

World Heritage Patrimoine mondial

7 EXT.COM

Distribution limited / Distribution limitée

WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF. 3C
Paris, 3 December / décembre 2004
Original: English / French
Anglais / français

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'EDUCATION,
LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE/CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA
PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL, CULTUREL ET NATUREL

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE/COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Seventh Extraordinary Session/-Septième session extraordinaire

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room II

Paris, Siège de l'UNESCO, Salle II

6 – 11 December / décembre 2004

Item 3C of the Provisional Agenda: Report of the Rapporteur of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (Suzhou, 2004)

Draft Summary Records of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (Suzhou, 2004)

Point 3C de l'ordre du jour provisoire: Rapport du Rapporteur de la 28e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (Suzhou, 2004)

Projet de compte-rendu analytique de la 28e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (Suzhou, 2004)

World Heritage Patrimoine mondial

28 COM

Distribution limited /limitée

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.26
Paris, 3 December / 3 décembre 2004
Original: English /Français

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

**ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES
POUR L'EDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE**

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

**CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE
MONDIAL, CULTUREL ET NATUREL**

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

**Twenty-eighth session
Vingt-huitième session**

**Suzhou, China/Chine
28 June/juin – 7 July/juillet 2004**

Item 26 of the Agenda : Adoption of Decisions

**Draft Summary Record of the Twenty-eighth session of the World Heritage
Committee (Suzhou, 28 June - 7 July 2004)**

Point 26 de l'ordre du jour : Adoption des Décisions

**Projet de Compte-rendu analytique de la Vingt-huitième session du Comité du
Patrimoine mondial (Suzhou, 28 juin - 7 juillet 2004)**

Agenda item/
Point d'Ordre
du jour

Page
No.

1. Opening session
Ouverture de la session
2. Introduction by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
Introduction par le Directeur général de l'UNESCO ou son représentant
3. Welcome by the Host Country
Allocution de bienvenue par le pays hôte
4. Requests for Observer status
Demandes du statut d'observateur
5. Adoption of the Agenda
Adoption de l'ordre du jour
6. Report of the Rapporteur of the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee (Paris, 30 June - 5 July 2003)
Rapport du Rapporteur sur la 27e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (Paris, 30 juin - 5 juillet 2003)
7. Report of the Rapporteur of the 14th General Assembly of States Parties (Paris, 14-15 October 2003)
Rapport du Rapporteur sur la 14e Assemblée générale des Etats parties (Paris, 14-15 octobre 2003)
8. Programme and Budget 2004 - 2005 (32C/5) approved by the 32nd General Conference of UNESCO
Programme et Budget 2004 - 2005 (32C/5) approuvé par la 32e Conférence générale de l'UNESCO
9. Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities and on the implementation of the Decisions of the World Heritage Committee
Rapport du Centre du patrimoine mondial sur ses activités et sur la mise en œuvre des décisions du Comité du patrimoine mondial
- 10A International Assistance: Examination of International Assistance requests
Assistance internationale: Examen des demandes d'Assistance internationale
- 10B International Assistance: Progress report on the evaluation of International Assistance
Assistance internationale: Etat d'avancement sur l'évaluation de l'Assistance internationale
11. Execution of the Budget
Exécution du Budget

12. Proposals concerning the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget 2006 - 2007 (Draft 33C/5)
Propositions concernant la préparation du Projet de Programme et Budget 2006 - 2007 (Projet 33C/5)
13. Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List
Stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial représentative, équilibrée et crédible
- 14A Establishment of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger: Tentative Lists
Etablissement de la Liste du patrimoine mondial et de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril : Listes indicatives
- 14B Establishment of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger: Nominations of properties to the World Heritage List
Etablissement de la Liste du patrimoine mondial et de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril : Inscription de biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial
- 15A Examination of the state of conservation : Properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger
Examen de l'état de conservation : Biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril
- 15B Examination of the state of conservation : Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
Examen de l'état de conservation : Biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial
- 15C Examination of the state of conservation : Update on the List of World Heritage in Danger
Examen de l'état de conservation : Mise à jour de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril
16. Presentation of the Periodic Report for Latin America and the Caribbean and follow-up regional Programme
Présentation du Rapport périodique pour l'Amérique latine et les Caraïbes et suivi du Programme régional
- 17A Progress Reports on Periodic Reporting: Progress report on the preparation of the Periodic Report for Europe and North America
Rapports d'avancement sur la soumission des Rapports périodiques : Etat d'avancement sur la préparation du Rapport périodique pour l'Europe et l'Amérique du Nord
- 17B.I Progress Reports on Periodic Reporting: Follow-up to the Periodic Report in the Arab States
Rapports d'avancement sur la soumission des Rapports périodiques : Suivi du Rapport périodique dans les Etats arabes

- 17B.II Progress Reports on Periodic Reporting: Protection of Palestinian Cultural and Natural Heritage
Rapports d'avancement sur la soumission des Rapports périodiques : Protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel palestinien
- 17C Progress Reports on Periodic Reporting: Follow-up to the Periodic Report in Africa
Rapports d'avancement sur la soumission des Rapports périodiques : Suivi du Rapport périodique en Afrique
- 17D Progress Reports on Periodic Reporting: Follow-up to the Periodic Report in Asia and the Pacific
Rapports d'avancement sur la soumission des Rapports périodiques : Suivi du Rapport périodique en Asie et dans le Pacifique
- 18 Performance indicators for World Heritage Programmes
Indicateurs de performance pour les Programmes du patrimoine mondial
- 19 Progress report on the Global Training Strategy
Etat d'avancement de la stratégie globale de formation
- 20 Progress report on the Partnerships for World Heritage Conservation (PACT) initiative
Etat d'avancement de l'initiative de partenariats pour la conservation du patrimoine mondial (PACTe)
- 21 Publication plans (including budgeted proposals) for a compilation of *World Heritage Basic Texts*, Guidance documents for the protection of World Heritage properties that would supplement the *Operational Guidelines* and a *Handbook on the World Heritage Convention*
Projets de publication (avec propositions budgétées) pour un recueil de *Textes fondamentaux sur le patrimoine mondial*, des documents de référence pour la protection des biens du patrimoine mondial qui complèteraient les *Orientations* et un *Manuel de la Convention du patrimoine mondial*
- 22 Report on the use of the World Heritage Emblem
Rapport sur l'utilisation de l'emblème du patrimoine mondial
- 23 Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur
Election du Président, des Vice-Présidents et du Rapporteur
- 24 Provisional agenda of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (June - July 2005)
Ordre du jour provisoire de la 29e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (juin-juillet 2005)
- 25 Other business
Questions diverses
- 26 Adoption of Decisions
Adoption des Décisions

- 27 Closure of the session
Clôture de la session

Annexes

- I** Agenda /Ordre du jour
- II** Chronological timetable of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (28 June - 7 July 2004)
Calendrier chronologique de la 28e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (28 juin - 7 juillet 2004)
- III** Index of Decisions of the World Heritage Committee
Index des Décisions du Comité du patrimoine mondial

1. to 3. OPENING SESSION

OUVERTURE DE SESSION

Document : WHC-04/28.COM/INF.1

The 28th session of the World Heritage Committee was opened by Mr Zhang Xinsheng (China) Chairperson, on 28 June 2004 in Suzhou, China. The Chairperson welcomed H.E. Mme Chen Zhili, State Councillor of the People's Republic of China, Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, the Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Liang Baohua, Governor of Jiangsu Province, Mr Michael Abiola Omolewa, President of the UNESCO General Conference, Mr Hans-Heinrich Wrede, President of the Executive Board, Mr Yang Weize, Mayor of Suzhou, Committee Members, States Parties and all observers. The 21 members of the Committee: Argentina, Benin, Chile, China, Colombia, Egypt, India, Japan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland participated in the session.

72 States Parties to the World Heritage *Convention* who are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Barbados, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Vietnam and Yemen.

The Permanent Observer Mission of Palestine to UNESCO also attended this session as an observer.

Representatives of the Advisory Bodies to the Committee, namely the International Centre for the

Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) also attended the session.

Opening address by Mr Zhang Xinsheng, Chairperson (China)

Address by Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO.

Welcome addresses by the Host Country :
Address by H. E. Mr. Hu Jintao, President of the Republic of China
Address of Mr Liang Baohua, Governor of Jiangsu Province
Address by the Mayor of Suzhou.

Speech by Professor Michael Omolewa, President of the UNESCO General Conference.

Speech by Ambassador Hans-Heinrich Wrede, Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO.

The List of Participants is included as **Annex I** to Decisions, document *WHC-04/28.COM/26*.

4. REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

DEMANDES DU STATUT D'OBSERVATEUR

*Documents: WHC-04/28.COM/4
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.4*

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a last-minute request for observer status had been received from three representatives of the Global Heritage Fund.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that Mrs Christina Cameron from Canada was identified as an observer in the document and suggested that her name should be removed from the observer list as she was the head of the Canadian delegation. She also noted that there were many representatives from the media (journalists, broadcasters) on the list. She reminded the Committee that Rule 8 of the *Rules of Procedure*, governing requests for observer status, allowed for non-profit-making institutions only as observers to Committee sessions, and asked how it could be applied to media representatives.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the media representatives concerned were there as partners involved in various World Heritage activities. They would be participating in the Partnership Presentations and would not be operating as journalists but as observers of the various organisations.

Se référant au projet de décision **28 COM 4**, la délégation du **Liban** demande que soit ajoutée au paragraphe 2 du projet de Décision la catégorie des missions d'observation auprès de l'UNESCO, expressément prévue par le *Règlement intérieur*.

5. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

ADOPTION DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR

*Documents: WHC-04/28.COM/5 Prov
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.5 Rev*

Mr. Zhang Xinsheng, the **Chairperson** of the World Heritage Committee, informed the Committee of a press conference to be held at 12:30, and reported on the previous day's Bureau recommendations to World Heritage Committee. He recommended the adoption of the provisional agenda as amended, whereby item 14 would precede item 13. He noted that International Assistance requests would be discussed under item 10A of the agenda. He presented the Bureau recommendation that media not be allowed during the working sessions of the World Heritage Committee. He also reported on the Bureau recommendation that the World Heritage Committee review the nomination of the Bam Citadel in Iran given the exceptional circumstances surrounding that property. He also noted the Bureau's recommendation not to consider changing the current procedure in regards to producing 2 complete Summary Records of the Committee proceedings, one in French and one in English.

The **Chairperson** took the opportunity to invite Arabic, Chinese and Spanish language speakers to indicate in which language (French or English) they would like their interventions recorded in the summary record. After several interventions of the concerned Members of the Committee, it was decided that interventions made in Spanish, Arabic and Chinese would be reported in English.

In their interventions regarding the language of preference for the Summary record, the Delegations of **Argentina, Colombia, Oman,**

India, and Lithuania thanked the host country for its warm welcome and the Chairperson of the Committee for his good work.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the proposed modifications of the agenda. However, it noted that in the future, it would like the order to be re-inversed so that the State of Conservation reports be examined before the nominations.

The Delegation of **India** sought clarification as to the rationale for placing item 14 prior to item 13. Item 13 is integrally related to Cairns decision, and the Delegation expressed concerned about lack of time to deal with it.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that item 13 would now include the recommendations of the Working Group on the Cairns decision, and that this Working Group would need the time to deal with the issue. Placing item 13 after item 14 would give the Working Group sufficient time to do so.

The Delegation of **Canada** (Observer) expressed concern on the small amount of time allocated to the periodic reporting section of the agenda. It stated that it had spent 2 years working on its own periodic report, and thinks that 4 hours to cover a new report, and follow-up on previous periodic reports is too short. If there is an opportunity to give more time, it would be appreciated.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that Canada's observations were appropriate and all would be done to find additional time. He noted that a side event during the Tuesday lunch had been organized to discuss the Latin American and Caribbean periodic report. He hoped that this even would help reduce the time needed during the Committee deliberations on periodic reporting.

La Mission d'Observation de la **Palestine** (Observateur) remercie le Président et les autorités chinoises pour leur accueil chaleureux. Notant l'amendement proposé par le Liban sur le paragraphe 2 du Projet de décision **28 COM.4**, la délégation demande également à figurer sous le nom "Mission d'Observation de la Palestine auprès de l'UNESCO" dans la Liste des participants.

The **Chairperson** asked for volunteers to form the Working Group on the Cairns Decision.

The Delegations of **India, Egypt, Colombia, Lebanon, China, South Africa, Lithuania, Saint**

Lucia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Benin, Argentina, Portugal, UK, Japan offered to volunteer.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed concern on the size of the working group and suggested that it be limited to a set number of countries per region.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Working Group would be open ended and that others were welcomed to join. The Working Group would provide proposal for the committee to discuss during agenda item 13.

The Delegation of **Norway** stated that according to rule of procedure 21, only members of the World Heritage Committee could be part of the Working Group. The Chair concurred.

The Delegation from **Saint Lucia** suggested that the Working Group size should be workable and operational.

Se déclarant très honorée de l'accueil des autorités chinoises à Suzhou, la délégation du **Bénin** souligne que le groupe de travail est beaucoup trop large et inclus presque la totalité des membres du Comité. Aux fins d'un travail effectif, la délégation recommande qu'un ou deux représentants de chaque région ainsi que les Organisations consultatives fassent partie de ce groupe.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that the Working Group should be smaller to ensure effectiveness. It suggested that the number and identity of countries should be determined at lunch time amongst those having expressed interest.

La délégation du **Liban** apporte son appui à la proposition de réduire le Groupe de travail en limitant le nombre de ses membres et souligne que deux représentants par région serait une bonne solution.

The **Chairperson** suggested that at a lunchtime meeting, the interested Delegations could identify the members of an appropriately sized Working Group.

The **Chairperson** declared the agenda adopted as amended.

6. REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE 27TH SESSION OF THE

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
(PARIS, 30 JUNE - 5 JULY 2003)**

**RAPPORT DU RAPPORTEUR SUR
LA 27E SESSION DU COMITE DU
PATRIMOINE MONDIAL (PARIS, 30
JUN - 5 JUILLET 2003)**

*Documents: WHC-04/28.COM/6
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.6*

The **Rapporteur** of the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee, Ms Louise Graham, presented her report. The principles laid down by the Committee regarding drafting had been applied consistently in the production of the Decisions and the Summary Record. There had been a substantial improvement in the formatting of the decisions, although some improvements could still be made. The previous year, 2003, had been a busy one for World Heritage, with three statutory meetings being held (the 6th extraordinary session of the Committee, 27th session of the Committee and 14th General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention). The volume of work involved in the preparation and follow-up of the meetings had resulted in delays in the production of the summary record of the 27th session, and revision of the *Operational Guidelines* had added to the delay. The first draft of the summary record had been produced seven months after the session. It had been sent to the heads of delegation only recently and they had been given two weeks to submit their comments. The comments had been incorporated in the draft and the latest version distributed at the present session. The document was in French and English, the Committee's working languages.

With regard to the present session, substantial changes were being made, and the Rapporteur hoped to have a first draft within six weeks. The style of the Summary Record had not yet met the standards requested by the Committee; however, the Secretariat's skills were being supplemented at that session in order to correct that aspect. She thanked Ms Bénédicte Selfslagh, the previous Rapporteur, with whom she had had regular meetings to ensure consistency, for her tireless effort, patience and skills. She also thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Assistant Director-General for Culture for their support and personal interest, as well as the Secretariat, which, despite losing key members and skills, continued to perform its duties in a professional and courteous way. The Rapporteur

expressed concern at the loss of staff at the Centre over the past year, including those responsible for core functions. The Director-General of UNESCO had identified the problem at the 12th session of the General Assembly (2001), but little progress had been made since then. She said that the Committee had received a draft summary record of the 6th extraordinary session (17-22 March 2003), and asked the Chairperson to give floor to the Rapporteur of that session for a brief comment on the issue.

Le **Rapporteur** de la sixième session extraordinaire, Mme Selfslagh, informe le Comité que le projet de Résumé des interventions complété et corrigé sera mis à la disposition du Comité dans l'après-midi du 28 juin. Mme Selfslagh informe qu'elle reste à la disposition des délégations qui souhaiteraient y apporter des commentaires. Elle espère que la version définitive, intégrant d'éventuelles modifications proposées par les délégués, pourra être établie avant la fin des travaux de la présente session.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked both the Rapporteurs for their work and agreed with the remarks regarding staff changes in the Centre, expressing a need for continuity. It would be presenting some ideas thereon at a later stage of the session, in particular concerning resources devoted to the work of the Committee within UNESCO.

La délégation du **Bénin** remercie les deux rapporteuses pour les excellents rapports présentés. Elle souhaite savoir quelles dispositions le Centre du patrimoine mondial compte prendre pour répondre à la préoccupation importante soulevée par le Rapporteur de la 27^e session, concernant la diminution des effectifs du Centre. Elle propose au Comité de porter cette question à l'attention du Directeur général de l'UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Rapporteurs and shared the concerns raised with regard to the staffing situation of the Centre. It noted its intention to return to the issue under Other business.

The Delegation of **Argentina** thanked both Rapporteurs and concurred with the concerns voiced by previous speakers regarding posts at the Centre. It further noted the particular problem of the lack of permanent staff dealing with the Latin America and Caribbean region.

The Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Rapporteurs and endorsed the comments made by other delegations regarding staffing issues at the Centre.

The Delegation of **Portugal** took note of the report and thanked the Rapporteurs for accurate and detailed work. It endorsed other delegations' concern with regard to staffing issues at the Centre.

The Delegation of **Japan** also concurred with other delegations' concern with regard to staffing issues at the Centre and announced that it would speak on the issue later in the session.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the summary record was an essential instrument in creating a better institutional memory. It would also express its views on staffing matters at a later stage.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** concurred with the previous speakers and made specific reference to the need to ensure that the different regional groups were represented at the Centre.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the Rapporteurs for the quality of their work, and expressed preoccupation with regard to the staffing situation of the Latin America and the Caribbean desk of the World Heritage Centre.

