour its contents,</p>	

<b>I. Core principles</b>	
All parties will be guided by the core principles of integrity, objectivity and impartiality.	
i. ‘Integrity’ is upholding the highest standards of professional principles, ethics and fairness in the implementation of the Convention.	
ii. ‘Objectivity’ is basing recommendations and decisions on scientific facts and rigorous analysis of the documentation presented to the Committee.	
iii. ‘Impartiality’ is acting in accordance with the Convention, its Operational Guidelines and Rules of Procedure of the World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly of States Parties, and the documents guiding the ethical principles of all respective stakeholders such as the UNESCO Constitution, <b>[Chair’s proposal to align with the introductory part] UNESCO Staff Regulations and Rules</b> , the Standards of Conduct for International Civil Service, <b>UNESCO Staff Regulations and Rules</b> , <b>ICCROM Staff Regulations and Rules</b> , ICOMOS Ethical Principles, Code of Conduct and Professional Ethics for the Secretariat of IUCN and Terms of reference for the IUCN World Heritage panel; and to benefit the credibility of the World Heritage List and ensure the ethical integrity of their decisions.  <b>[proposals of addition of a point iv to be considered at the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting]</b>	
	<p><b>Saudi Arabia</b> proposes to consider the following additional provision:</p> <p><b>iv. Respect for Cultural and Heritage Diversity</b></p> <p><b>“Respect for cultural diversity demands acknowledgment of the legitimacy of the cultural values of all parties” [Annex 4/Para 6 of OG] which requires “conscious efforts to avoid imposing mechanistic formulae or standardized procedures in attempting to define or determine authenticity of particular monuments and sites” [Annex 4/Appendix</b></p>

	1/Para 1 of OG] and further requires assessment approaches that may involve “multidisciplinary collaboration and the appropriate utilization of all available expertise and knowledge” in addition to “analytical processes and tools specific to the nature and needs of those cultures” [Annex 4/Appendix 1/Para 2 of OG].
	<p>The <b>Russian Federation</b> proposes to consider the following additional provision:</p> <p><b>iv. Transparency of the evaluation process</b></p> <p>Transparency of the evaluation process is considering all information regarding a nomination in consultation and constant dialogue with nominating States Parties with the respect of the principle of fair geographical representation involving regional experts familiar with the subject. Make public the methodology and existing policies of evaluation of the nominations; the list of panel members and criteria of selection of the field mission experts, the panel members and advisors.</p>
	<p><b>Egypt</b> proposes to consider the following additional provision:</p> <p><b>iv. Diversity of Expertise views</b></p> <p>‘Diversity of expertise views’ is a recognition that judgments about values attributed to cultural properties may differ from culture to culture, and even within the same culture. Experts’ recommendations could diverge based on varying professional, geographical and cultural perspectives; and decisions.</p>

<b>II. [Text] provisions</b>	<p><b>Switzerland</b> considers that “decision-making on the monitoring of World Heritage properties in general, and on the state of conservation reports in particular, is in principle as important, if not more important, for achieving the objectives of the Convention than decisions on new inscriptions. However, we note that in discussions on the Code of Conduct, inscriptions and related processes are generally given more consideration than those related to the state of conservation of properties. The Code of Conduct should therefore focus more on decisions pertaining to conservation reports. Without objective arguments, new proven information or new credible scientific facts, it should not be possible, for example, to open decisions for any discussion that would reduce their effectiveness.”</p>
<b>I. The Committee commits to:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recognize that “Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole. The Committee defines the criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List” (<i>Operational Guidelines</i>, paragraph 49).</li> </ol>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Mindful that the World Heritage Committee is an intergovernmental committee, choose as their representatives persons qualified in the field of cultural or natural heritage (<i>Convention</i>, Article 9.3; <i>Rules of Procedure</i>, Rule 5.2).</li> </ol>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Voluntarily limit their term of office to four years instead of six years in order to give other States Parties an opportunity to serve on the Committee (<i>Operational Guidelines</i>, Paragraph 21), and strictly observe the six years gap between two mandates as per Rule 13.2 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly.</li> </ol>	