7. **REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 14TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (PARIS, 14-15 OCTOBER 2003)**

RAPPORT DU RAPPORTEUR SUR LA 14E ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES (PARIS, 14-15 OCTOBRE 2003)

Document : WHC-04/28.COM/7

The **Rapporteur** of the 14th General Assembly of States Parties (Paris, 14-15 October 2003), Ms. Alissandra Cummins, thanked the Chinese authorities for the excellent preparations for hosting the World Heritage Committee, introduced the document, which had originally been issued with the document code *WHC-03/14.GA/10*.

She said that the General Assembly, after electing its Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur, had considered and taken decisions on seven items concerning procedural and substantive matters. Given the shortness of time, she would not review procedural items such as Item 3A, "Revision of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly", Item 6, "Examination of the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund, including the status of the States Parties' contributions" and Item 7, "Determination of the amount of the contributions to the World Heritage Fund in accordance with the provisions of Article 16 of the *World Heritage Convention*", all of which had been adopted without significant debate. She would instead concentrate her remarks on those issues which had generated considerable discussion.

Item 4, concerning a new voting mechanism and revision of procedures for election of members of the World Heritage Committee, had called for the General Assembly to adopt Resolutions 14 GA 4.1 and 14 GA 4.2. The General Assembly had paid significant attention to Resolution 14 GA 4.2, concerning proposed amendments to Rule 13 of the Rules of Procedure which aimed to establish a clear timetable and procedure for the invitation, presentation, notification and closure of the list of candidatures for elections to the World Heritage Committee, as reflected in the paragraph 2 of the Resolution, which set out the new Rule 13.

Item 5, "Report of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on the activities of the World Heritage Committee", had generated considerable debate because the limitation on budgetary

resources had affected the Committee's ability to address the persistent imbalance in both the geographical representation of sites as well as the bias in favour of cultural sites over natural sites, while recognizing that there were still over 40 States Parties with no World Heritage sites. The General Assembly had adopted Resolution 14 GA 5 as amended. The Resolution urged the Director-General to give priority to identifying new additional resources for the activities of the World Heritage Centre, whether within the Regular Budget or through extra-budgetary funds, particularly when preparing document 33 C/5.

The General Assembly had adopted the resolutions on Items 6 and 7 without amendment.

Item 8, "Progress report on the implementation of the Global Strategy for a credible, representative and balanced World Heritage List", had led to much debate. According to the Rapporteur, the States Parties had been preoccupied by the rate of progress of the initiatives undertaken within the Global Strategy to assist under- or non-represented States Parties, particularly concerning the implementation and reinforcement of capacity-building and training as well as increasing the representativity of the World Heritage List, giving special attention to the Pacific and Caribbean regions.

She recalled that the States Parties had identified a need for a future action plans to be informed by "an in-depth analysis of the implementation of this Strategic Objective" (para.148 of the working document). Citing paragraph 159 of the working document, she stressed that "Under-representativity was linked both to funding issues and to priority-setting by the World Heritage Committee and the States Parties. The Committee should develop recommendations to urgently address the under-representativity of the List and should also adopt a time frame for action" in Suzhou. Furthermore, she recalled, Resolution 14 GA 8, which had been prepared by a working group, recommended that "additional financial resources be allocated to the World Heritage Centre" for programmes to strengthen capacity in regions under-represented on the List, and requested that the Centre submit to the 28th session of the Committee draft proposals to enable the development of appropriate action plans.

Under Item 9, "Elections to the World Heritage Committee", States Parties had been invited to consider the composition of the World Heritage Committee since 1976 when filling eight seats on

the Committee, including one seat to be allocated to a State Party not represented on the World Heritage List. The Rapporteur recalled that the Chairperson had been asked to provide information, prior to the start of elections, on the implementation of the voluntary reduction of the term of office from six to four years, in accordance with the Resolution of the 13th General Assembly, as well as the recommendation by the Committee at its 24th session under agenda item 6.2, "Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee", regarding the representation of the different regions and cultures within the Committee and on the World Heritage List.

The Rapporteur noted further that the lack of satisfactory response given and the inadequacy of the information provided had caused great concern amongst the States Parties. The matter remained an outstanding issue which must be dealt with and guidelines for the format and timely presentation of information on the voluntary reduction of the term of office must be developed in conformity with previous decisions and prior to the next elections in 2005. She reported the outcome of the elections, whereby Kuwait, Benin, Chile, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Norway had been elected to the Committee.

Finally, she concurred with the points made previously by the Rapporteur of the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee on the production of documents. She thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture and the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his staff for their support. The first draft of the document had been prepared in late November 2003 and finalized by January 2004 when it had been available for circulation to the States Parties for comment and amendment.

The **Chairperson** said that if the Committee so agreed, he would consider that it took note of the working document. He closed Item 7.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the Committee might take more time to reflect on the working methods of the General Assembly.

8. PROGRAMME AND BUDGET 2004 - 2005 (32C/5) APPROVED BY THE 32ND GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO

PROGRAMME ET BUDGET 2004 - 2005 (32C/5) APPROUVE PAR LA 32E

CONFERENCE GENERALE DE L'UNESCO

Document : WHC-04/28.COM/8

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the working document and briefly described the objectives of the two Main Lines of Action concerning support to the World Heritage governing bodies, and the implementation of technical assistance to States Parties within the framework of the four strategic objectives of the Budapest Declaration on World Heritage of 2002.

The Delegation of **Argentina** requested information on the implementation status of activities outlined in document 32 C/5 and their results, as well as on the use of the additional US\$ 1 million provided by the United States as allocated by the General Conference at its 32nd session. It asked for the information to be made available in time for the discussion on Item 11, Execution of the Budget, as it would enable the World Heritage Committee to make any necessary adjustments to its decisions under Item 12, Proposals concerning the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget 2006-2007 (Draft 33 C/5).

The Delegations of **Saint-Lucia, the Netherlands** and the **United Kingdom** supported the proposals made by the Delegation of Argentina.

The **Chairperson** asked the World Heritage Centre to provide the information requested by the Delegation of Argentina and closed Item 8.

13. GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

STRATEGIE GLOBALE POUR UNE LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL CREDIBLE, REPRESENTATIVE ET EQUILIBREE (suite)

Documents : WHC-04/28.COM/13
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13B
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13C
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13D

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to give their opinion on the open-ended working group established under decision **27 COM 14** on the Cairns Decision.

The Delegation of **India** referred to the importance of the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List in the context of the Cairns Decision, and said that a mandate had been given to the working group to look at statistics concerning the List, as it did not reflect fully the cultural heritage of humankind and the world's natural treasures. A holistic policy framework was much needed.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that World Heritage was UNESCO's most visible programme and expressed its respect for the Centre's work. The Cairns Decision had been the result of a lengthy discussion process and covered many different issues. Thus far, 754 sites were inscribed on the List, and the question of its upper limit would arise in the decade to come. Another question was how the Centre could fulfil its task with the current limitations on its capacity and budget; the same was true for the Advisory Bodies. Conservation of the heritage was an essential duty, and ways and means for applying comprehensive safeguarding principles based on a common understanding needed to be found.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the Cairns Decision was related to two issues: workload and representativity. Global and comparative studies were certainly helpful, but it was up to States Parties to decide which sites to nominate. The development of tentative lists was certainly critical and it was important that assistance in that respect was available on grounds of intellectual rigour. The workload of the Centre and the Committee was also a problem, but the most important issue was that the sites already on the World Heritage List had to be managed adequately. The basis for World Heritage was its outstanding universal value and to deal with targets would undermine the World Heritage Convention. Only sites which satisfied the criteria of the Convention should be nominated.

La délégation du **Bénin**, quoique n'ayant pas soumis de commentaires sur la décision de Cairns, à l'élaboration de laquelle elle a cependant activement participé, pense qu'il faut éviter un dérapage du processus de coopération

internationale que la Convention du patrimoine mondial est censée mettre en œuvre. La décision en question, adoptée moins de quatre ans plus tôt, est le fruit d'un compromis, obtenu à l'issue de vastes consultations. La remettre en cause serait renoncer à la volonté d'équilibre régional qui avait présidé à son adoption. Or il s'agit plutôt de savoir dans quelle mesure la Liste du patrimoine mondial peut être effectivement plus représentative et crédible, autrement dit de rechercher des modalités efficaces de renforcement des capacités, de coopération technique et d'assistance technique. Telle est la voie à suivre pour réellement contribuer à modifier la situation dans la région Afrique.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that the Convention was an instrument for international cooperation. The Cairns Decision was one of a group of closely connected decisions, including those regarding tentative lists, the credibility of the List, and natural and cultural balance. To date, there were still well over 40 countries without sites and the 14th General Assembly of States Parties, in its resolution 14 GA 8, had clearly indicated the need to develop action plans in that respect. Tentative lists should be seen as an active tool in redressing the current situation, the Internet should be used and an overall review of the Global Strategy should take place in 2007. Finally, it supported maintaining the Cairns Decision and integrating it into a broader framework.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that not enough time had elapsed since the adoption of the Decision - it was important to take a long-term perspective. It underscored the fundamental role of selection under the Convention. The promotion of cooperation between transborder sites was critical. It was also crucial to preserve the spirit of the Convention and for the situation to be assessed by the working group.

The Delegation of **Oman** said that countries were entitled to review the Cairns Decision, but that it would be useful to wait until it had been implemented for a five-year period before making an evaluation. The working group should examine the critical issues of expertise in some countries, the assistance needed to prepare nominations, and the capacity of the Centre.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its wish for a holistic approach including capacity-building, international cooperation and global coverage. The efforts of States Parties should focus on cooperation and complementarity of activities.

Concerning the guidelines for the working group, the Delegation of **China** said that it should look at the main purpose of the List, the imbalance of the List and an effective methodology that could ensure quality. While the Cairns Decision should be maintained as it stood, the Delegation welcomed efforts to redress geographical distribution, under-representation of types, and the workload of the Advisory Bodies. It recommended a three-year time period for review. In the spirit of the Convention, it called for an objective assessment of the situation that could provide a basis for recommendations and practical development to supplement the Cairns Decision in joint efforts.

The Delegation of **Chile** recalled that the Decision had already been modified in 2003 with the change from 30 to 40 nominations. It agreed with the comments of the Delegation of Benin concerning representativity and management, and said that any further modification had to be undertaken in that spirit. The working group should put forward practical proposals.

The Delegation of **Columbia** said that it was in favour of maintaining the Cairns Decision, which was a consensus decision, but an assessment of it would be timely. The capacity of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to study and screen sites was critical.

The Delegation of **Egypt** remarked that there seemed to be more agreement than disagreement in the Committee. The basic problems were human resources and the capacity for handling nominations. Practical solutions were also needed for urgent issues including earthquakes, global warming and environmental pollution. The Decision should be reviewed in two to three years' time.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that the Cairns Decision was not unchangeable. Over 40 countries were still without a site and there were many questions to be addressed by the working group, including the qualities a site should have to merit inscription; the regional imbalance of the List; the credibility of each site; whether there should be a limit to nominations; how to deal with sites in danger; the human resources of the Centre; the viability of the Global Strategy, and the availability of funds, which might be decisive.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the views expressed and considered that the Cairns Decision

should remain in place for a number of years. The main issues for the group would be the credibility of the World Heritage List and the question of capacity.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it had submitted comments and proposals in writing on the subject under discussion. As regarded the mandate of the working group, it had an excellent reference tool in the form of the guidelines handed down by the Committee at its 27th session.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that not enough time had elapsed since 2000 to be able to see concrete results and that the focus should be on capacity building. The Advisory Bodies and the staff of the Centre were overburdened with work. It recalled that there were other options for assistance, and said that regional programmes to train trainers should be reinforced. Another important issue concerned the state of conservation for which the Committee had global responsibility, in particular as many sites had no management plans.

La délégation du **Liban** remarque qu'il est assurément trop tôt pour évaluer, voire remettre en cause la décision de Cairns. Elle rappelle, comme la délégation du Bénin, que cette décision est le fruit d'un compromis. La remettre en question reviendrait à mettre en doute la capacité du Centre du patrimoine mondial et des organisations consultatives de s'acquitter de leur tâche avec sérieux. Le groupe de travail devrait en fait réfléchir à la meilleure façon de mettre en œuvre la décision de Cairns.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** agreed that more time was needed. As the Centre already had capacity problems, it wondered how it would be affected with even more sites on the List.

La délégation de l'**Italie** (Observateur) observe que le débat tourne autour de trois points essentiels : l'esprit de la décision de Cairns, son applicabilité et la question de son abandon ou non. La délégation soutient l'esprit de Cairns ainsi que la rationalisation du travail du Centre du patrimoine mondial. En ce qui concerne l'application, elle relève un malentendu sur le fond car le Comité a associé deux aspects qui ne devaient pas l'être : la limitation du nombre de sites à inscrire et les questions relatives au Centre. Et elle se prononce contre l'abandon de la décision. Tirant le bilan de sa contribution financière au Centre, la délégation fait les propositions concrètes suivantes, qui visent à améliorer la décision sans pour autant pénaliser

les Etats parties déjà représentés sur la Liste: renforcement des capacités, à l'instar des efforts faits par l'Italie en Afrique, dans le Pacifique et dans les Caraïbes ; soutien financier des Etats parties au Fonds du patrimoine mondial pour les sites naturels ; mise en place de programmes de formation d'experts du patrimoine mondial en collaboration avec des universités, sur le modèle des activités menées de concert avec l'Université de Sienne et l'Institut de Florence; assistance technique pour l'élaboration de plans de gestion pour les sites qui en sont dépourvus.

La délégation de la **France** (Observateur) note que la décision de Cairns a déjà porté des fruits depuis son adoption. Elle exhorte le Comité à ne pas oublier, dans sa réflexion sur Cairns, les dommages que continuent de subir les sites du patrimoine mondial, qu'ils soient ou non inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril.

13. GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continued)

STRATEGIE GLOBALE POUR UNE LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL CREDIBLE, REPRESENTATIVE ET EQUILIBREE (suite)

Documents : WHC-04/28.COM/13
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13B
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13C
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13D

The **Secretariat** provided some information about interpretation arrangements and apologized for technical problems that had occurred the previous day.

In reply to a request from the Delegation of **Lebanon**, the **Chairperson** clarified the order of the Agenda to be followed and introduced item number 13 (Global Strategy) and asked the Advisory Bodies to present their analyses.

ICOMOS presented its analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists as regarded the cultural heritage.

IUCN presented its analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists as regarded the natural heritage.

The **Chairperson** commended the presentations, which would nourish the debate within the Working Group on the Cairns Decision set up by the Committee on the previous day. He therefore suggested discussing the matter within the overall debate on item 13 due to take place after the examination of the nominations, unless Committee members had any technical or procedural questions.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the ICOMOS presentation did not give adequate attention to the importance of the notion of Outstanding Universal Value, or to the role of States Parties in nominating sites. Neither was there sufficient linkage with the Global Strategy and the current *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Finally, it requested clarification on collaboration between ICOMOS and IUCN in the preparation of the two analyses, especially concerning cultural landscapes and mixed sites.

ICOMOS replied that the two organizations were aware of each other's work, and pointed to the analogies and similarities in their conclusions and recommendations.

La délégation du **Liban** se réjouit de la finalisation des rapports de l'IUCN et de l'ICOMOS qui, selon elle, ont grandement contribué à faire progresser la réflexion sur les moyens d'améliorer la représentativité de la Liste. Tout en rappelant que les deux organisations consultatives souhaitent obtenir les réactions du Comité sur leur travail, elle souligne la nécessité de ne pas mêler le débat sur le contenu des rapports à celui sur la Stratégie globale, afin de ne pas en amoindrir la valeur scientifique, et propose de ménager du temps pour un débat approfondi sur ces deux rapports.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, recalling that the two reports had been requested by the Committee four years earlier, stressed the importance of allocating enough time for a thorough debate on their contents, and considered that they should have not been presented simply as information documents, but as full-fledged working documents.

The Delegation of **India** said that the reports provided a very good basis for the Committee's deliberations and concurred with the remarks made

by the United Kingdom on the need to establish a link between the analyses and their implications for the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the view expressed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia and added that, given the great importance of the item, additional time for its discussion could have been allocated at the expense of other items on the agenda or the work of the Working Group on the Cairns Decision.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** observed that it would be difficult to make a distinction between technical and substantive comments on the matter, and joined other previous speakers in requesting adequate time for a debate on the two reports.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supporting the opinion expressed by the Netherlands, added that if it had known that the intention was not to have a debate until after examination of the nominations, it would not have agreed to the composition of the Working Group as proposed.

La délégation du **Bénin** appuie les interventions précédentes en faveur d'un examen séparé des deux rapports, et propose que le débat soit engagé en plénière et non au sein du groupe de travail.

The Delegation of **China**, while sharing the view of other speakers that the subject was important and should be allocated sufficient time for its consideration, recalled that the Committee had already decided to amend the agenda, postponing discussion of item 13 until after the examination of the nominations. It suggested therefore, supported by the Delegation of **Lithuania**, that the Committee stick with that decision and hold the debate at a later stage.

The Delegation of **India** stressed the link between the analyses and the remit of the Working Group, and suggested changing the agenda once more in order to have a debate on the analyses immediately.

The **Chairperson**, recognizing the need that had arisen for a debate on the presentations made by the Advisory Bodies, said that consideration of items 9, 10A, 11 and 12 would be postponed until after the examination of the nominations. Item 10B, however, would be maintained as foreseen in the agenda for practical reasons.

After this clarification on the Agenda, the Chairperson decided to continue the debate on item 13 and specifically on the analysis presented by ICOMOS (*WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A*)

La délégation du **Liban** souligne la cohérence de l'analyse qui distingue un cadre thématique et un cadre chronologique. Le rapport de l'ICOMOS confirme à son avis l'opinion du Comité sur le cas précis du patrimoine culturel, caractérisé par l'existence d'un déséquilibre, dans le nombre de sites inscrits sur la Liste, en faveur de l'Europe, du moyen âge, mais aussi des monuments religieux, ainsi que de la chrétienté occidentale.