<p>4. Remain impartial and base their decisions on objective and scientific considerations (<i>Operational Guidelines</i>, Paragraph 23), and endeavour to appreciate different competencies and opinions, encourage mutual respect, promote humble and respectful dialogue, and in case of disagreement, seek to reach agreement by consensus through cooperation.</p>	
<p><i>New paragraph 5 with amendments made by the Open-ended working group during its 4th meeting and still pending</i></p> <p><b>[New paragraph 5]</b>  <del>5. Refrain from</del> Ensure that credibility, balance and representativity is guaranteed, and consider avoiding presenting nominations during their tenure on the Committee, keeping in mind paragraph 61(c) of the Operational Guidelines which states that a priority of examination will be applied to “<i>nominations of States Parties, former Members of the Committee, who accepted on a voluntary basis not to have a nomination reviewed by the Committee during their mandate. This priority will be applied for 4 years after the end of their mandate on the Committee</i>”.</p> <p>The States parties Members of the Committee presenting nominations shall refrain from taking part in the debate in conformity with the Rules of Procedure (art. 22.7).  <del>to ensure impartial and objective decision-making, and to avoid conflict of interest.</del></p>	<p>Amendment proposed by the <b>Russian Federation</b>:</p> <p><del>Refrain from</del> Ensure that credibility, balance and representativity [Russian Federation] of the World Heritage List is guaranteed, and consider avoiding presenting nominations for the examination of the Committee during their tenure on the Committee, keeping in mind paragraph 61(c) of the Operational Guidelines which states that a priority of examination will be applied to “<i>nominations of States Parties, former Members of the Committee, who accepted on a voluntary basis not to have a nomination reviewed by the Committee during their mandate. This priority will be applied for 4 years after the end of their mandate on the Committee</i>”.</p> <p>The States parties Members of the Committee presenting nominations shall refrain from taking part in the debate in conformity with the Rules of Procedure (art. 22.7).  <del>to ensure impartial and objective decision-making, and to avoid conflict of interest.</del></p> <p><b>Saudi Arabia</b> considers that “on more practical terms, it is unclear how the secretariat is planning to meet the objective of prioritizing the withheld nominations. There will be approximately more than 50 – 60 files to be prioritized per year in addition to the existing backlog and given the long list waiting to be evaluated by relatively limited Advisory Bodies in terms of resources, expertise, and manpower, how can such priority be applied?”.</p>



	<p><b>China</b> considers that “in accordance with Articles 11.1 and 11.2 of the World Heritage Convention, each State Party has the right to submit nomination. As per the rules of procedure of GA 14.1 d) the State Parties which has never served as a member of the world heritage Committee can only choose between presentation of nomination and presentation of candidature to elections to the World Heritage Committee. <b>And therefore proposes to delete paragraph 5.</b></p>
<p><i>Remaining text to be examined by the Open-ended working group</i></p> <p>6. [Chair] <del>Not accept invitations to</del> <b>Consider avoiding</b> visiting sites proposed for inscription to the World Heritage List, neither to sites on the World Heritage List currently in the process of Reactive Monitoring (<i>Operational Guidelines</i>, Paragraph 169) in order to ensure impartial and objective decision making and the equal treatment of all World Heritage properties.</p>	<p><b>Belgium</b> wishes to “revise the wording to reconcile the rejection of lobbying and legitimate interest in the issues on which Committee members are called upon to decide or to shed light on a matter under discussion by the Committee.”</p> <p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> supports “without further amendments the wording of this principle.”</p> <p>Amendment proposed by the <b>Russian Federation</b>:</p> <p><b>Avoid to <del>Not</del> accept invitations of the States Parties to visit sites on their territory proposed for inscription to the World Heritage List during their tenure on the Committee,</b> neither to sites on the World Heritage List currently in the process of Reactive Monitoring (<i>Operational Guidelines</i>, Paragraph 169) in order to ensure impartial and objective decision making and the equal treatment of all World Heritage properties.</p>
<p>7. Contribute with truthful, credible and timely information for any case on their territory to be considered by the Committee in line with the provisions of the Operational Guidelines, and refrain from lobbying for any decision that many threaten the Outstanding Universal Value or that is in violation of the Operational Guidelines and Rules of Procedure.</p>	<p><b>Belgium</b> notes that “these provisions concern all States Parties. As such, they should be moved to the relevant chapter or the wording should be revised to reiterate that, for cases concerning them, Committee members must also comply with the provisions applying to all States Parties.”</p> <p>See also comments by <b>Belgium</b> in paragraph 2 of the section “Purpose and scope” and in point I.iii and in point II.20.</p> <p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> supports “without further amendments the wording of</p>