Dans le même ordre d'idées, la délégation relève une disparité entre les diagrammes consacrés à l'analyse du patrimoine culturel des différentes régions, estimant que le patrimoine européen fait l'objet d'un traitement beaucoup plus poussé. Elle recommande vivement à l'ICOMOS, s'il ne veut pas courir le risque de se voir taxer d'eurocentrisme, d'étendre aux autres régions la méthode appliquée à l'Europe, et de mener par exemple une étude pertinente sur des pays comme la Chine, l'Inde ou le Japon. Par ailleurs, elle propose d'affiner l'analyse de catégories telles que celle des sites romains, que l'on retrouve jusqu'en Asie, et évoque l'éventualité d'un regroupement des grands empires dans une même catégorie.

Enfin, tout en engageant l'ICOMOS à combler les lacunes relevées dans son rapport, la délégation du Liban appuie la recommandation visant à mettre en place un ensemble d'activités telles que des ateliers régionaux.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** underscored the importance of regional and international cooperation in addressing the problems identified in the two analyses, and referred to a workshop held in its region to reflect on the issue of representativity in Latin America and the Caribbean.

La délégation du **Bénin** se félicite de la qualité du rapport qui reconnaît, notamment à la page 47, l'existence de lacunes dans l'appréciation des catégories. Elle propose néanmoins qu'un travail d'identification des lacunes soit fait pour la catégorie qualitative, afin de mieux adapter les stratégies de renforcement des capacités. Tout en jugeant la division typologique proposée satisfaisante, elle souligne, pour la catégorie "vernaculaire", la nécessité de poser une véritable problématique de réflexion afin de ne pas tomber

dans l'eurocentrisme, et suggère à l'ICOMOS, pour la catégorie des "itinéraires culturels", d'affiner son approche afin de permettre aux Etats parties de différencier, par exemple, la route de la soie de la route de l'esclave. Enfin, elle appuie, avec la délégation du Liban, la proposition d'organiser des séminaires régionaux en vue d'affiner les catégories dans le cas des régions moins bien représentées dans la Liste, telles que l'Afrique.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, thanking the two Advisory Bodies for their very useful contribution, highlighted three distinct issues. Firstly, the apparent difference in the approach between cultural and natural heritage, with particular reference to the definition of Outstanding Universal Value. Secondly, the question of credibility: if a property was of Outstanding Universal Value and yet was not well managed, should it be inscribed on the World Heritage List, and possibly also on the World Heritage List in Danger, as a means of enhancing its protection? Finally, given the widespread concern at the ever-increasing number of sites inscribed on the List, perhaps consideration should be given to ways of "shortening" it.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the two Advisory Bodies for having produced the long-awaited studies on the Lists. It highlighted the issues of the definition of Outstanding Universal Value, the sustainability of inscription on the World Heritage List, and the proposed Action Plan, which it would be necessary to follow up. That could be done both through regional meetings and through organizing a special two-day session of the World Heritage Committee, in December, to look exclusively at those specific issues.

The Delegation of **India** stressed the need to further develop the sub-categories in which the cultural heritage had been classified at regional and subregional levels. On the study presented by IUCN, it said that the suggestion that 300 would be a reasonable figure in order to achieve complete representativity of the world's natural heritage on the List contradicted the previous statement that further scientific development might provide new perspectives as to what was significant.

The Advisory Bodies should assist the States Parties in filling the gaps identified by the studies, especially with regard to the revision of Tentative Lists, taking into account the observation that inscribing all the sites presently on the Tentative

Lists would not improve the representativity of the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commenting on the presentations, observed however, that the approach taken by ICOMOS was too eurocentric. The key was to ensure credibility and transparency in the process aimed at filling the gaps on the List, bearing in mind that there would have to be an upper limit at one point and that other protection frameworks complemented the *World Heritage Convention*. IUCN should work with the States Parties to undertake collaborative studies, and avoid at all costs a piecemeal approach.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that the two studies took different approaches to the definition of Outstanding Universal Value, adding that it favoured the one proposed by IUCN. The problem had very practical implications, since it was necessary to set a target for the work of the Committee. The suggestion made by Portugal concerning a special meeting of the Committee on the issue was most appropriate.

The Delegation of **Colombia** emphasized the need for a regional approach and further collaboration between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. The categorization adopted for Latin America did not seem adequate.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, disagreed with the statement made by ICOMOS that the workload did not affect the quality of the assessments and reiterated that its approach was too eurocentric. It did appreciate the action-oriented nature of the ICOMOS report, though, and encouraged IUCN to follow suit. The Action Plan proposed by ICOMOS was welcome but existing instruments should not be forgotten. The revision of Tentative Lists seemed to be the priority in identifying the gaps on the World Heritage List, and it should be undertaken with the full involvement of the Advisory Bodies and UNESCO experts. It was necessary to avoid frustrating States Parties which had worked for years to put together a nomination only to see it rejected.

Turning to the study prepared by IUCN, the Delegation noted that it referred to the new *Operational Guidelines*, which had yet to be approved, and joined the Delegation of India in expressing a certain scepticism as to the proposed ceiling of 300 natural heritage properties. The system of classification proposed by IUCN,

moreover, was only one of the many available, which should have been taken into account to compensate for possible shortcomings. IUCN's approach to the scale of the properties should be reassessed, especially as far as small islands were concerned, relatively small areas which might well have Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** also objected to the total absence of consideration given to criterion (iii) in the analysis conducted by IUCN, on the grounds that beauty would not be scientifically measurable. On the contrary, there must be a methodology to assess beauty, and it was necessary to work together on that and other issues. The lack of an adequate bibliography was also noted, as well as consideration for the specific political issues related to transboundary sites. Finally, it raised the issue of the soundness of the Advisory Bodies' judgments on the criteria and called for an independent evaluation of their work.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand**, congratulating both Advisory Bodies on their reports, expressed its agreement with the idea of an upper limit, although it recognized that it would be difficult to set ceilings at that stage. It also commended IUCN for the recognition of the potential of South-East Asian marine areas for future inscriptions, and stressed the importance of scale, with specific regard to species conservation. On the ICOMOS study, it suggested that ICOMOS develop the concept of Outstanding Universal Value and avoid comparing different cultures, concentrating instead on regional contexts.

The Observer Delegation of **Sudan** emphasized the need to achieve a better balance in the List, recalling that its country, the largest in Africa in terms of area and extremely diverse in cultural and natural heritage, had only one property inscribed. It also stressed the urgent nature of protection measures with specific mention to the negative effects of the floods that had affected the archaeological site of Meroe.

The Delegation of **Oman** said that the lack of balance was due to the fact that countries had not done enough to identify and inscribe their sites. There was a need for awareness-raising and capacity-building in under-represented regions and UNESCO should have recognized those problems. Sometimes assistance had been prevented or hampered by communication problems, especially when international experts did not speak the local languages, or even by lack of competence.

The Delegation of **China** commended the reports presented by ICOMOS and IUCN, which constituted a basis for the discussion on the Global Strategy and the Cairns Decision, but stated that it would be impossible to provide reasonable technical comments on substantive reports in such a short time. It added that the study prepared by IUCN appeared based on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value and used a multidisciplinary approach. On the issue of balance, it must be seen in relative, rather than absolute terms. It was important to ensure credibility through the appropriate protection of natural and cultural heritage properties, and that called for coordination between IUCN and ICOMOS. At that stage there would be no need to fix a ceiling to the number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. On the other hand, including sites on the List was an effective way of enhancing cooperation and strengthening protection. With regard to the ICOMOS report, the Delegation found that it lacked balance and that more depth was required in the analysis of the Asian cultures, with particular attention to ethnic minorities. It would be necessary to organize regional expert workshops to further understanding of those issues.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the various comments regarding the organization of regional workshops, which might contribute significantly to better identifying gaps on the World Heritage List, ideally in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. In that respect, technical and financial assistance would be essential. There was a particular need to further develop Tentative Lists and management plans, and there should be synergy between the States Parties and the Committee to ensure the follow up of its recommendations.

The Delegation of **South Africa**, congratulating IUCN and ICOMOS on their analyses, stressed that it was an open process nourished by continuous research and cooperation which would lead to an improvement in the representativity of the List. States Parties which had not submitted a Tentative List must be assisted as a matter of priority, in line with the conceptual framework provided by the Global Strategy. In that regard, the definition of Outstanding Universal Value must be further developed in terms of both cultural and natural heritage. The Delegation expressed its concern regarding the sustainability of the World Heritage

List, with particular regard to the well-being of the communities living within or around the inscribed properties. Addressing that issue should be the next step in the development of the Global Strategy.

The Delegation of **Lithuania**, expressing appreciation for the studies presented by IUCN and ICOMOS, observed however that they needed to be harmonized, particularly as far as mixed properties were concerned. It also reiterated the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia on the need to streamline the nomination process and avoid insofar as possible the frustration of States Parties whose sites were rejected. The issue of which classification system to adopt should also be looked at by IUCN. The Delegation would be in favour of the meeting proposed by the Delegation of Portugal.

The Delegation of **Norway** joined previous speakers in noting a lack of consistency in the IUCN-proposed ceiling of 300 natural heritage properties to fill all the gaps in the World Heritage List, and its statement that new scientific research might open new perspectives in the understanding of natural heritage values. It also supported the Portuguese proposal to have a special meeting to address quantitative and qualitative issues related to the definition of Outstanding Universal Value. There was a need for collaboration between IUCN and ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** commented that clarifications on the meaning of Outstanding Universal Value would facilitate the harmonization of the two reports. It further observed that the grouping of regions within the same analytic approach would likely bring distortions, particularly in its part of the world. It supported the proposal to organize regional expert meetings, as well as the remark made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia on the issue of the scale of a property. It added that, as long as a property possessed Outstanding Universal Value, there would be no reason to establish any upper limit to the List.

La délégation du **Togo** (Observateur) félicite la Chine pour son accueil et, comme les délégations du Liban, du Bénin et de Sainte-Lucie, se prononce en faveur d'une meilleure représentativité des autres régions et plus particulièrement de l'Afrique. Elle suggère que, dans le cadre du patrimoine, la notion de solidarité internationale soit le fil conducteur du processus d'analyse complémentaire qui pourrait étayer le rapport de l'ICOMOS. Elle rappelle en outre la nécessité de ne pas transposer

les critères d'appréciation du patrimoine de l'Europe à celui des autres régions et appuie l'idée d'organiser des séminaires régionaux afin précisément de définir les spécificités propres à chaque région.

La délégation de la **France** (Observateur) constate que la vision de l'ICOMOS, telle qu'elle se dégage du rapport soumis, est influencée par l'expérience de la région Europe, qui privilégie le plus souvent l'approche chronologique, et précise que la notion de patrimoine a beaucoup évolué en France, notamment depuis l'adoption de la Convention. Prenant acte de la faible représentativité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial, elle propose que la réflexion dépasse le seul cadre des Etats parties pour s'inscrire dans un cadre plus régional, comme le préconisent à très juste titre l'ICOMOS et l'IUCN dans leurs rapports. Elle appuie à son tour l'idée d'organiser, comme le suggère la délégation du Portugal, des ateliers régionaux en association avec les organisations consultatives, qui constitueraient un préalable à l'organisation d'une réunion plus scientifique. Enfin, la France informe le Comité de son intention de mettre à jour sa Liste indicative et invite ses voisins européens à faire de même.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** emphasized that nominations should not be seen as a bureaucratic process and stressed the need for the early involvement of, and assistance from the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat, which would probably reduce the workload of the Committee at the later stage. It observed that transboundary sites were fully within the spirit of the *Convention*, and suggested that, besides reviewing Tentative Lists, the possibility of grouping distinct properties according to common themes should be explored.

The Observer Delegation of **Greece**, thanked IUCN and ICOMOS for their exhaustive reports, and drew the Committee's attention to the need to look into the Periodic Reports submitted by the various regions in order to assess which properties met the standards and requirements of World Heritage. The publication proposed by ICOMOS on a selection of 100 World Heritage properties was premature. On the other hand, an analysis of deferred and rejected nominations would provide useful insights.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled the importance, when adopting a classification system, of giving adequate consideration to local perspectives and their relation to global issues. It made reference in

that respect to the Red Sea and the Suez Canal, whose importance could be better understood in the regional context and through dialogue with local experts. IUCN should produce further guidelines on the issue of habitats. The improvement of the Tentative Lists seemed to be the way to proceed, but how to improve them was a moot point. The proposal put forward by IUCN regarding the publication of a World Heritage Atlas had to be discussed further among the various countries before it could be given support. The Delegation said that there seemed to be an imbalance among regions and themes. It was very important to work towards raising awareness in the less-represented regions. Countries must take action, but they needed technical and financial assistance. Concerning the typological frameworks proposed by IUCN in its study, deserts, and particularly the Sahara should be included, as well as the theme of great rivers. Desert landscapes had been the subject of a workshop held in Egypt which had stressed their great potential for World Heritage.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** pointed to the urgent need for awareness-raising, observing that not much had been done in that regard, as well as for technical assistance from the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to States Parties without the necessary expertise.

The early involvement of the Advisory Bodies in the preparation of Tentative Lists and nominations was also advocated by the Observer Delegation of the **Philippines**, together with the idea of an independent evaluation of their work. It referred to a specific case concerning its country, which had received US\$30,000 from UNESCO for assistance in preparing a nomination. The activity had been implemented by the UNESCO Bangkok Office which had transmitted the nomination to the Centre, only to see it rejected as incomplete by the latter. Such unpleasant situations could be avoided if the Advisory Bodies were more involved in the nomination process.

The Observer Delegation of **Peru** stressed the great commitment that World Heritage imposed on States Parties, especially with regard to maintaining heritage values and addressing at the same time the legitimate expectations of the communities living within or around the properties.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** agreed with several other speakers that the key to improving the representativity of the List was the revision of Tentative Lists. In that respect, both the top-down

and the bottom-up approaches should have been considered. It mentioned the need to provide technical assistance to States Parties, to obtain an early reaction from the Advisory Bodies on Tentative Lists and to make those available through publications, including on the Internet. With reference to the pyramid-shaped scheme contained in the presentation by IUCN, the Tentative Lists should be placed just under the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** emphasized the importance of preserving the credibility of the system, and called for immediate action to restore the true spirit of the *Convention*. It added that the Cairns Decision should be reviewed and its current provisions should not apply to under-represented regions. Advisory Bodies should be given the means to assist States Parties, while the more advanced countries should be invited by the Committee to provide the necessary resources.

In reply to the observations made by the members of the Committee and Observer Delegations, **ICOMOS** expressed its gratitude for the advice they had provided. It also agreed with the timeliness of organizing regional workshops. On the suggestion made by some to integrate further the analytical approaches of ICOMOS and IUCN, ICOMOS drew the Committee's attention to the fact that cultural heritage lacked the classificatory structure of the natural heritage. It agreed, however, that working in close association would certainly be beneficial. ICOMOS shared the view of the Delegation of Benin that spiritual and vernacular heritage should be given more attention, as well as views expressed by other delegations on other specific issues such as the need for a better chronology for sub-regions such as China. ICOMOS was ready to provide increased assistance in the process of identifying the heritage. The concept of Outstanding Universal Value, on the other hand, was clearly defined in the *Convention* and the *Operational Guidelines*, and was not easily changeable. At any rate, ICOMOS was fully ready to play its role, if adequate resources were made available.

IUCN, for its part, thanked all the speakers for their useful and constructive contributions. On the subject of the upper limit, it said that the proposed figure corresponded to their professional view, but that of course it might require adjustments. On the use of different classification systems, IUCN explained that in its analysis it had made reference to at least six, with a view to avoiding any possible

omission. Deserts, in particular, would soon be the subject of a specific study. IUCN further explained that the analysis was supposed to provide advice to the States Parties, alongside thematic studies and regional meetings held in the past. The revision of Tentative Lists constituted, in the view of IUCN, a great opportunity. Some States Parties had produced remarkable Tentative Lists, and they could be used as references. Concerning the possibility that the Advisory Bodies could be involved, or might assist States Parties in the preparation of nominations, IUCN considered that that would not be appropriate if they were supposed to provide the Committee with independent advice.

The establishment of a methodology to measure the beauty of a natural site, in the eyes of IUCN, posed insurmountable problems, taking into account the intrinsic cultural nature of that quality. Perhaps an analysis of the characters of the properties which had been inscribed under that criterion might provide some insight.

IUCN added that it already worked closely with ICOMOS, despite some differences in approach, and noted that the recommendations proposed by the two Advisory Bodies were similar in substance.

10B PROGRESS REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

ETAT D'AVANCEMENT SUR L'EVALUATION DE L'ASSISTANCE INTERNATIONALE

Document : WHC-04/28.COM/10B

The **Evaluator**, independent consultant Ms June Taboroff, presented the working document emphasizing that it was only a progress report, focusing in particular on the process and the criteria for the allocation of Emergency Assistance, providing information on funds granted, and recommending ways and means for improving efficiency, accountability, design and implementation.

The **Director of the Centre** added that it was only part of a more comprehensive evaluation in response to a request of the Committee. That report was due to be completed in the coming year. It would contain a performance assessment and

proposals for increasing effectiveness, especially with regard to the limited funds available. He explained that Emergency Assistance had been hard hit by the recent budget cuts in the World Heritage Fund. Therefore, links should be sought with other systems for assistance, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and with NGOs, for which partnerships should be established.

The report would further elaborate on a risk preparedness strategy to meet future emergency needs. The latest information, which had been received the previous week, was that, as part of such a strategy, a Rapid Response Facility had been established with Vodafone International and the United Nations Foundation, in cooperation with Fauna & Flora International, a United Kingdom-based organization.

La délégation du **Bénin**, après avoir remercié le Centre du patrimoine mondial ainsi que l'évaluatrice pour le travail accompli, observe que le document soumis contient une critique sérieuse à l'égard de tous les acteurs concernés - Comité du patrimoine mondial, Etats parties, Centre du patrimoine mondial, organisations consultatives - et met en cause tout à la fois la définition de l'urgence, le manque de suivi, l'utilisation des fonds et l'impact de l'assistance. Ainsi, c'est moins la stratégie qui est visée que la nécessité de définir la notion d'urgence, de respecter la réglementation et d'accorder une place plus importante à la prévention.

Deux questions fondamentales se posent à cet égard. En premier lieu, il est proposé au paragraphe 2.b du projet de décision que le Centre du patrimoine mondial "développe au cours de l'année à venir une analyse complète du processus d'assistance internationale financée par le Fonds du patrimoine mondial, afin de la présenter au Comité en 2005". Sachant qu'une première évaluation a été réalisée en 1998, cela signifie-t-il qu'il faut entreprendre de rechercher des fonds pour une deuxième évaluation? Le Bénin n'est pas de cet avis et considère qu'il faut exploiter les informations disponibles pour en tirer des conclusions. Il juge en outre particulièrement important d'élaborer une stratégie de prévention. En second lieu, est-il vraiment nécessaire d'organiser un séminaire pour le Centre, le Comité et les organisations consultatives afin de présenter les constatations de l'évaluation? Une réponse claire à ces questions paraît indispensable pour

assurer une bonne mise en oeuvre de l'assistance d'urgence.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the evaluator for her report. It would have been helpful if the terms of reference had been attached to enable an accurate assessment of the results of the evaluation. With regard to those results, the thorough review of Emergency Assistance contained useful recommendations for the Committee and the World Heritage Centre. Emergency Assistance and International Assistance had to be looked at in conjunction with each other, in line with the management review undertaken in 1998.

With regard to the criteria for providing Emergency Assistance to States Parties that were in arrears, the Delegation said that under normal circumstances such States Parties would not be eligible for receiving International Assistance, and it could thus, absurdly, become advantageous to let a property degrade to the extent that Emergency Assistance could be requested and granted.

It supported the recommendation to include the results of the Periodic Reports in the development of a strategy, as well as the recommendation on the importance of risk preparedness planning. However, it would like clarification on the recommendation on training, and on subparagraph 2a of the Draft Decision, which referred to discussing a set of proposals at a subsequent session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Japan** thanked the evaluator for an informative report and said that it supported the Draft Decision, provided that the cooperation referred to in its paragraph 3 with the Advisory Bodies and other international agencies also included cooperation with the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Argentina** expressed its satisfaction with the report and thanked the evaluator for her work. It agreed with the report's conclusions, with the exception of the implication that the Committee had not guided the granting of Emergency Assistance with a well-thought-out strategy. The Committee agreed with the need for improvement and the Delegation of Argentina proposed swift implementation of the recommendations with the oversight of the Committee. Implementation of the recommendations should be considered after completion of the full evaluation, and only then should a comparison be made with the means of

assistance deployed by other organizations. It questioned, however, the need for training and also suggested the establishment of a drafting group for the decision.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the evaluator for an excellent report, which flagged all the concerns of the Committee, and concurred with the comments of Benin, the Netherlands and Argentina. It gave the example of an Emergency Assistance request, the Rice Terraces of the Philippines, which had raised questions concerning the money being withheld by the UNESCO Regional Office, and parts of it used for the travel expenses of the Director of that office to the site, although he is not an expert. It endorsed the comments of the Delegation of Argentina concerning the immediate implementation of the recommendations and the establishment of a drafting group.

ICCROM thanked the evaluator for her report, calling the Committee's attention to the need for better monitoring and accountability. It suggested that the Committee discuss the definition of Emergency Assistance, as the figures in the report showed an inconsistent use of funds. It mentioned the important link with sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the question of funds allocated them.

Concerning risk preparedness and training, ICCROM described its activities in the Dominican Republic and India and the preparation of training kits on the subject. Funds for that did not come from Emergency Assistance but from the budget for training. It would be useful for the report's recommendation on training to be clarified.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the evaluator for an excellent report and agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia that action had to be taken before the next Committee session. Furthermore, it recalled that, contrary to what was stated in the report, there was no April 2004 version of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.

The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** supported the findings and recommendations of the report and explained, with regard to the Emergency Assistance provided for the Rice Terraces, that US\$75,000 had been granted and decentralized to the UNESCO Bangkok Office, of which US\$29,000 had been allocated to missions of the Secretariat and consultants, leaving US\$46,000 for

a stakeholders meeting. It stressed the need for a policy for directing assistance to the site and facilitating its removal from the Danger List.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** thanked the evaluator for her thorough report and commented that a drafting group should deal in particular with the granting of assistance to sites not on the World Heritage List or on the Tentative List. Given the small funds available, priority should go to sites on the Danger List.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** said that it was disturbed to have understood that the granting of Emergency Assistance to countries in arrears was referred to as "having a free lunch". The issue of States Parties which were in arrears and requested such assistance had been discussed in 1989, and the payment of dues was not necessary in case of natural disasters. The Emergency Assistance was not for the benefit of the State Party but intended to mitigate threats to the World Heritage site.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** commented that the State Party requesting and receiving Emergency Assistance should be informed on how to proceed with regard to accountability and provided with expert advice.

La délégation de la **Belgique** (Observateur) s'associe aux orateurs précédents, dont les remarques montrent que l'inquiétude du Comité était fondée. Elle attire l'attention du groupe de rédaction, sur l'article 20 de la Convention qui stipule que les fonds attribués dans ce cadre doivent aller à la préservation des biens et non aux dépenses administratives. Il convient en effet d'éviter que le Fonds ne serve, comme il arrive bien souvent, à financer des frais de gestion et d'administration.

La délégation du **Madagascar** (Observateur) signale que son pays a bénéficié à deux reprises de l'assistance d'urgence suite à des catastrophes naturelles et exprime sa reconnaissance pour cette aide, ainsi que pour l'évaluation indépendante fournie. Toutefois, bien que la notion d'urgence ne fasse pas de doute dans le cas d'une catastrophe naturelle, l'expérience montre que la procédure est trop longue et l'aide lente à venir. Le pays a dû puiser dans ses propres fonds pour "colmater la brèche" survenue dans le bien, puis attendre longtemps avant de récupérer la mise. La délégation souhaite que le Comité réfléchisse au

moyen de hâter la procédure pour prévenir ce genre de situation.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked about the conditions for the allocation of funds in the event of assistance being granted to countries in arrears, given the World Heritage Centre's lack of funds, and the possible negative consequences that that might have.

The Delegation of **India** referred to the relevant section of the report on World Heritage in Danger, and explained that India had received Emergency Assistance for a management plan for the site of Hampi. As fourteen properties had received such assistance and since the funds were already limited, it suggested creating a separate budget line for sites on the Danger List.

The **Evaluator**, in response to the questions raised about the recommendation on training, explained that it referred to training for staff of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies in best practices of disaster mitigation so that they could better assess and provide advice on requests for Emergency Assistance. The findings were only preliminary, a longer report was to be expected and a focal point should be established in the World Heritage Centre for the future handling of Emergency Assistance. She further elaborated on experiences in the World Bank, where there had been extensive evaluations of the emergency assistance that accounted for 20% of the Bank's lending. Rapid allocation of funds for humanitarian issues was justified, but in other cases it was considered better not to jump to quick solutions and instead to properly design assistance programmes and their follow-up. In conclusion, an average of two to three months was needed for approval of an Emergency Assistance request, which, although it could take longer, could not be considered to be particularly rapid.

ICOMOS said that when disasters struck, plans were needed and it referred to the case of Dubrovnik, where tiles were urgently needed to repair damage. Only scarce funds were available to save monuments. Specialists should continue searching for solutions.

The **Chairperson** concluded that the report reflected many of the Committee's concerns, reiterating that Emergency Assistance was important, and although the budget for it was limited, its impact did not have to be. The Draft Decision needed to be rewritten, under the

coordination of a Committee member. A drafting group was therefore established consisting of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Saint Lucia and Argentina.

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

ETABLISSEMENT DE LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL ET DE LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL EN PERIL

14A. Tentative Lists of States Parties submitted as of 15 May 2004 in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines*

Listes indicatives des Etats parties soumises au 15 mai 2004 en conformité avec les *Orientations*

Documents:

WHC-04/28.COM/14A

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14A WHC-04/28.COM/14A Rev

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14A add

The **Secretariat** presented the working documents, noting that document WHC-04/28.COM/14A Rev contained corrections to clerical errors observed by States Parties. It also presented orally a revised version of Draft Decision 28 COM 14A, replacing its paragraph 2 with the following text:

2. Noting also that the recently completed study of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists prepared by ICOMOS and IUCN would contribute significantly to the discussion concerning the improved use of tentative lists as requested by the Committee in its Decision **27 COM 8A**,

The **Rapporteur** recalled that the Committee had decided that all draft decisions and revised draft decisions should be presented in written form.

The Delegation of **Argentina** proposed that the agenda item be left open in order to incorporate discussions on Global Strategy under item 13.

The **Chairperson** agreed and suggested that the Committee continue with the rest of agenda item

14. He stated that in total 48 nominations were to be reviewed, including 30 new nominations of which 24 were cultural sites and 6 natural, as well as 7 extensions, 10 deferrals and 1 transboundary nomination. There was also one emergency nomination, and one proposed name change.

14B. Nominations of properties to the World Heritage List

Inscriptions de biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial

Documents:

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee about the proposed name change for Miguasha Park, which was adopted without debate (**28 COM 14B.1**).

The **Secretariat** then presented the list of five States Parties which had withdrawn their nominations (**28 COM 14B.2**). In response to an observation made by the **Delegation of Portugal**, it said that the omission of one of the withdrawn sites from the French version of the working document would be corrected in the final decision.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the process of preparing draft decisions could be expedited if they were prepared by the Advisory Bodies themselves in collaboration with the Centre. Draft Decision **28 COM 14B.3** had been prepared in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.

Before going on with the first nomination, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked the floor to raise a number of general issues, including different standards used in the Advisory Bodies' evaluation of cultural and natural sites, and consistency in recommendations, in particular regarding management and serial nominations.

The Delegation of **India** also referred to evaluation processes and to the lack of time available to States Parties which might wish to clarify issues raised in the published evaluations.

IUCN described its evaluation procedures, recalling its founding principles which guided the rigorous evaluation process it undertook in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* in

order to arrive at a recommendation, making full use of its expert network.

The Chairperson gave the floor to the Advisory Bodies to present the evaluations of new nominations.

| | |
|-------------|----------------------|
| Property | Hawar Islands |
| Id. N° | N 1126 |
| State Party | Bahrain |
| Criteria | N (ii) (iv) |

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and informed the Committee that the revised recommendations in *WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Add* based on additional information had been prepared prior to the session.

The Delegation of **Oman** agreed with the proposed deferral of the nomination.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it did not have the revised recommendations.

The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Chile** noted that they too did not have the revised recommendations. They said that they would like to hear the opinion of the State Party concerned on the recommendations.

The Delegations of **Saint Lucia**, **Kuwait**, **India**, and **Oman** expressed concern that the recommendation imposed the idea of transboundary nomination as a requirement for inscription.

The Observer Delegation of **Bahrain** informed the Committee that a transboundary nomination would be a complex issue to address with neighboring countries, and that it should not be a condition for inscription.

The Delegations of **Lebanon**, **Colombia** and **China** endorsed the IUCN recommendation for deferral.

La délégation du **Bénin** estime qu'il ne faut pas négliger la volonté des Etats, certains pouvant refuser de s'associer à l'initiative proposée. Il faut également prendre garde à ne pas retarder l'action, déjà bien engagée, de l'Etat partie. Et même si ce dernier souscrit en l'occurrence à la recommandation de l'IUCN, il importe de ne pas créer de précédent en subordonnant une proposition d'inscription à l'assentiment d'autres

Etats. Dans ce cas précis, l'authenticité du site doit demeurer le principal élément à prendre en considération.

The Delegation of **Portugal** pointed out that five State Parties had withdrawn their nominations after an unfavorable recommendation by IUCN. Others had not done so, and their nominations had been the subject of a revised draft decision. There should be a standardized procedure for responding to evaluations.

The Delegation of **India** asked for clarification concerning the timeframe for deferral.

The Delegation of **St. Lucia** said that the nomination had merit on its own and that a transboundary nomination should not be a prerequisite once the integrity issues had been solved.

The **Chairperson** said that there was a clear sense in the Committee that a transboundary nomination should not be made a precondition for listing.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that a transboundary nomination could be an option to be encouraged rather than a requirement.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the remarks of the Delegation of Portugal. It proposed that the State Party should be given an opportunity to react at an early stage after an independent evaluation by an expert. Furthermore, it requested that documents should not be altered after they had been distributed.

La délégation de la **Fédération de Russie**, souscrivant à l'idée d'un site transfrontalier, suggère de différer cette proposition d'inscription et d'attendre la 29e session pour prendre une décision à ce sujet.

La délégation du **Bénin** considère que l'on ne peut différer la décision relative à ce site sans en préciser les motivations..

The Delegation of **Japan** shared the concerns voiced by the Delegation of the Netherlands, but noted that should new information be made available it may be appropriate to change a draft decision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, referring to Benin's question to IUCN, suggested that one reason for deferral was to provide for a larger area.

The Delegation of **India** commented on the lack of opportunities to react to evaluations - previously, the Bureau had been a sort of filter.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** reminded the Committee that the site had been a Ramsar wetland site since 1997.

IUCN, noting that species did not respect national boundaries, said that it had not intended to impose a transboundary nomination as a condition.

The Delegations of the **United Kingdom, Oman, St. Lucia** and **Benin** asked IUCN to be more explicit on whether a transboundary nomination would be necessary for inscription of the site.

IUCN informed the Committee that the site as presently defined did not meet the criteria for inscription.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** asked whether any precedents existed for the imposition of a joint inscription by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Columbia** noted the similarity of the nominations by Bahrain and Portugal with regard to the size, shape and connectivity of the areas concerned.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether it was an ecosystem issue or one of flora and fauna, and stressed that the site was quite important in the region.

IUCN said that there had been a number of transboundary cases, including the Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve, and sites in Mongolia and Russia, Viet Nam and Laos. It would be happy to work with States Parties to avoid situations such as that of Iguacu, which came under two separate entries on the List.

The Observer Delegation of **Bahrain** said that independent reports declared the site to be unquestionably of outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether IUCN gave any weight to such reports.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** suggested deferring the nomination without giving a reason.

The Delegation of **Norway** reiterated the questions asked by St Lucia and the United Kingdom.

The Delegations of **Columbia, Portugal** and **India** suggested deferring the nomination and encouraging the State Party to consider accepting wording that would make a transboundary nomination optional.

The Delegation of **Egypt** reiterated that the site was of importance as the habitat of several rare species.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed an amendment to the revised draft decision reading "... to allow the State Party to consider an appropriate extension to the site".

The draft decision, as amended, was adopted.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that working document *WHC-04/28.COM/14B. Add.* contained revised Draft Decisions on certain proposed nominations.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra |
| Id. N° | N 1167 |
| State Party | Indonesia |
| Criteria | N (ii) (iii) (iv) |

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and informed the Committee that it recommended inscribing it on the basis of natural criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). In light of discussions held with the State Party with regard to the best way to address the serious threats to the property, it had proposed an alternative recommendation that would not involve its immediate inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the recommendation for inscription but wondered whether the proposed timescale of two years for the monitoring mission was realistic.

The Delegation of **India** said that it was reassured that IUCN had revised its earlier recommendation. It stressed that the threats mentioned by IUCN had to be placed in perspective. On the issue of illegal logging, the fact that impact was limited given the total surface area of the serial property must be taken into account. Furthermore, the planned road mentioned by IUCN was situated outside the proposed World Heritage property. Like the Delegation of the United Kingdom, it considered

that the time frame suggested seemed inappropriate, and it did not agree with IUCN that the proposed mission should assess the need to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as the normal procedures set out in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, including consultation with the State Party concerned, should be followed.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated IUCN and stated that it strongly supported the inscription of the property. It asked the State Party to give its view on the recommendation.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** said that it was pleased with the recommendation of IUCN to inscribe the property and affirmed its government's commitment to the conservation of the property. The level of threat needed to be assessed further to review the need to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The construction of the road, which was planned outside the site, was currently under review and the extent to which it might pose a threat to the site would be reviewed further. With regard to the issue of illegal logging, it was indeed a problem but one that had to be put in perspective given the size of the site. The Delegation also agreed that an action plan for long-term management needed to be elaborated and that a mission could be sent to the site within two years of inscription to evaluate the threat to it in cooperation with the State Party. The property was the first serial nomination in the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and its very large size, as well as the social and economic context of the country, presented special challenges for its conservation. It expressed the hope that it would be able to count on the support of the Committee and the international community in facing those challenges.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the recommendation of IUCN but agreed with the concerns voiced by previous speakers with regard to the time frame for the mission. It fully supported the statement by IUCN in its evaluation that it was only possible to compare like with like.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported the recommendation of IUCN in favour of inscription but also shared the concern expressed by the Delegation of India with regard to the possible inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Oman** supported the inscription.

La délégation du **Bénin** appuie l'inscription du bien et approuve la dernière recommandation de l'UICN demandant un plan d'action, mais doute qu'il soit possible d'envoyer la mission avant deux ans et suggère en conséquence une révision du calendrier.

The Delegation of **China** supported the recommendation for inscription and the proposal to allow for a more appropriate time frame.

La délégation du **Liban**, tout en estimant que le bien possède toutes les qualités requises pour être inscrit sur la Liste, partage les préoccupations exprimées par les délégations de l'Inde et de Sainte-Lucie et propose en conséquence d'attendre quelques années avant d'entreprendre une mission et de laisser ainsi le temps nécessaire à la mise en œuvre du plan d'urgence. Elle demande par ailleurs qu'au paragraphe 3 (ii) de la décision, l'expression *urgent review* soit traduite en français par *révision urgente* et non *étude urgente* du projet routier.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its strong support for inscription and requested clarification from IUCN on the urgent measures to be taken by the State Party. On the issue of the road, it stated that although the planned location might be outside the proposed World Heritage property, it was still within the Leuser ecosystem and might thus affect the site.