	<p>this principle.”</p> <p>Amendment proposed by the <b>Russian Federation</b>:</p> <p><b>Provide</b> <del>Contribute with</del> truthful, credible and timely information for any case on their territory to be considered by the Committee in line with the provisions of the Operational Guidelines, and refrain from <del>lobbying</del> <b>contributing</b> for any decision that <del>many</del> <b>may</b> threaten the Outstanding Universal Value or that is in violation of the Operational Guidelines and Rules of Procedure.</p> <p>Amendment proposed by <b>Saudi Arabia</b>:</p> <p>Contribute with <b>accurate</b> <del>truthful</del>, credible and timely information for any case on their territory to be considered by the Committee in line with the provisions of the Operational Guidelines, and apply integrity of the process at all times for any decision that many threaten the Outstanding Universal Value or that is in violation of the Operational Guidelines and Rules of Procedure.</p>
<p>8. Strictly observe that any new draft decisions, proposals or amendments should be submitted at least 24 hours before the discussion of the agenda item concerned (<i>Rules of Procedure</i>, Rule 23.3).</p>	<p><b>Belgium</b> notes that “this provision is not of the same nature as the others and should not impede the quality of debates.”</p> <p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> supports “the spirit of [this] point; nevertheless it would be welcomed clearer wording for better understanding. [The Czech Republic notes that] the original wording of the Rule 23.3 <i>Rules of Procedure</i> is sufficient in its principal: “<i>New draft decisions/proposals and amendments thereto should, whenever possible, be submitted to the Secretariat at least 24 hours before the discussion of the agenda item concerned.</i>” Nevertheless the rule of “submission 24 hours before the discussion of the agenda item concerned” should rather be related to the “new draft decisions and <u>fundamental</u> proposals or amendments”. During the session, the Committee should still be able to make further amendments in order to openly discuss and</p>

	<p>transparently react just during the session in the spirit of <i>Rules of Procedure</i> and <i>Code of Conduct</i> when working on the consensual final wording of a draft decision.” And therefore proposes the following amendment:</p> <p>Strictly observe that any new draft decisions, <b>fundamental</b> proposals or amendments should be submitted at least 24 hours before the discussion of the agenda item concerned<sup>1</sup>. (<i>Rules of Procedure</i>, Rule 23.3).</p> <p><b>Amendment proposed by the Russian Federation:</b></p> <p>Strictly observe <b>the Rule 23.3 of Rules of Procedure</b>, that <b>any</b> new draft decisions, proposals or amendments should <b>whenever possible</b> be submitted at least 24 hours before the discussion of the agenda item concerned (<del><i>Rules of Procedure</i>, Rule 23.3</del>).</p>
<p>9. In the interest of recognising global cultural diversity and equitable representation, encourage interventions from observers including local communities’ and indigenous peoples’ representatives in items concerning such groups or interests before decisions are made by the Committee (<i>Rules of Procedure</i>, Rules 6, 7, 22.4).</p>	<p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> supports “without further amendments the wording of this principle.”</p> <p><b>Amendment proposed by the Russian Federation:</b></p> <p>In the interest of recognising global cultural diversity and equitable representation, encourage interventions from observers including local communities’ and indigenous peoples’ representatives in items concerning such groups <del>or interests</del> <b>with the prior consent of the Chairperson</b> before decisions are made by the Committee (<i>Rules of Procedure</i>, Rules 6, 7, 22.4).</p> <p><b>Amendment proposed by Saudi Arabia:</b></p> <p>In the interest of recognising global cultural diversity and equitable representation, encourage interventions from observers including local communities’ and indigenous peoples’ representatives in items concerning such groups or interests before decisions are made by the Committee (<i>Rules of Procedure</i>, Rules 6, 7, <b>8</b>, 22.4).</p>