IUCN pointed out that the Committee must realize that the site was one of the most threatened in the world and was in fact already subject to some degradation. Certain donor agencies had spent substantial amounts of money to try to avert the threats, with limited success. The threats were detailed in the working documents and required constant monitoring, which was why IUCN recommended a monitoring mission within two years of inscription. It referred to the case of the Galapagos Islands, where a similar procedure had been followed.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the recommendation made by IUCN, including the proposed monitoring mission and time frame.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** also supported inscription and was satisfied with the commitment of the State Party to address the threats.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the recommendation for inscription as well as the need to give more time to the State Party, especially since there seemed to be a need to educate the local communities on the importance of the conservation of the site. It therefore proposed extending the time frame for the mission to three years.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, whilst in favor of inscription, also pointed to the current level of threat and suggested that the Committee should therefore consider placing the property immediately on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as that could help mobilize the necessary international assistance.

La délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** félicite l'État partie et souscrit aux recommandations de l'IUCN. Elle propose d'établir deux plans, un à court terme, suivi d'une mission pendant la deuxième année, et l'autre à plus long terme.

The **Secretariat** said that, although substantial international support had been given to sustainable development projects around the site, very little direct support had been given for conservation. The Committee might like to take the opportunity to consider how projects developed around World Heritage properties with the support of donor agencies could take into account the Committee's recommendations.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted the willingness of the Committee to inscribe the property and proposed adopting the Draft Decision, which had apparently been proposed in consultation with the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** stated that it disagreed with the assessment of the level of threat by IUCN and proposed that the envisaged mission should evaluate the level of threat in consultation with the State Party.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, on a point of order, insisted that the concerned State Party may only take the floor when asked for precise information by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Colombia to consider danger listing, as that would raise awareness about the conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **India** endorsed the point of order raised by the Delegation of Saint Lucia but

said that it would like to request the information from the State Party anyway. It had concluded from the information given by the State Party that further consultations were needed with IUCN and suggested that perhaps a system of regular reporting should be put in place. It also proposed revising paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision to include a reference to paragraphs 86-93 of the *Operational Guidelines* on danger listing.

The Delegation of **Netherlands** said that it was concerned that the recommendation by IUCN might not be fully understood by the State Party and pointed to the imminent danger which demanded immediate action and an emergency action plan. That had to be part of the decision; otherwise, the Netherlands would support the proposal by the Delegation of Colombia for immediate danger listing. It therefore requested that the Delegation of Indonesia provide information on what immediate action the State Party intended to take to improve the conservation of the property.

IUCN reiterated that the State Party was in agreement on the existence of the threats although there might be a difference of opinion with regard to their level, and that the Draft Decision had been proposed in agreement with the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** confirmed that it agreed that the threats existed and said that steps were already being taken to address them. It also agreed with the recommendation of IUCN to send a mission in two years to evaluate whether the site should be on the List of World Heritage in Danger according to the usual rules and procedures.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that there was consensus among the Committee to inscribe the property and proposed that a State of Conservation report be requested from the State Party by the 29th session instead of already recommending a monitoring mission. That would allow the Committee to reassess at that time the necessity of sending a mission.

The Delegation of **Chile** agreed that the site should be inscribed and proposed that since the discussion was focusing on the time frame and specific outcomes, the Committee should discuss the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the proposal tabled by the Delegation of the United Kingdom,

since it addressed the concerns of the State Party, IUCN and the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** agreed with that proposal and informed the Committee that it was willing to assist the State Party in its efforts to strengthen the conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, on a point of order, said that during deliberations on nominations, observers were not allowed to take the floor.

La délégation du **Liban**, préoccupée de voir que l'État partie n'est pas d'accord avec l'opinion de l'UICN, rappelle que le Comité est seul habilité à juger de la sévérité des menaces qui pèsent sur le bien. Après avoir d'abord envisagé une inscription immédiate du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, elle a finalement décidé de se rallier à la solution préconisée par la délégation du Royaume-Uni. Evoquant le cas de la demande d'inscription de Vienne, elle rappelle que si les recommandations du Comité ne sont pas prises en compte, celui-ci a le droit d'agir en conséquence.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed that it was the Committee which had the final say. It proposed either extending the time frame to three years, or adhering to the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegations of **Colombia, Kuwait, Oman, New Zealand** and **Norway** supported the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

La délégation du **Bénin** aimerait appuyer la proposition de la délégation du Royaume-Uni, mais n'est pas convaincue que le calendrier proposé pour la mission soit approprié. Elle juge la proposition de la délégation de Sainte-Lucie plus claire et se dit prête à l'appuyer si celle de la délégation du Royaume-Uni n'était pas davantage clarifiée.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the proposal by the United Kingdom as long as it would not prevent the Committee from considering danger listing at its 29th session based on the State of Conservation report presented by the State Party.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.5** as amended by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

| | |
|-------------|---------------------------|
| Property | Ilulissat Icefjord |
| Id. N° | N 1149 |
| State Party | Denmark |
| Criteria | N (i) (iii) |

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and recommended to the Committee that it should be inscribed on the basis of natural criteria (i) and (iii).

The Delegations of the **United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Norway** and **Oman** expressed their support for inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

Noting broad consensus, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.8** adopted.

| | |
|-------------|----------------------------|
| Property | Coiba National Park |
| Id. N° | N 1138 |
| State Party | Panama |
| Criteria | N (ii) (iii) (iv) |

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and noted that new information presented to it by the State Party prior to the present session had been significant enough to warrant a change in its original recommendation. The information related specifically to a significant increase in the proposed size of the marine component of the property. However, the nomination papers did not reflect the change. It recommended therefore that the nomination should be deferred until the new proposed national law establishing the national park had been approved and a revised, expanded nomination submitted for evaluation.

The Delegations of the **United Kingdom, Saint Lucia, the Netherlands, Colombia, New Zealand** and **Argentina** supported the IUCN recommendation.

The **Chairperson** noted the consensus in the Committee and declared Decision **28 CM 14B.10** adopted.

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------|
| Property | Pitons Management Area |
| Id. N° | N 1161 |
| State Party | Saint Lucia |
| Criteria | N (i) (iii) |

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and recommended to the Committee that it should

not be considered for inscription under natural criterion (iii), and that it deferred in regard to criterion (i) until such time as studies could determine the exact nature of the property's volcanic origins.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested additional information from IUCN with regard to the underwater aspects of the site and concerning the apparent inconsistency between the ICOMOS and IUCN interpretations of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value.

IUCN replied that it considered that the concept of Outstanding Universal Value must be viewed from a global perspective and that it attempted to apply the criterion as strictly as possible. Such were the requirements imposed by the *Operational Guidelines*. It repeated its recommendation that the inscription should be deferred and not rejected outright. In respect to the underwater component, it repeated the information contained in the evaluation report, noting that the principal underwater features supporting the nomination related to geological features and not biological values.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought more information from the State Party on the question of the property's integrity.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** informed the Committee that IUCN had assessed 15 variables for integrity, and had been satisfied with almost all of them. With regard to the institutional framework variable, the Delegation noted that the current framework, though interim, was fully functional and in the process of being formalized. Marine sedimentation had been noted as an issue, but the problem was being comprehensively addressed. It corrected the IUCN evaluation, noting that only two hotels were located in the property, and not four. It concluded that, in its opinion, the conditions of integrity were fully met.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** thanked the State Party and expressed its concern regarding the evaluation procedures used by IUCN. It questioned the comparison of sites of very different size, as such comparisons were rather difficult and it was hard to see how meaningful conclusions could be reached. The underwater nature of the geological features should be taken into consideration.

La délégation du **Bénin** juge peu satisfaisante l'explication donnée par l'IUCN. A l'heure où l'on

prône l'adoption d'approches régionales, comment justifier que la valeur esthétique d'un bien reconnue sur le plan régional cesse de l'être sur le plan mondial?

The Delegation of **India** said that it had found it hard to understand the rationale for IUCN's recommendation to defer. It appeared to be based on the lack of geological studies and on the scientific uncertainty on the origins of the site. The Delegation wondered what information was still required before a conclusion could be reached and expressed concern that the requisite studies might take a long time to carry out.

IUCN noted the difficulties in evaluating properties for criterion (i) and said that it was currently reviewing methodologies. It emphasized that there continued to be uncertainties as to the volcanic origins of the property's main features, and explained that it had proposed a deferral of the nomination until its volcanic origins could be properly assessed. Even if that issue was resolved, the nomination would likely not meet conditions required for natural criterion (i). IUCN also noted that the site had great natural beauty but that no clear framework existed under which that attribute could be objectively assessed. IUCN's recommendation had been based on previous decisions made by the Committee. In general, the Committee needed to be very cautious with natural criterion (iii), as there were only a small number of islands inscribed under it and the Committee had rejected several other proposals to inscribe islands under that criterion.

The Delegation of **India** said that the proposal for deferral was based on a lack of knowledge of the nature of the site's origins, and not on integrity issues. It asked for clarification as to whether the site was volcanic or not, and whether other features under which the nomination had been prepared had been considered in IUCN's evaluation.

IUCN responded that it was necessary to consider the site in a comparative context, and that it was definitely a volcanic feature. The feature was, however, only a narrow manifestation of a large variation of volcanic features in the world. The comparative analysis in the evaluation report suggested that the site was not in the same league as other volcanic sites and was of only secondary interest to volcanic science. It stressed that the feature was so narrow as to be difficult to be considered important at the global level.

The Delegation of **Colombia** raised the issue of States Parties with no World Heritage properties and suggested that paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision was somewhat perplexing given Saint Lucia's earlier comments on integrity. It requested further information from the State Party on the issue of the property's management status and on the government's commitment to conservation of the site.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** described the measures taken by its government and referred the Committee to the relevant paragraphs in the evaluation report.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with the IUCN recommendation not to inscribe the site under natural criterion (iii), but questioned the recommendation with regard to criterion (i). The property had been nominated against the background of a globally-recognized, important regional volcanic phenomenon. It referred to a recent World Heritage workshop in the Caribbean, where transboundary and serial nominations had been discussed as a possible means of identifying potential World Heritage properties in that region. Recognizing the regional importance of the volcanic phenomenon to which Saint Lucia's Pitons belonged, the Delegation suggested a possible strategy of a phased serial nomination, which could allow States Parties in the region to bring forward nominations at their own pace. It proposed that the Committee should inscribe the property under criterion (i), with the recommendation that the State Party produce an action plan within a year to clarify how it would deal with the management issues raised by IUCN. It also recommended that the State Party collaborate with the Centre to review the regional volcanic features of the Caribbean with the objective of developing a regional nomination based on the area's volcanic heritage.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested a reaction from IUCN with regard to that proposal.

IUCN noted that there was merit in the proposal of considering a regional transboundary serial nomination based on volcanic heritage.

La délégation du **Bénin** appuie la proposition de la délégation du Royaume-Uni.

The Delegation of **Portugal** had no objection to the proposal made by the delegation of the United Kingdom. However, paragraph 5 of the Draft

Decision suggested the possibility of re-submitting the nomination as a cultural landscape. It requested more information from IUCN on the matter, and sought the opinion of the State Party on that option.

IUCN replied that the possibility of a cultural landscape nomination was a suggestion only and a proper opinion would need to come from ICOMOS. IUCN's field visit had revealed apparent possibilities for such a nomination, or, alternatively, for development as a Biosphere Reserve.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that various options had been assessed before the site had been nominated, but experts had advised the State Party not to pursue a cultural landscape designation.

The Delegation of **Egypt** did not consider the cultural landscape proposal to be relevant. The proposal to consider the site as a potential Biosphere Reserve was the State Party's to consider. A transboundary nomination might warrant more attention, and the State Party should consider that option. However, the site should be inscribed on its own merits.

The Delegation of **Argentina** proposed that the property should be inscribed under natural criteria (i) and (iii) and did not consider that IUCN had clearly defended its evaluation. It repeated its concerns regarding the difficulty of carrying out comparative analyses, the absence of research, which had been the grounds for proposing deferral, and the fact that, although the conditions for site integrity appeared to be met, the evaluation had concluded that that was not the case. It suggested that paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision should be modified accordingly, paragraph 5 should be deleted and paragraph 4 maintained.

The Delegation of **Oman** favored inscription under natural criterion (i) and perhaps criterion (iii), subject to further studies.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. In light of the discussion on the Global Strategy, it noted that the Committee had a duty to make the *Convention* more accessible to developing countries and small island developing states.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported inscription based on the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

La délégation du **Liban**, revenant sur la question de l'intégrité et de la gestion du site, relève une contradiction dans le document de l'UICN : d'une part, on félicite l'Etat partie pour le plan de gestion et, d'autre part, on remet en question la mise en application de ce plan. En outre, l'adhésion de la population dont il est fait état est souvent un élément plus efficace pour la conservation d'un site. Tout en soutenant la proposition du Royaume-Uni, la délégation insiste sur la nécessité de ne pas faire de l'extension transfrontalière une condition.

The Delegation of **China** also supported the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom. The Committee should disregard IUCN's recommendation that Saint Lucia should consider a cultural landscape nomination.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** disagreed with the comment on the conditionality of a transboundary nomination made by the Delegation of Lebanon, and suggested that the nomination should be deferred to allow for the development of a serial transboundary nomination that would better reflect the volcanic heritage of the Caribbean. It suggested that the title of the nomination should reflect the regional nature of the longer-term phased nomination.

La délégation du **Bénin** soutient l'inscription du bien, considérant qu'il doit être inscrit en raison de ses mérites intrinsèques. Elle demande par ailleurs que l'UICN réponde à la question de la contradiction soulevée par le Liban.

The Delegation of **India** said that the property warranted inscription based on its own qualities and that the State Party alone should decide whether or not it wished to pursue a serial transboundary nomination.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee agreed that the property should be inscribed under natural criteria (i) and (iii) and declared Decision **28 COM 14B.11**, as amended, adopted.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Cape Floral Region Protected Areas |
| Id. N° | N 1007 Rev |
| State Party | South Africa |
| Criteria | N (ii) (iv) |

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report, a case that showed that a Committee decision to defer could facilitate the production of excellent nominations. IUCN recommended inscription under criteria (ii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the Advisory Body's recommendation.

La délégation du **Bénin** souligne les qualités indéniables du site et félicite l'Etat partie pour l'efficacité dont il a fait preuve dans la préparation des plans de gestion et la mise en place d'autres projets visant à promouvoir la conservation du site. Voyant que ni la proposition de l'Etat partie ni la recommandation de l'UICN ne semblent soulever d'objection, elle propose d'inscrire le bien par acclamation.

Decision **28 COM 14B.12** to inscribe the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv) was adopted by acclamation.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its gratitude with humbleness, honour and excitement for the inscription of South Africa's sixth World Heritage site. It remarked upon the establishment of the innovative programme, CAPE (Cape Action for People and the Environment), associated with the Cape Floral Region and the site's excellent position in terms of tourism which could generate jobs and revenue.

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------|
| Property | Paleohabitat of Tarnóc |
| Id. N° | N 667 Rev |
| State Party | Hungary |
| Criteria | N (i) |

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and said that it was IUCN's third evaluation not recommending inscription under criterion (i).

The **Chairperson** said that the National Office of Cultural Heritage in Hungary had sent a letter to the Director of the World Heritage Centre and asked that it be read out.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** read out the letter received on 25 June 2004 requesting "a suspension of the decision-making process" and a new evaluation by IUCN. He said that that would not be possible because no such procedure was provided for in the Committee's *Rules of Procedure*.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** commended the thorough job done by the Advisory Body and put two questions to the State Party concerned. The first concerned the recommendation to consider the site for designation under the UNESCO Geoparks programme, which, according to the Delegation, would serve the primary objective, namely, conservation. Secondly, if IUCN came to Hungary for another evaluation, what would then be put forward as new information?

The Observer Delegation of **Hungary** thanked China for hosting the 28th session and explained that to its knowledge the property had been evaluated for the Committee only once, in 1992. The second time, it had not been dealt with, as the dossier had been considered incomplete, whereas the present dossier contained a completely new nomination.

In response to Delegation of the Netherlands, it stated that, first, the recommendation to join the Geoparks initiative was an exciting one, but that the Delegation could not take a decision on that. In response to the second question, it referred to a 2002 IUCN study on geological history and the history of life on Earth, which called attention to the lack of fossil sites from the Miocene era. The nomination in question could fill that gap, and a deferral would enable comparative study, further discussion and a clearer understanding of the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **India** asked whether the site's lesser diversity and smaller scale, as compared to similar sites in Canada, Australia and the United States, for instance, had played any role in the assessment. It said that fossil sites were rare and while they might not be of Outstanding Universal Value on their own, they were important for the larger picture. It wondered whether possibilities for serial transboundary nominations with similar sites in Europe could be considered.

The Delegation of **Lithuania**, following India's comment, requested clarification on the possibility of overlaps with regard to the site's biodiversity with the other sites mentioned in the comparison.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that it supported the nomination as a complement to existing fossil sites on the World Heritage List. It asked whether a deferral would help further reflection about a systematic study.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked upon the clear recommendation by the Advisory Body and requested IUCN to explain whether deferral would allow new insights concerning the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

IUCN said that deferral was always an option and that if, the Committee so wished, it would conduct another evaluation in addition to those carried out in 1986 and 1993. The latest evaluation had been carried out by a respected expert, who considered that the site was not of Outstanding Universal Value. Furthermore, many such sites existed, numbering perhaps in the thousands, and the site under discussion was not outstanding with regard to the Miocene period. A new evaluation would be costly, but IUCN would abide by the Committee's decision.

La délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** remarque qu'à la suite de l'évaluation de l'IUCN, les autorités hongroises ont demandé une nouvelle évaluation dans une lettre reçue par le Centre du patrimoine mondial le 18 juin 2004.

The Delegation of **China** commended the Advisory Body on its work. At the same time, it appreciated the State Party's confidence in the *Convention* and said that it would support giving it another chance to improve the dossier and the site's management.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** did not agree with that proposal.

The Delegation of **Argentina** questioned the Advisory Body's statement that there were "thousands" of fossil sites. Given the interest of the site, and the time factor working against its conservation, the Delegation would support a deferral.

The Delegation of **Oman** said that it would support a deferral in response to IUCN's flexibility.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, referring to page 9 of the English version of the working document (p.10 in the French version), and in response to the statement by the Russian Federation, asked whether the letter received on 18 June contained important new information for another evaluation, and whether it was worth envisaging a second opinion other than IUCN's.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the State Party's perseverance was exemplary, which

no doubt would guarantee proper management of the site, and therefore it did not object to a deferral.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision to defer nomination of the Paleohabitat of Tarnóc in Hungary adopted. (Decision **28 COM 14B.13**)

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve |
| Id. N° | N 1023 Rev |
| State Party | Russian Federation |
| Criteria | N (ii) (iv) |

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and explained that the site had been nominated under a different name in 2000, evaluated in 2002, withdrawn on the issue of the marine boundaries and was at that time recommended for inscription under criteria (ii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the Russian Federation and supported the inscription of the site. It asked IUCN whether the recommendation in the Draft Decision that a management plan should include a tourism strategy was meant to prevent or encourage tourism.

IUCN referred to paragraph 44 (b) (v) of the *Operational Guidelines* and explained that there were no significant threats to the site, but that in the future tourism and maintaining World Heritage values had to be considered with a view to mitigating impact.

The Delegations of **Lithuania, China and Norway** favoured inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its support for inscription, but raised concerns about management in relation to the site's rich diversity.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** thanked IUCN and expressed its support for inscription.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its support, but also raised concerns about management, asking how the State Party was going to manage the site.

La **Fédération de Russie** assure le Comité que le plan de gestion sera prêt avant la venue de la mission prévue dans la décision.

The **Chairperson**, seeing no objections, declared that the Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve of the Russian Federation was inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv). (Decision **28 COM 14B.14**)

La délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** remercie vivement les participants à la réunion, les experts ayant examiné la proposition, le secrétariat et les membres du Comité. Elle souligne l'importance que cette inscription revêt pour la population de la République autonome des Tchoukches et pour le développement économique de la région.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Western Caucasus (Extension to include the Teberdinskiy Reserve) |
| Id. N° | N 900 Bis |
| State Party | Russian Federation |
| Criteria | N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) |

IUCN presented its evaluation report of the proposed extension of the Western Caucasus property in the Russian Federation to include the Teberdinskiy Reserve and said that it had been inscribed in 1999 under criteria (ii) and (iv), that the extension was proposed under all four criteria, and that its recommendation was not to approve the extension under any of the four criteria.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** questioned Draft Decision **28 COM 14B.16**, given the IUCN recommendation in the working document in favour of a comprehensive assessment of all potential sites in the Western Caucasus.

IUCN said that the recommendation for a comprehensive assessment should indeed stand.

The Delegation of **India** asked whether IUCN was recommending a serial nomination for the site.

IUCN said that the region had a number of potential World Heritage sites that merited further study as possible components of a future serial nomination, and referred to paragraph 19 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **India** observed that clearer guidelines were needed with regard to serial and transboundary nominations.

La délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** remercie l'IUCN pour son évaluation du dossier et convient

qu'il n'y a pas lieu de recommander l'extension du site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.15** adopted and asked if there were any comments on the second Draft Decision relating to the state of conservation of the existing Western Caucasus World Heritage site (Draft Decision **28 COM 14B.16**).

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that the Committee had expressed its concern in 2001 and asked whether any new information had been presented by the State Party.

La délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** fait part de nombreuses difficultés rencontrées et invoque la volonté de proposer l'extension du site même avant d'avoir recueilli les informations nécessaires à l'analyse de la situation concernant l'intégrité du site déjà inscrit. Elle précise que le rapport contenant ces informations sera prêt en février 2005.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.16** adopted.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Gough Island Wildlife Reserve (extension to include Inaccessible Island) |
| Id. N° | N 740 Bis |
| State Party | United Kingdom |
| Criteria | N (iii) (iv) |

IUCN presented its evaluation report of the proposed extension of Gough Island Wildlife Reserve (United Kingdom) to include Inaccessible Island. The site had been inscribed in 1995 under criteria (iii) and (iv). It recommended extension of the site under the same criteria.

The Delegations of **China, South Africa** and **Colombia** expressed their support for extension.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said it had no objection to the extension, but asked, in relation to tourism issues, how inaccessible Inaccessible Island was.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the island was very inaccessible.

Le délégué du **Liban** suggère de rebaptiser le site "Iles Gough et Inaccessibles".

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the French version was incorrect and should read *Iles Gough et Inaccessible*.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether the extension involved more than one island.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the extension involved one island.

IUCN said that Gough Island had been inscribed in 1995 and that the present extension concerned the inclusion of Inaccessible Island, which would make a total of two islands.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether IUCN had actually visited Inaccessible Island.

The **Chairperson** declared that the extension to Gough Island to include Inaccessible Island of the United Kingdom was approved under existing criteria (iii) and (iv) (Decision **28 COM 14B.17**). The property would henceforth be known as Gough and Inaccessible Islands.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | Area de Conservación Guanacaste (Extension to include the Sector Santa Elena) |
| Id. N° | N 928 Bis |
| State Party | Costa Rica |
| Criteria | N (ii) (iv) |

IUCN presented its evaluation report of the extension of the Area de Conservación Guanacaste (Costa Rica) to include the Sector Santa Elena. The extension had been recommended by the Committee in 1999, at its 23rd session.

The Delegations of **Colombia, India** and **Saint Lucia** expressed their support for extension.

The Delegation of **Argentina** also expressed its support, in particular for paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision commending the State Party on its excellent work. It asked whether the site could be inscribed under criterion (i) as well.

IUCN said that the State Party had not nominated the property for inscription under criterion (i) and that the question was better directed to the Observer Delegation of Costa Rica.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported extension and congratulated the State Party on its work concerning legal issues.

The **Chairperson** declared that the extension to the Area de Conservacion Guanacaste to include the Sector Santa Elena was approved under criteria (ii) and (iv).

The Observer Delegation of **Costa Rica** thanked the host country and local authorities, and the Committee for approving the Guanacaste extension, which concerned one of the most important regions for conservation and management in Costa Rica and, indeed, the whole of Central America. The Delegation said that it was sure that the State Party would be happy to consider nomination under criterion (i) as well, as the area's geological formations were the oldest in the country.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | St. Kilda (renomination to include cultural criteria and extension to include marine area) |
| Id. N° | N/C 387 Bis |
| State Party | United Kingdom |
| Criteria | N (ii) (iii) (iv) |

IUCN and **ICOMOS** presented their evaluation report of the mixed property.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that while the Outstanding Universal Value of the natural aspects of the property was clear, it could not recognize any outstanding cultural value in its cultural aspects, and would appreciate clarification from **ICOMOS** on that point.

ICOMOS explained that the cultural value rested in a particular response of human activities to extreme conditions, and that the comparative analysis had confirmed that the property possessed cultural value of great interest.

The Delegation of **India** commended the State Party as a standard-setter in the management planning of heritage sites, and asked whether a management plan for the property had taken into account the extension and, if so, in what way the marine environment was managed, as it would be a useful example for other sites.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed its support for the inscription of the property.

La délégation du **Liban**, soulevant une question d'ordre méthodologique, demande à l'**ICOMOS** s'il aurait fait la même recommandation dans le cas où le site n'aurait pas déjà été inscrit pour ses valeurs naturelles. Autrement dit, un site mixte doit-il obligatoirement satisfaire à l'exigence d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle à la fois culturelle et naturelle, ou suffit-il qu'un nouveau critère culturel vienne renforcer la reconnaissance d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle sur le seul plan naturel ?

ICOMOS reiterated that the property represented a type of human settlement, whose inhabitants had subsisted on the bird population of the island. The property possessed cultural value that merited inscription in its own right.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** sought clarification as to whether the property was a fossil landscape, or an associative cultural landscape, whether it possessed any spiritual value, and whether it was an archaeological site. It asked what cultural value the property possessed, considering that the living population had evacuated the island in the 1930s.

The Delegation of **Argentina** agreed that the additional natural criteria were justified, endorsed the questions raised by the Delegations of Lebanon and India, and questioned the Outstanding Universal Value of the proposed cultural criteria, particularly as it was a cultural landscape without a living community.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the Draft Decision and asked the State Party to make a statement.

La délégation du **Bénin**, soulevant une motion d'ordre, observe que le Royaume-Uni ne peut être sollicité pour défendre une proposition à ce stade. Les questions posées à l'auteur de la proposition doivent porter sur des points précis.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked whether the State Party considered the cultural criteria to be of Outstanding Universal Value.

La délégation du **Liban** réitère la motion d'ordre soulevée par la délégation du Bénin, estimant que la question posée par la délégation de la Lithuanie demeure insuffisamment précise.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked whether the State Party considered that the property possessed

Outstanding Universal Value in terms of the cultural criteria.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the management plan had been revised in harmony with the revised nomination. The nominated property was a relict cultural landscape, one of the World Heritage categories recognizing the interaction between people and nature.

The Delegation of **Egypt** remarked that while every site had some cultural value, the Committee must inscribe a site on the World Heritage List on the basis of its Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Norway**, on a point of order, said that the State Party was not allowed to interpret the value of a nominated property.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked ICOMOS to explain the phrase “human occupation in extreme conditions”, which figured in its evaluation report.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether it was the Advisory Body or the State Party which had suggested including cultural criterion (v), particularly because the nominated property was a relict cultural landscape. It encouraged the Committee to apply the same level of rigour to the nomination under discussion as it had to previous nominations.

ICOMOS said that in no case would vernacular architecture by itself be recognized as possessing Outstanding Universal Value. However, the particular cultural settings and human use could provide the context which gave the property, including its vernacular architecture, its Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked the State Party to provide information as to how the population of the island had survived the challenging environment over the years and why that type of settlement system was worthy of inscription on the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS referred to the fragility of vernacular architecture and said that although the architecture on the island might not meet the cultural criteria, the property represented a certain type of human settlement of great interest. In response to the question posed by the Delegation of Lebanon, it explained that it was the link between culture and nature that was of significance and not the value of the vernacular architecture.

In response to the question raised by the Delegation of Colombia, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that the islanders had managed to survive largely by subsisting on the bird population, and that the property offered an illustration of a unique and sustainable settlement system.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the inscription to extend the marine area. It also supported inscription as a cultural landscape representing close links between the natural and cultural aspects. A property of that nature would serve as an interesting case study for future nominations of relict cultural landscapes.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that, while the natural criteria could be justified easily, the Outstanding Universal Value of the cultural aspects had yet to be clearly demonstrated, as the fragility of vernacular architecture and a sustainable settlement system did not constitute a valid basis for inscription.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed its support for the nomination, as the property demonstrated inextricable links between nature and culture as was also the case for the Maori culture in New Zealand.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** summarized the preceding statements, indicating that cultural and natural aspects of the property were closely linked, and that the Outstanding Universal Value of the natural criteria was not disputed. Following that reasoning, it asked whether the cultural criteria could also be of Outstanding Universal Value by default. If that was the case, the use of criterion (v) could be justified but if not, the argument for inscription under criterion (v) could not be sustained. Nonetheless, it supported the Draft Decision as it stood.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its concern that there were no clear guidelines concerning the definition and values of vernacular architecture in a hostile environment and suggested that the State Party should carry out a comparative analysis. The Committee could examine the re-nomination under cultural criteria at a later stage.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the Draft Decision as it stood.

The **Chairperson** said that it was difficult to form a consensus and suggested that the inclusion of the cultural criteria be reviewed at a later stage.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, on a point of order, said that the Committee had not yet reached a decision on the inclusion of cultural criteria.

The **Chairperson** remarked again on the difficulty of reaching consensus, and suggested that a comparative study on relict landscapes should be prepared by the State Party.

La délégation du **Liban** propose, comme le suggère le Président, de différer l'examen de la proposition de prise en compte de nouveaux critères culturels et d'engager l'Etat partie à mener une étude comparative des valeurs culturelles du bien en vue d'un réexamen ultérieur.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, speaking at the invitation of the Chairperson, sought to clarify the statement made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The **Chairperson** explained that the Committee would endorse the natural criteria and at the same time it would recommend that the State Party should carry out a comparative study on relict landscapes in extreme climatic and remote geographical conditions to be examined at a later stage.

The Delegation of **United Kingdom** asked whether the Committee was discussing a possible deferral, as the term had not been mentioned until that point.

The **Chairperson** said that consensus had been reached and declared Decision **28 COM 14B.19** adopted as amended.

| | |
|-------------|--------------------------|
| Property | Tomb of Askia |
| Id. N° | C 1139 |
| State Party | Mali |
| Criteria | C (ii) (iii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

La délégation du **Liban** soutient l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial de ce site de valeur universelle exceptionnelle, d'autant qu'une structure de gestion traditionnelle est en place qui fonctionne très bien.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that the ICOMOS evaluation was a good basis for a decision and strongly supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **South Africa** declared that the nomination was a very important one, representing a unique aspect of Africa's heritage. It expressed its full agreement with the inscription of the site.

The **Chairperson**, noting with satisfaction the consensus among the Committee members, declared Decision **28 COM 14B.20** adopted and the site inscribed on the World Heritage List.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | Koutammakou the Land of the Batammariba |
| Id. N° | C 1140 |
| State Party | Togo |
| Criteria | C (v) (vi) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

La délégation du **Bénin** fait remarquer que ces maisons traditionnelles sont les témoins d'une architecture unique en Afrique ne se retrouvant qu'au Togo et au Bénin et précise que le nom du site est communément associé à celui des bâtisseurs. Elle regrette toutefois que l'ICOMOS n'ait pas retenu le critère (i) en ce qui concerne ce site.

The Delegation of **China** suggested that the site should be inscribed by acclamation.

Decision **28 COM 14B.21** was adopted by acclamation.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** fully supported the inscription. However, it asked ICOMOS for more precise information about the application of criterion (vi), which was referred to in its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, on a point of order, expressed the hope that ICOMOS would be able to answer the question raised by the United Kingdom. If the answer could not be given at that time, it would hopefully come at a later stage.

Prenant la parole à l'invitation du Président, Mme Aguihah, ministre de la Culture du **Togo** et membre de la Délégation (Observateur), se déclare très heureuse de l'inscription de ce bien, premier site togolais à figurer sur la Liste du patrimoine

mondial. Après avoir remercié les membres du Comité et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'aide apportée à la préparation du dossier d'inscription, elle dit que son pays est désormais engagé sur la voie de la mise en oeuvre de la *Convention*. Elle rend ensuite hommage au Président du Comité pour son travail ainsi qu'au Directeur général de l'UNESCO pour l'action entreprise, au titre de la stratégie globale, pour inciter les Etats parties à mettre en oeuvre la *Convention*. Elle félicite les autorités chinoises pour leur accueil et rend également hommage aux membres des organisations consultatives et au Secrétariat pour le travail accompli. Le Togo, déclare-t-elle, s'est engagé à faire en sorte que, grâce au plan de gestion, le site soit maintenu dans un parfait état de conservation et à pérenniser son authenticité et son intégrité.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Portuguese City of Mazagan (El Jadida) |
| Id. N° | C 1058 Rev |
| State Party | Morocco |
| Criteria | C (ii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegation of **Portugal** quoted a Portuguese poem referring to the site. It declared that it was clearly of Outstanding Universal Value. In addition, it testified to cooperation between Morocco and Portugal and the Delegation mentioned the recent creation of a Portuguese-Moroccan Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, though having no objection to the inscription of the site, asked what exactly the Committee was inscribing, since the last recommendation of the Bureau, based on the ICOMOS evaluation, had been to extend the site and it did not appear that the site had in fact been extended.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** thanked ICOMOS for its evaluation and endorsed the position expressed by Portugal in supporting the inscription of the site based on criteria (ii) and (iv).

La Délégation du **Bénin**, appuyant la recommandation d'inscription, précise que des contacts similaires ont été établis entre le Bénin et le Portugal, qui ont permis de nouer des liens de coopération et d'amitié. Elle salue la haute conscience patrimoniale du Royaume du Maroc qui

est reflétée notamment dans la recommandation de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its deep gratitude to ICOMOS for its presentation of the unique site, and thanked Portugal for its words. It stressed that the site was a prime example of peaceful coexistence between Christians, Muslims and Jews, and for that reason it endorsed its inscription.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the site was indeed an example of cooperation. It took the opportunity to state its opinion that all delegations should be able to express their position before the inscription of a site by acclamation.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its support for the nomination of the site and recalled with satisfaction that what had once been a synonym of conflict now represented an example of peace between nations.

The Delegation of **Oman** endorsed the ICOMOS recommendation and congratulated the Moroccan Government on its efforts.

Se référant à la question posée par le Royaume-Uni, la délégation du **Liban** précise que les limites du site ont été modifiées par l'inclusion des fossés au-delà des remparts. Elle se joint au consensus qui se dégage en faveur de l'inscription du site sur la Liste.

Responding to the question of the United Kingdom, **ICOMOS** said that new information had been received in May 2004 which had resolved the concerns of the Bureau.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM14B.23** adopted.