	<p>Amendment proposed by <b>China</b>:</p> <p>In the interest of recognising global cultural diversity and equitable representation, <b>while fully respecting the sovereignty and laws and regulations of the countries where the cultural and natural property is located</b>, encourage interventions from observers including local communities’ and indigenous peoples’ representatives in items concerning such groups or interests before decisions are made by the Committee (Rules of Procedure, Rules 6, 7, 22.4).</p>
<p>10. In its decision making concerning new nominations, avoid making a decision that is moving more than one step from the draft decision as recommended in the Advisory Body technical evaluation. This should only be done where there is clear technical and objective evidence in support of such a decision. For example, this may include decisions that move from a recommendation ‘not to inscribe’ to a deferral, or a recommendation for a referral to inscription. To uphold the integrity and credibility of the nomination process and the World Heritage List, decisions that move from a recommendation ‘not to inscribe’ or ‘defer’ to refer/inscribe must be avoided.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b> notes “that the non-paper as currently drafted requires each point under Section II to begin with a verb to make grammatical sense. The amendment to the first sentence below is made to reflect this. The second and third sentences are suggested as removed, as the principle of this paragraph is focused on deterring “<b>more</b> than one step from draft decisions” and therefore its focus should remain on this.” And therefore proposes the following amendment:</p> <p><del>In its decision making concerning new nominations, a</del> Avoid making a decision that is moving more than one step from the draft decision as recommended in the Advisory Body technical evaluation <b>when making decisions on new nominations</b>. <del>This should only be done where there is clear technical and objective evidence in support of such a decision. For example, this may include decisions that move from a recommendation of ‘not to inscribe’ to a deferral, or a recommendation for a referral to inscription.</del> To uphold the integrity and credibility of the nomination process and the World Heritage List, decisions that move <del>from</del> <b>between</b> a recommendation <b>of</b> ‘not to inscribe’ <b>to refer/ inscribe</b>, or ‘defer’ to <del>refer/inscribe</del> must be avoided.</p> <p><b>Belgium</b> suggests to “delete the last sentence which limits the Committee’s working and decision-making capacity. The work must be based on dialogue, mutual respect, as well as respect for each other’s prerogatives.”</p>

~~To uphold the integrity and credibility of the nomination process and the World Heritage List, decisions that move from a recommendation ‘not to inscribe’ or ‘defer’ to refer/inscribe must be avoided.~~

The **Czech Republic** “particularly supports the key recommendation **point 11** concerning the Committee decision making process of new nomination for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Committee Members should avoid making a decision that is moving more than one step from the draft decision as recommended in the Advisory Body technical evaluation. The Czech Republic considers it essential that Committee decisions do not deviate from Advisory Bodies advice and overlooking provisions of the Operational Guidelines.”

See also comments by **Sweden** in paragraph I.iii.

**Switzerland** “explicitly supports the proposed rule stipulating that when deciding on inscription on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee may not take a decision that deviates from the draft decision by more than one level (the four levels being not to inscribe, defer, refer, or inscribe.”

Proposal by the **Russian Federation**:

**[Paragraph as proposed by Australia]** ~~In its decision making concerning new nominations, a~~**A**void making a decision that is moving more than one step from the draft decision as recommended in the Advisory Body technical evaluation **when making decisions on new nominations**. ~~This should only be done where there is clear technical and objective evidence in support of such a decision. For example, this may include decisions that move from a recommendation of ‘not to inscribe’ to a deferral, or a recommendation for a referral to inscription.~~ To uphold the integrity and credibility of the nomination process and the World Heritage List, decisions that move ~~from~~ **between** a recommendation **of** ‘not to inscribe’ **to refer/ inscribe**, or ‘defer’ to ~~refer/inscribe~~ **[Russian Federation]** ~~must~~ **shall** be avoided.

<p>11. Recognise Outstanding Universal Value <u>only</u> when deciding to inscribe a property on the World Heritage List (<i>Operational Guidelines</i>, Paragraph 154), noting that a property does not have Outstanding Universal Value if it is not inscribed on the World Heritage List.</p>	<p><b>Austria</b> “suggests moving article 12, that addresses the recognition of OUV only at time of inscription, further up, considering its importance and ramifications for the Committee’s decisions and States Parties’ inscription policies and strategies.”</p> <p><b>Belgium</b> notes that “it should be clarified that it is the statement of universal value that is adopted at the time of inscription on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage List identifies properties of outstanding universal value. The Committee recognises that value, but that value exists independently of the inscription (see Article 12 of the Convention).”</p> <p><b>China</b> considers that “this article is contrary to Article 12 of the World Heritage Convention” <b>and therefore proposes to remove paragraph 11.</b></p>
<p>12. Promote and adhere to the goal of the Global Strategy for a more credible, balanced and representative World Heritage List.</p>	
<p>13. Ensure the full and timely payment of their assessed contribution to the World Heritage Fund.</p>	<p><b>Belgium</b> questions whether “this provision belong in a Code of Conduct. Its inclusion is all the more surprising given that the payment of voluntary contributions and any arrears is a condition of eligibility for the World Heritage Committee. If so, it should apply to all States Parties and should therefore be moved to the relevant chapter.”</p> <p>See also comment by <b>Belgium</b> in paragraph 1 of the section “Purpose and scope”.</p>
	<p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> proposes to consider the following additional Code provisions:</p> <p><b>The Chairperson of the Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>his/her role and mandate should be more precisely defined, particularly in leading and moderating discussions, following the Code of Conduct during the Committee meeting and especially in</b></li> </ul>