La délégation du **Maroc** remercie à la fois le Comité pour l'inscription de ce site, dont elle souligne le caractère unique et le bon état de conservation, et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'aide précieuse apportée lors de la préparation du dossier. Elle remercie également la délégation du Portugal pour les mots émouvants prononcés à l'occasion de cette inscription, qui donnent la mesure de l'événement pour les Marocains et soulignent les obligations qui en découlent pour eux. Elle assure que tout sera mis en oeuvre pour protéger le site, ne doutant pas que la coopération avec le Portugal sera renforcée grâce à cette

inscription. Enfin, elle remercie chaleureusement les autorités chinoises pour leur accueil.

| | |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| Property | Wine Village Terraces |
| Id. N° | C 1122 |
| State Party | Cyprus |
| | |

ICOMOS presented the property and its evaluation report. It drew the attention of the World Heritage Committee to a recently-published thematic study on vineyards which had been distributed to Committee members.

La délégation du **Bénin** souhaite savoir si l'évaluation du site a manqué d'expertise ou si le site n'a pas de valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

ICOMOS explained that, in its view, the nominated landscape was typical but not of Outstanding Universal Value as there were many sites of a similar kind.

Pour le **Liban**, ce dossier est l'exemple type du dossier incomplet, que le Centre devrait peut-être refuser d'accepter. La délégation souscrit à la recommandation de l'ICOMOS, estimant qu'il existe beaucoup de sites semblables dans la région, dont nombre sont encore en activité.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed reservations regarding the Draft Decision, as the lack of information in the nomination dossier did not necessarily mean that the site was not of Outstanding Universal Value. Although the State Party was not present, it would be interesting to know whether it intended revising and resubmitting the dossier.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the members of the Committee had not been provided with a copy of the ICOMOS thematic study on vineyards. It would however not disagree with the inscription of the property.

The Committee adopted Decision **28COM 14B.38**.

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Property | Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) |
| Id. N° | C 1093 |
| State Party | Jordan |
| Criteria | C (ii)(iv) (vi) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated ICOMOS for the good work accomplished during the evaluation process and for maintaining a continuous dialogue with the State Party. It expressed its satisfaction at the nomination of a property of undisputed universal value, as attested to by its artistic, historic and spiritual significance, and supported wholeheartedly its inscription on the World Heritage List according to the criteria recommended by ICOMOS. In particular, the Delegation of Egypt stressed the importance of the property in the spread of monotheism in the region, including the spread of Islam, recalling that the Prophet Mohammed had been led to his mission following a fateful encounter with a monk at Umm Er-Rasas, during one of his voyages.

The Delegation of **Lithuania**, commenting on the change in the ICOMOS recommendation further to the late submission of additional information on the management plan by the State Party, requested supplementary clarification on the precise standards applied by the Advisory Body in that respect. It seemed that some sites were deferred for lack of a management plan, and others inscribed.

ICOMOS explained that management plans should reflect the actual management system on the site. When a property was well-managed, but a management plan did not exist, ICOMOS usually recommended inscription of the site and requested the elaboration of a proper management plan. When, however, management at the site level was not satisfactory, ICOMOS recommended deferral of the nomination to enable the State Party to improve the situation on the ground. Ideally, it would be preferable to have both sound management at the site and a proper management plan. We are currently in a transitional period and there were still some ambiguities to be resolved. However, the future *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* should provide much clearer indications to States Parties on this issue. ICOMOS recommendations, at any rate, were based on professional judgment taking into account a number of different issues and knowledge of the site's conditions.

The Delegations of **Oman, China and Kuwait** thanked ICOMOS for its presentation and expressed their support for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List under the proposed criteria (i), (iv) and (vi).

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, acknowledging the explanations provided by ICOMOS concerning management plans, asked when the management plan for Umm er-Rasas would be ready and in place. It also asked ICOMOS how it had come to be convinced of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, considering that in the evaluation document presented to the members of the Committee it had referred to the lack of a comparative analysis as an obstacle to the evaluation of the site.

ICOMOS explained that the State Party had not provided a time frame in the nomination document, and that the two monitoring missions recommended by ICOMOS were also meant to examine that issue. The additional information provided by the State Party after the preparation of the document to which the Delegation of the Netherlands referred, on the other hand, contained sufficient elements to establish the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in comparison to similar sites in the region.

The Delegation of **Chile**, supporting the inscription of the property, expressed the hope that the State Party would abide by the commitments made and ensure the implementation of sound management at the site. It added that the case bore no relation whatsoever to that of the property of Saint Kilda, examined by the Committee on the previous day.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that in the preceding few years, the presence of a management plan and comparative analysis had been considered a condition for the inscription of properties on the List. Given that there had been no time for proper consultations within the ICOMOS panel of experts due to the late submission of the management plan, which had not been provided to the Committee for its consideration, the Delegation expressed its concern as to how ICOMOS had reached its conclusions.

The Delegation of **India** said that clear guidelines on the requirements of a comparative analysis would be welcome, and agreed with the Delegation of Chile on the difference between the case of Umm er-Rasas and that of Saint Kilda.

Replying to the Delegation of the United Kingdom, **ICOMOS** explained that many of the experts involved in evaluating the property were familiar with the site and considered it to be of Outstanding Universal Value. However, insufficient

information had been provided in the original nomination file. When additional elements had been transmitted by the State Party, ICOMOS had finally been convinced that the property deserved inscription.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the inscription of the property on the List under criteria (i), (iv) and (vi).

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, referring to the revised recommendation of ICOMOS, observed a certain lack of consistency. In particular, it noted that management plans could have been at the stage of drafts, completed or completed and implemented. The ICOMOS recommendation did not require the completion of the management plan, which in the view of the Delegation was an essential step towards its implementation on the ground. It suggested, therefore, including some wording to that effect in the text of the Committee's decision.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, supporting the inscription of the property, requested clarification on the issue of inappropriate conservation methods which, according to the report prepared by ICOMOS, were still being used at the site.

ICOMOS reassured the Committee on that point, explaining that recent information provided by the State Party had confirmed that Portland cement was no longer in use at the site.

La délégation du **Bénin** appuie l'inscription du bien, compte tenu des informations supplémentaires fournies par l'ICOMOS et des déclarations de l'Égypte, et ne doute pas que l'ICOMOS a reçu les messages qui lui ont été adressés à propos du processus d'évaluation du plan de gestion.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the inscription of the property on the List, and recommended that continuous dialogue be maintained between ICOMOS and States Parties throughout the evaluation process. However, it was the Committee that eventually had to take a decision, and the latter had not been provided with the additional information that had led ICOMOS to modify its original recommendation. It was an issue that must be addressed in the future.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the inscription of the property and was satisfied with the clarifications provided by ICOMOS on the

management plan and Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** questioned the need for two consecutive monitoring missions to the site, as proposed in the ICOMOS recommendation, since it would appear that good management was already in place. It suggested, instead, that the Committee should request the State Party to provide, within one year, the complete management plan of the property.

ICOMOS explained that the two proposed missions were meant to monitor implementation on the ground of the new management plan that was being finalized.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the inscription of the property and suggested adopting the Draft Decision as proposed.

The **Secretariat** read out the text of the decision **28 COM 14B.22** as amended and adopted by the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Jordan** thanked the Committee for its decision, which was most encouraging for those working on the site. Jordan would indeed keep its commitments in line with the recommendations made by the Committee.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Royal Exhibition Building and Carleton Gardens |
| Id. N° | C 1131 |
| State Party | Australia |
| Criteria | C (ii) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

La délégation du **Liban** s'interroge sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, dont l'architecture ne présente pas, semble-t-il, d'aspect novateur et dont l'intégrité est compromise par la présence d'un bâtiment neuf au milieu du jardin. En ce qui concerne les zones tampons, elle considère que les quatre avenues qui entourent le bâtiment ne sont pas suffisantes et ne partage pas l'avis de l'ICOMOS à cet égard.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stressed the need to place the property in a broader framework. It recognized, however, the rarity of the building, irrespective of whether it displayed specific

innovative architectural features. It supported the deferral of the nomination, but recalled the need for consistency, especially taking into account the decision made by the Committee on the inscription of the Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia).

The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed its concern as to the process followed by the Advisory Body which had led to the recommendation to defer inscription. It was necessary to maintain consistency to ensure fairness and justice in the evaluation of properties. The Delegation asked whether the State Party had any information to provide with regard to the recommendation by ICOMOS that the property be re-submitted as a serial transboundary nomination encompassing other similar sites from other countries. It also requested clarification as to the level of legal protection in place for the proposed buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stressed the importance of the International Exhibition Movement and the fact that the proposed property was the only extant building representing that phenomenon, and supported its inscription on the List. It requested further clarification from ICOMOS on whether the property had Outstanding Universal Value of its own. If so, then it could be examined on its own merits. Could the State Party provide more details about the comparative analysis?

ICOMOS explained that the nomination did not really make the case with respect to the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, hence the recommendation for deferral.

(coffee break)

The Delegation of **Japan** shared the concern expressed by the Delegation of New Zealand on the communication process between the State Party and the Advisory Body. Until what date, in the evaluation process, could a State Party provide information effectively to ICOMOS?

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** provided information about the comparative analysis and legal protection. The proposed building, the only surviving example of 21 built worldwide, conformed to the standards set for exhibition halls at the time of its construction, and in that respect it truly embodied the innovations introduced by the Exhibition Movement. Concerning legal protection of the buffer zone, there were provisions in place for the entire area adjacent to the nominated

property which took into account heritage values at the local, federal and state level. In addition, a legally-binding management plan covering the entire buffer zone formed part of a general Urban Planning Instrument at the federal level.

The Delegation of **India** said that the nominated property had the potential for inscription, given that it was the only surviving example of its kind. The nomination could therefore come back as a serial proposal, especially if the time frame considered for the Exhibition Movement was extended beyond 1915.

ICOMOS pointed out that there were still in existence examples of exhibition halls other than what were known as "Halls of Industry". If the timescale was extended to, say, 1945, then many exhibition buildings in North America could be included.

The Delegation of **Norway** recalled the comments provided by the World Tourism Board (ITB) and the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH) on the overall importance of the nomination and asked ICOMOS for further clarification.

ICOMOS confirmed that TICCIH had also been consulted.

The Delegation of **Egypt** considered that the explanations provided by ICOMOS and the State Party were satisfactory, and suggested that more time should be allowed for the State Party to present a better case.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** said that, as suggested in the presentation made by ICOMOS, the property had Outstanding Universal Value, and proposed its inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supporting inscription under criterion (ii), recalled that the area now occupied by the new Melbourne Museum had always been intended for temporary buildings. It further stressed that the recommendation of ICOMOS was not consistent with previous conclusions reached by the Committee regarding, for instance, Hawar Islands (Bahrain) and the Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia), when the possibility of the State Party considering a transboundary nomination had been evoked. Finally, cultural properties should be assessed for authenticity, not integrity.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the immediate inscription of the property, with a recommendation to look into the possibility of a subsequent serial nomination. The important testimony to the industrial heritage would improve the representativity of the List.

The Delegation of **Oman**, in the light of the preceding statements, supported the inscription of the property on the List.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that, as clearly shown by the presentation, the site had Outstanding Universal Value both for its intrinsic artistic quality and its link with the Exhibition Movement, and supported its inscription on the List.

La délégation du **Liban** partage l'avis de la délégation du Royaume-Uni.

The Delegation of **China** supported the inscription of the property under criterion (ii).

La délégation du **Bénin** fait part de la perplexité que lui inspire l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its frustration at the overturning of the Advisory Bodies' recommendations, which seem to be changed always in the same direction, namely, in favour of inscription. The Committee had been too generous, and that had an impact on the credibility of the whole system. If, however, the Committee decided to inscribe the property, while recommending a future serial nomination, it should at least extend the time horizon of the possible future serial site beyond the 1815-1915 period recommended by ICOMOS.

The **Secretariat** read out the text of revised Decision **28 COM 14B.24**, which was adopted by the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** made a short statement, thanking the Committee for its support.

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Property | Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Koguryo Kingdom |
| Id. N° | C 1135 |
| State Party | China |
| Criteria proposed | C (i) (ii)(iii)(iv)(v) |

The Vice-Chairperson (Nigeria) took the chair.

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegations of **India, Oman, Colombia and Nigeria** expressed their full support for the inscription of an exceptional property which would enrich the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, underscoring the extraordinary quality of the well-preserved site, commended the State Party on the large buffer zone proposed. It supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Japan**, supporting the inscription of the nominated property, emphasized the particular artistic quality of its ancient wall paintings, dating from the period between the third century BC and seventh century AD.

La délégation du **Bénin** appuie l'inscription du bien sur la Liste et suggère, compte tenu des similitudes entre les deux sites, d'enchaîner avec l'examen de la proposition relative à l'Ensemble des tombes de Koguryo, soumise par la République populaire démocratique de Corée.

Responding to the comments of Benin, **ICOMOS** explained that the nomination of the Complex of Koguryo (Democratic People's Republic of Korea - DPRK) had come as a deferred property, and was therefore due to be examined at a later stage, according to the agenda. However, it drew the attention of the Committee to its recommendation to China that the possibility of a future joint transboundary nomination of the Koguryo culture.

The Delegation of **India** said that it would agree to the Committee discussing the nomination submitted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea before it discussed the property nominated by India (Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park).

La délégation du **Liban** regrette que l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS ne soit pas à la hauteur du bien, dont elle souligne la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Committee decided to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List under the proposed criteria. (Decision **28 COM 14B.25**)

The Delegation of **China** thanked the Committee and ICOMOS, recognizing the great honor and responsibility deriving from the inscription. It stressed the importance of protecting the cultural diversity of humankind and assured the Committee of the full commitment of the Chinese authorities to protect the heritage site for present and future generations. Finally, it expressed the hope that the nomination put forward by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would be successful, and said that China intended to cooperate with the latter in the future to explore the possibility of a joint transboundary nomination of the Koguryo culture.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | Complex of Koguryo Tombs |
| Id. N° | C 1091 |
| State Party | Democratic People's Republic of Korea |
| Criteria | C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report noting that it was a serial nomination, and was, in addition, linked to the recently-inscribed property in China, Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Koguryo Kingdom.

The nomination had been deferred by the Committee at its 27th session (**Decision 27 COM 8C.19**). All relevant remaining technical issues had since been resolved. Those tombs that the ICOMOS evaluator had reported not being able to enter, were tombs that had yet to be excavated.

Additions to the site in the form of new monumental sculpture was intended to enhance the presentation of the site, and was not represented by the State Party as being original, ancient artifacts from the site.

With regard to the Committee's previous suggestion that a comparative study (with similar sites in China) could be necessary, ICOMOS remarked that such a study was no longer required, as the corresponding sites on the Chinese side of the border had already been nominated and inscribed on the World Heritage List.

It recommended to the Committee that the property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv).

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that, contrary to what was stated in the documentation

before it, there were in fact 30 tombs in the nominated area.

The Delegation of **China** supported inscription, noting that it was the first nomination from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported inscription, and suggested that areas for cooperation between the State Party and China could include excavation and conservation, in particular protection from environmental threats.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported inscription, and inquired about the inclusion of risk preparedness measures in the property's management plan.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported inscription and congratulated the State Party on submitting an important nomination of a site of outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **Oman** supported inscription and commended the cooperation between the State Party and China in the preparation of the two nominations.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** welcomed the nomination and supported inscription.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was consensus in the Committee in favour of inscription and congratulated the State Party, declaring Decision **28 COM 14B.33** adopted, as amended to correct the number of tombs listed in the table.

The Observer Delegation of the **Democratic People's Republic of Korea** thanked the Committee and confirmed its commitment to conservation of the inscribed property, and to cooperation with UNESCO, China and the rest of the international community in the safeguarding of the site. It congratulated the Government of China on the inscription of the Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Koguryo Kingdom.

The **Chairperson** noted that it was the first inscription of a property in the State Party on the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS clarified that the Complex of Koguryo Tombs (DPRK) was inscribed under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), while the Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Koguryo

Kingdom (China) were inscribed under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v).

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park |
| Id. N° | C 1101 |
| State Party | India |
| Criteria | C (iii)(iv)(v) (vi) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report, explaining why it had revised its recommendation.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed its appreciation for the efforts made in preparing the excellent management plan for the property, and supported its inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked ICOMOS for its explanation and supported the inscription of the property on the List.

La délégation du **Liban** appuie fortement l'inscription du bien sur la Liste.

ICOMOS said that, of course, all management plans had to be monitored in their implementation, but that that one in particular, being new, required particular attention. The property in question had been in the past managed by two different institutions. The Archaeological Survey of India had been in charge of the archaeological areas, while the Temples were looked after traditionally by the religious authorities. A single combined system had been introduced, and it was expected that some time would be necessary until it could become effective.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the inscription under criteria (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) and suggested that a decision to that effect be taken by acclamation.

The Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi). (Decision **28 COM 14B.26**)

The Delegation of **India** made a short statement emphasizing the strong awareness of the local community of the importance of the property and the need to preserve it as a means of maintaining its own cultural identity.

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Property | Pasargadae |
| Id. N° | C 1106 |
| State Party | Islamic Republic of Iran |
| Criteria proposed | C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, commending the presentation made by ICOMOS, asked why criterion (vi) had not been considered for the property, given its close association with Cyrus the Great and the major historic events which had marked the establishment of the first Achaemenid Empire.

ICOMOS confirmed that, in that perspective, Pasargadae had symbolic significance that might merit inscription under criterion (vi).

The Delegation of **Egypt** emphasized the artistic, historic and symbolic importance of the property, already recognized at the time of Alexander the Great, who was said to have paid his respects to the tomb of Cyrus and ordered its restoration. It therefore supported its inscription on the List.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, endorsing the proposed recommendation, asked whether the management plan for the property had taken into account the concerns of the local community and the risks presented by floods.

ICOMOS informed the Committee that the local community had indeed been part of the decision-making process leading to the management plan, which also addressed the risk of floods.

The Delegation of **India**, expressing its appreciation for the large number of outstanding properties being nominated from the Asia region, supported the inscription of the property on the List.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, joining previous speakers in supporting the proposed inscription of the site on the List, recalled that the Committee had requested the Advisory Bodies to assess the nominated properties against all criteria, and not just those proposed by the State Party. The Committee had also agreed not to consider new criteria at the time of the inscription of a property.