	<p>the case of the possible conflict of interest of any Committee member, in line with the provision 22.5., 22.6 and 22.7 of the <i>Rules of Procedure</i>.</p>
<p>The Committee strongly encourages the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies as well as the States Parties to the Convention to observe the <b>[Text]</b> and abide by the following provisions:</p>	<p><b>Australia</b> remarks that “the non-paper notes at the beginning that the World Heritage Centre is “hereinafter: the Secretariat” and the edit below reflects this. The change in the order of the stakeholders is also made to reflect the order in which they are listed in the following paragraphs.” And therefore proposes the following amendment:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Committee strongly encourages the <b>Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat</b> <del>World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies</del> as well as the States Parties to the Convention to observe the Code of Conduct and abide by the following provisions</p> <p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> supports “without further amendments the wording of this principle.”</p> <p><b>Sweden</b> considers that “this section is structured around the key actors concerned which is suitable. The [...] text marked in bold is unnecessary and should be removed” and therefore proposes to following amendment:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><del>The Committee strongly encourages the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies as well as the States Parties to the Convention to observe the Code of Conduct and abide by the following provisions:</del></p>
<p>The Advisory Bodies shall:</p>	
<p>14. Act in a manner consistent with this <b>[Text]</b>, particularly in their capacity to advise the Committee in its deliberations. This includes transparent, equal and open processes, publishing of principles and criteria for selection of experts to missions, evaluations and panels, strengthened efforts to enhance dialogue and provision of early advice.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b> notes that “this section needs the inclusion of active verbs to make clearer sense.” And therefore proposes the following amendment:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Act in a manner consistent with <del>the</del><sup>is</sup> Code of Conduct, particularly in their capacity to advise the Committee in its deliberations. This includes <b>maintaining</b> transparent, equal and open processes, publishing of principles and criteria for selection of experts to missions, evaluations and panels, strengthen<del>ing</del><sup>ed</sup> efforts to enhance dialogue and <b>ensuring</b></p>

**the** provision of early advice.

**Belgium** regrets that “the state of conservation reports on sites included on the List of World Heritage in Danger are not always presented to the Committee for discussion. When these are approved without being presented and debated, those sites remain “under the radar” and out of the spotlight.”

Belgium further notes that “the Nomination files process is increasingly complex and represents a significant financial investment. Undertaking that process is usually a long-term endeavour carried out in an inclusive manner. Serial transnational nominations are particularly time-consuming and require investment from both national authorities and local communities. The assistance of the Advisory Bodies and the implementation of the process at an early stage is particularly important in this type of nomination in order to avoid misleading impressions, misunderstandings, and the rise of tensions between the national authorities and the Advisory Bodies. Dialogue is essential and the earlier it is initiated, the better the outcome. Whether technical assistance is provided or not, all States Parties should be provided with general access”. *This comment by Belgium could also be applied to paragraph II.16.*

The **Czech Republic** supports “without further amendments the wording of this principle.”

**Sweden** considers that “In the sub-section on Advisory Bodies, the word “representation” would be fitting, either in paragraph 15 or in a new separate paragraph. Appropriate cross-references should be made to the Operational Guidelines and to any other relevant documents. The following sentence may be added to paragraph 15” and therefore proposes the following amendment:

Act in a manner consistent with this Code of Conduct, particularly in their capacity to advise the Committee in its deliberations. This includes transparent, equal and open processes, publishing of principles and criteria for selection of experts to missions, evaluations and panels, strengthened efforts to enhance dialogue and provision of early advice **and demonstrating efforts to achieve regional representation.**

See also comments by **Switzerland** in paragraph 2 of section “Purpose and scope”.



	<p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> proposes to consider the following additional Code provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>should make publicly available more comprehensive description of their methodology for assessing criteria, for selection of the field mission experts and for the panel experts and advisors</b></li> <li>- <b>at each stage of the nomination process, they should publish and more clearly refer to their existing policies of evaluation of the nominations, with a view of their possible amendments so as to increase the transparency and better understanding by the State Parties of reasoning behind their conclusions and recommendations</b></li> </ul>
The Secretariat to the Convention shall:	
15. Act in a manner consistent with the <b>[Text]</b> . This includes transparent, equal and open processes and strengthened efforts to enhance dialogue and provision early advice.	<p><b>Australia</b> notes that “this section needs the inclusion of active verbs to make clearer sense.” And therefore proposes the following amendment:</p> <p>Act in a manner consistent with the Code of Conduct. This includes <b>maintaining</b> transparent, equal and strengthen<b>ing</b> efforts to enhance dialogue and <b>ensuring the</b> provision of early advice.</p> <p>See also comment by <b>Belgium</b> in point II.15.</p>
-	<p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> proposes to consider the following additional Code provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>its role should be more precisely defined, so as to act as a facilitator in process of more intensive dialog among Advisory bodies and States Parties during the nomination process</b></li> <li>- <b>in line with Rules of Procedure (the Rule 45) “the documents relating to the items on the Provisional Agenda of each session of the</b></li> </ul>

	<p><i>Committee shall be distributed at the latest six weeks before the beginning of the session”, and in order to increase the transparent, better understanding and preparedness of the Committee and the State Parties to the Committee session, the Secretariat should distribute (even if successively in several sets) working documents such as reports, progress reports, follow-up documents, general policy statements or scientific and/or thematic studies that follow some requirement of previous decision or resolution, etc. for Committee session as soon as they are available and not wait with their distribution to the latest date.</i></p>
The States Parties to the Convention shall:	See also the contribution submitted by the <b>Russian Federation</b> in advance of the third meeting of the Open-ended working group (paragraph 10).
	<p><b>Palestine</b> proposes as a new paragraph 17 the following amendment :</p> <p><b>Abide by the provisions of the convention including the full and timely payment of their assessed contribution to the World Heritage Fund.</b></p> <p>See also the contribution submitted by the <b>Russian Federation</b> in advance of the third meeting of the Open-ended working group (paragraph 11).</p>
16. Act in a manner consistent with the [Text] to uphold the integrity and credibility of the World Heritage Convention for the benefit of all States Parties.	See comment by <b>Belgium</b> in paragraph 2 of the section “Purpose and scope”.
17. Support the Committee in meeting its responsibility to make impartial decisions based on objective and scientific considerations ( <i>Operational Guidelines</i> , Paragraph 23) through open and equal dialogue and information sharing with the Committee and the Secretariat.	

<p>18. Respond to all requests for information in a timely manner, facilitate missions requested by the Committee, provide credible and reliable information and ensure consultation with relevant stakeholders including local communities and indigenous peoples.</p>	<p><b>Belgium</b> considers that “consideration should also be given to implementing Article 172 and the questioning of the Committee by third parties. The participation and involvement of communities ensures the successful implementation of the Convention, but it is important to avoid using the Convention as a means to apply pressure and interfere in the States’ management”.</p> <p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> supports “without further amendments the wording of this principle.”</p> <p>Amendment proposed by <b>China</b>:</p> <p>Respond to all requests for information in a timely manner, facilitate missions requested by the Committee, provide credible and reliable information and, <b>while fully respecting the sovereignty and laws and regulations of the countries where the cultural and natural property is located</b>, ensure consultation with relevant stakeholders including local communities and indigenous peoples.</p>
<p>19. Refrain from influencing the Committee’s deliberations and decision making through lobbying before and during the World Heritage Committee sessions (<i>Rules of Procedure</i>, Rules 22.5, 22.6 and 22.7). In particular, the States Parties shall observe the requirement concerning conduct during voting stipulating that “<i>After the Chairman has announced the beginning of voting, no one shall interrupt the voting</i>” (<i>Rules of Procedure</i>, Rule 36).</p>	<p>See comment by <b>Belgium</b> in paragraph 2 of the section “Purpose and scope” and in points I.iii, II.4, II.6 and II.8.</p> <p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> supports “without further amendments the wording of this principle.”</p>
<p>20. Voluntarily be restrictive with new nominations to ensure a more representative and balanced World Heritage List where the State Party is already well represented on the World Heritage List.</p>	<p>See comment by <b>Belgium</b> in paragraph 2 of the section “Purpose and scope” and in points I.iii, II.4, II.8 and II.20.</p> <p>The <b>Czech Republic</b> supports “the spirit of this point; nevertheless it would be welcomed clearer wording for better understanding. The Czech Republic proposes to delete the second part of the recommendation, as a number of already inscribed properties of the State Party is not a proper criterion, variety</p>

of heritage typology differs; the representative and balanced World Heritage List should be achieved through different tools e.g. thematic studies and filling the gaps.” And therefore proposes the following amendment:

Voluntarily be restrictive with new nominations to ensure a more representative and balanced World Heritage List ~~where the State Party is already well represented on the World Heritage List.~~