The Committee adopted the decision as proposed. (Decision **28 COM 14B.27**)

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** thanked the Committee and ICOMOS for their support, and stressed the close link of Pasargadae to the moral legacy of Cyrus the Great, and particularly to his message of tolerance and recognition for cultural diversity.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range, and the Cultural Landscapes that surround them |
| Id. N° | C 1142 |
| State Party | Japan |
| Criteria | C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Lithuania** supported inscription on the List under the proposed criteria.

The Delegation of **India** strongly supported the inscription of the property, which testified to the spread of the Shinto and Buddhist religions in the region.

The Delegation of **Oman** commended ICOMOS for the beautiful presentation of the property, which was obviously of Outstanding Universal Value in many respects. It thanked Japan for its cooperation with ICOMOS and, joined by the Delegations of **Portugal** and **China**, supported inscription under criteria (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its appreciation for the excellent presentation by ICOMOS, and suggested that in the future the ICOMOS evaluations might include the name of their authors, as was the case in evaluations presented by IUCN.

ICOMOS explained that its reports were not the work of a single individual, but combined observations and contributions from a variety of sources. It would accordingly be impossible to identify a single author of an evaluation.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia, but expressed its reservations on the overall evaluation process. It would return to the issue at the end of the debate under the present agenda item.

The Committee adopted the decision as recommended by ICOMOS and inscribed the property of the Kii Mountain Range on the World Heritage List. (Decision **28 COM 14B.28**)

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its gratitude to ICOMOS for its contribution, which was greatly appreciated.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Petroglyphs within the Archaeological Landscape of Tamgaly |
| Id. N° | C 1145 |
| State Party | Kazakhstan |
| Criteria | C (iii) CL |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

It drew the Committee's attention to the quantity of scientific research and documentation that had been undertaken in respect of the nominated property and the quality of the analysis of that documentation, which had established the outstanding universal value and authenticity of the site.

It commended the site management plan, but recommended that the road intersecting the site should be moved to the periphery of the buffer zone, and that priority should be given to advancing the joint Norwegian-Kazakhstan project for the conservation of the site.

It recommended to the Committee that the nominated property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape under criterion (iii).

The Delegation of **Nigeria**, speaking in support of inscription, said that Tamgaly was an interesting site and asked whether absolute dates for it had been scientifically established.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** also supported inscription. It commended ICOMOS on its comprehensive evaluation of the nomination, and thanked Norway for its assistance to the State Party in preparing the site management plan.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** also supported inscription, but noted that ICOMOS appeared to be applying inconsistent standards with regard to its recommendation for the inscription of

Tamgaly, while recommending that the site of Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape in Azerbaijan should be deferred pending a comparative analysis.

The Delegations of **Egypt** and **China** supported inscription.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.29** adopted.

He congratulated the State Party and asked the Secretariat to send the Committee's congratulations to the Government of Kazakhstan.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Vegaøyan -- The Vega Archipelago |
| Id. N° | C 1143 |
| State Party | Norway |
| Criteria | C (v) CL |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

It underscored the significance of the continuity from the Stone Age until the present time in the occupational use of the site for the sustained production of eiderdown. It was a traditional occupation that had resulted in a long-evolved cultural landscape consisting *inter alia* of in- and out-field systems, a tradition of building houses for both humans and for ducks from driftwood, and other elements associated with the sustainable harvesting of eider duck down.

Historical documentation for the site was continuous from the eleventh century, and archaeological evidence had provided credible proof of the continuous use of the site for the past 10,000 years.

It recommended to the Committee inscription of the nominated property under criterion (v), and made several recommendations for the improved safeguarding of that fragile landscape in Draft Decision 28 COM 14B.45.

La délégation du **Bénin**, soutenue par les délégations de la **Lithuanie**, de l'**Oman**, de la **Chine**, des **Pays-Bas** et de la **Nouvelle-Zélande**, appuie l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported inscription, noting that it was a nomination of a cultural landscape giving evidence of a unique culture

which had survived for thousands of years in extreme circumstances through innovative and sustainable adaptation to the environmental and natural resources available therein.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked for further explanation of how the property met the criterion of outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported inscription and commended ICOMOS on a comprehensive and perceptive evaluation.

The Delegation of **India** spoke in support of inscription and expressed satisfaction that a nomination of such a long-endangered community had been brought before the Committee. It asked whether the property could be considered under natural criteria.

IUCN said that although the nominated property had high natural values, they were not of such outstanding universal significance as to qualify the site for World Heritage inscription. IUCN and ICOMOS had undertaken a joint evaluation mission to the site and had agreed to recommend its inscription as a cultural landscape under cultural criterion (v).

ICOMOS said that the occupation use of the site was unique, of extremely long duration, and exceptionally intact in all of its features.

The Delegation of **India** took note of the long continuous occupation of the site and supported inscription under the criterion proposed by ICOMOS. It added that India, too, had long-surviving traditional communities.

The **Chairperson**, noting the consensus among the Committee in favour of inscription, declared Decision **28 COM 14B.45** adopted.

The Delegation of **Norway** thanked the Committee, and introduced the representatives of Vegaøyan, who were present. It noted that the most recent previous inscription of a site in Norway had been 19 years previously.

| | |
|----------|--|
| Property | Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (Extension to include the Imperial Palace of the Qing Dynasty in Shenyang) |
|----------|--|

| | |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| Id. N° | C 439 Bis |
| State Party | China |
| Criteria | C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report noting that it was a serial extension to an already-inscribed property.

It underscored the intercultural form and character of the Shengyang Palace, combining Han, Manchu and Tibetan elements, and recommended the extension of the inscribed property to include the Shengyang Palace under existing criteria (iii) and (iv), and the inscription of the entire property (original plus extension) under additional criteria (i) and (ii). It did not recommend inscription under criterion (vi), as no evidence for the criterion had been provided in the nomination document.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported inscription, noting that it was a “marvellous property” in terms of both the architecture and the history it represented. It also commended the Chinese Government on its admirable record in the sustainable conservation of the already-inscribed Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties.

The Delegations of **Chile, Japan and Kuwait** supported inscription.

The Delegation of **India** supported inscription and congratulated the Government of China on putting forward the nomination.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported inscription, and asked whether the State Party had agreed to the revised name of the property.

The Delegation of **China** said that it had agreed to the revised name.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported inscription, but asked for clarification as to the criteria under which the property would be inscribed.

ICOMOS explained that its recommendation was to inscribe the property under four cultural criteria: (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and that those criteria, if accepted by the Committee, would apply to the serial inscription as a whole.

It noted that it had recommended that the State Party should re-examine the size and boundaries of the original property, with a view to extending its buffer zone.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was a consensus in the Committee in favour of inscription and declared Decision **28 COM 14B.30** adopted.

The Delegation of **China** expressed the thanks of the Government of China to the Committee.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | Imperial Tombs of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (Extension to include the Liaoning Tombs) |
| Id. N° | C 1004 Ter |
| State Party | China |
| Criteria | C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi) |

The Vice-Chairperson of Nigeria assumed the chair.

ICOMOS introduced the property, which had been nominated by the State Party under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (vi), noting that it was a serial extension to an already-inscribed property.

It noted that the proposed extension would include three additional tombs. It had considered whether the proposed nomination would be more appropriate as an extension of the Ming and Qing Palaces inscribed property, or of the Ming and Qing Tombs inscribed property, and had concluded that an extension to the Tombs would be more appropriate.

It recommended to the Committee the inscription of the extension to the property under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and (vi).

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** spoke in favour of inscription.

The **Chairperson**, noting that there was consensus among the Committee in favour of inscription, declared Decision **28 COM 14B.31** adopted by acclamation.

The Delegation of **China** expressed the thanks of the Government of China to the Committee.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Brihadisvara Temple, Thanjavur (Extension to include the Great Living Chola Temples) |
| Id. N° | C 250 Bis |
| State Party | India |

| | |
|----------|------------------------------|
| Criteria | C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) |
|----------|------------------------------|

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report, noting that it was an extension to an already-inscribed property.

It noted that the proposed extension to the Brihadisvara Temple, if accepted by the Committee, would create a serial property consisting of “living temples” visited by up to 60,000 people on certain days. The nomination dossier reflected very well the “living” character of the property, explaining its intangible spiritual and philosophical values, as well as its tangible architectural and historical values.

The property was well managed in a coordinated effort of the Tamil Nadu State Department of Religious Endowments and the Archaeological Survey of India.

During the evaluation mission, the **ICOMOS** evaluator had recommended that the boundaries of the property should be extended to include the tank (water reservoir) associated with the temples, and that recommendation had been accepted by the State Party. Although the temples were located in an urban area, there was no specific development risk to the property.

It recommended to the Committee the inscription of the proposed extension to the property under existing cultural criteria (ii) and (iii), and the further inscription of the extended site under the additional cultural criteria (i) and (iv).

The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Benin** supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported inscription, and asked **ICOMOS** whether it considered that criterion (vi) should be added to the nomination.

ICOMOS replied that as the State Party had not proposed inscription under criterion (vi), it had not evaluated that criterion. It would, however, be open to such a proposal and suggested that the State Party could consider the possibility at a later date.

The Delegation of **Oman** supported the inscription under the criteria recommended by **ICOMOS**.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.32** adopted by acclamation.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Committee for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus (formerly Victoria Terminus) Station |
| Id. N° | C 945 Rev |
| State Party | India |
| Criteria | C (ii) (iv) |

The Chairperson resumed the chair.

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report, noting that the nomination had been deferred by the Bureau at its 23rd session.

It recommended that the property should be inscribed under cultural criteria (ii) and (iv) only. However, it called attention to the importance of the Fort Precinct as the buffer zone, and suggested that the State Party could consider nominating an extension of the property to include the entire Fort Precinct (in which case additional criteria would be applicable).

It also suggested that the State Party should consider using the former and still commonly-used name, Victoria Terminus, as the name of the property on the World Heritage List (while retaining the new name, Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus, as the official administrative name) in memory of the fact that the Terminus had been built to commemorate the Jubilee of Queen Victoria. That was, however, a suggestion, and not a condition for inscription. ICOMOS would not insist on the use of the name Victoria Terminus, if the State Party did not so wish it.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported inscription, but did not support changing the name from that suggested by the State Party.

ICOMOS reiterated that it did not insist on the name change.

The Delegations of **Egypt, Nigeria, Oman** and the **Russian Federation** supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported inscription and asked the State Party what it thought of the ICOMOS recommendations.

The Delegation of **India** said that the Government of India preferred to keep the name as proposed, Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus Station.

La délégation du **Bénin** demande que l'on inscrive le site par acclamation.

La délégation du **Liban** demande à l'ICOMOS des précisions sur les inquiétudes exprimées quant à la compétence professionnelle des entreprises qui effectuent des travaux de restauration sur le site. Elle insiste pour que l'accent soit mis dans la décision sur la nécessité d'employer un personnel qui possède les qualifications et le savoir-faire nécessaires en matière de restauration.

ICOMOS agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the concerns being expressed had already been reflected in the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was consensus among the Committee in favour of inscription and declared Decision **28 COM 14B.34** adopted.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Committee on behalf of the Government and people of India, and remarked that the inscription paid tribute to the genius of the architect, Frederick William Stevens, and underscored the significance of Mumbai as a place of past and present international exchange. It also described the conservation protocols in place, which would ensure the safeguarding of the heritage values of the property.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape |
| Id. N° | C 1081 Rev |
| State Party | Mongolia |
| Criteria | C (ii) (iii) (iv) CL |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report, and noted that the nomination had been deferred by the Committee at its 27th session (27 COM 8C.27).

The nomination clarified the symbiotic links between nomadic society, its symbolic culture, and its religious and administrative fixed institutions. It was a nomination of an evolving cultural landscape, which over time had supported large empires.

It recommended to the Committee that the nominated property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape under cultural criteria (ii), (iii), and (iv).

The Delegations of **China, Lithuania and Norway** took the floor in support of inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported inscription, and thanked ICOMOS for its assistance to the State Party and for the comprehensive nature of its evaluation.

The Delegation of **India** supported inscription and congratulated the State Party on its efforts to nominate the property for inclusion in the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported inscription and endorsed the recommendations proposed by ICOMOS. It commended the State Party and ICOMOS on the preparation of the nomination dossier and site management plan.

The **Chairperson**, noting the consensus among the Committee in favour of inscription, declared Decision **28 COM 14B.35** adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Mongolia** thanked the Committee and all those who had assisted the State Party in the preparation of the nomination dossier. It assured the Committee of its commitment to the conservation and safeguarding of the inscribed property, noting that it was the first inscription of a Mongolian cultural property on the World Heritage List.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | The Madriu-Claror-Perafita Valley |
| Id. N° | C 1160 |
| State Party | Andorra |
| Criteria | C (v) CL |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

It presented the heritage values of the nominated property, which included pastoralism, summer settlement and terraced fields, iron smelting, paths and tracks, communal land ownership since the thirteenth century, and the spiritual heart of Andorra.

In its analysis of the needs of and threats to the property, ICOMOS identified access as both the

most pressing need for the inhabitants of the site and the most immediate threat to the conservation of the heritage values of the valley, if the need were met by the construction of a road.

With regard to the outstanding universal value of the nominated property, ICOMOS was of the opinion that it did possess outstanding universal value as a microcosm of an ancient land management system in the Pyrenees, and could qualify for inscription under cultural criteria (v), but not (iv).

It drew the Committee's attention, however, to the fact that formal legal protection for the nominated property was not yet fully in place, although the necessary legal and administrative processes were already underway.

It recommended to the Committee that it defer inscription of the property until legal protection for the site was in place, and the five attendant actions contained as recommendations in Draft Decision 28 COM 14B.36 had been acted upon.

IUCN explained that it had worked with ICOMOS on the evaluation of the nomination, motivated by the fact that it concerned a cultural landscape. There had been a joint ICOMOS-IUCN evaluation mission to the site. The IUCN component of the evaluation underscored the need for further research on the natural heritage of the nominated property and, particularly, the need for a comparative analysis of other mountain cultural landscapes in Western Europe.

IUCN's evaluation of the property had reinforced the ICOMOS recommendation to the Committee to defer inscription. In addition to the need to see protection legislation in place and operational, IUCN had recommended that a comparative analysis be conducted.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the recommendation to defer inscription, and supported the IUCN recommendation for a comparative analysis. It endorsed the proposal by other members of the Committee that ICOMOS evaluators should be identified by name in the evaluation documents submitted to the Committee, in line with IUCN practice.

The Delegation of **Argentina**, supporting the eventual inscription of the property, requested more information regarding the legal protection regime applicable at the site.

La délégation du **Bénin** demande à l'Etat partie et à l'ICOMOS de préciser la date à laquelle la protection juridique complète du bien entrera en vigueur.

La délégation d'**Andorre** (observateur) explique qu'une loi, promulguée en 2003, protège le patrimoine naturel, mais ne s'applique pas directement à ce site, classé dans la catégorie des paysages culturels, pour lesquels une loi est en cours de mise en oeuvre. Il faudra environ 6 à 12 mois pour qu'elle entre pleinement en vigueur, après quoi l'organe de gestion pourra commencer à appliquer le plan de gestion du site.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed the opinion that the outstanding universal value of the property was “obvious,” and underscored the significance of the survival of the ancient structure of communal land management. It proposed three options to the Committee: (i) immediate inscription of the property with the recommendations proposed by ICOMOS; (ii) referral of the nomination back to the State Party until the system of legal protection was in place and operational, and (iii) deferral of the inscription should another ICOMOS-IUCN mission, or comparative study, be deemed necessary by the Committee.

ICOMOS said that a second ICOMOS mission to the site would not be required.

IUCN said that a second IUCN mission to the site would not be required.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked ICOMOS whether the site did or did not have outstanding universal value.

ICOMOS said that it did.

La délégation du **Liban** demande des éclaircissements sur les études destinées à compléter l'inventaire des invertébrés, mentionnées dans l'évaluation et demandées avant l'inscription.

ICOMOS said that its five recommendations were not pre-conditions for inscription.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked for clarification as to the reason for deferral of inscription. Was it because of considerations of legal protection, or because of the need for a comparative study?

ICOMOS said that it was because legal protection was lacking - if legal protection were in place, ICOMOS would have recommended inscription.

IUCN said that legal protection was needed, as was a comparative analysis.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed the opinion that in light of the views of the Advisory Bodies, referral back to the State Party with the request for re-submission the following year would be the preferred course of action.

The Delegation of **India** inquired as to the time frame for the comparative analysis proposed by IUCN.

IUCN said that it would take approximately one month, and encompass similar sites in Western Europe.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed the opinion that consideration of inscription should be referred back to the State Party for one year, in order for legal protection to be put in place and the recommended comparative study to be conducted.

The Delegation of **India** asked why a comparative study was necessary if ICOMOS was already convinced of the property's outstanding universal value.

IUCN said that it felt a comparative study would be useful in establishing the property's outstanding universal value.

ICOMOS said that, as far as was concerned, no comparative study was necessary to establish the property's outstanding universal value. It expressed the view that as the property had not been nominated under natural criteria, only under cultural criteria, it was up to ICOMOS to evaluate outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **India** expressed the opinion that in light of ICOMOS's positive evaluation of outstanding universal value, the property should be inscribed with the recommendations of ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Argentina** spoke in support of inscription with the ICOMOS recommendations with regard to the need to ensure formal legal protection.

The Delegations of **Colombia** and **New Zealand** supported inscription.

The **Chairperson** asked whether any Committee members opposed inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed the opinion that any inscription as a cultural landscape should satisfy IUCN.

ICOMOS reminded the Committee that cultural landscapes were inscribed under cultural criteria and as such the ICOMOS evaluation of the property in question must be definitive.

The Delegations of the **Netherlands** and **Norway** spoke in favour of referral.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether the ICOMOS recommendation was for inscription or referral.

The Delegation of **Chile** said that procedure was key in the consideration of nominations, and supported inscription.

La Délégation du **Bénin** ne comprend pas pourquoi ce dossier est présenté au Comité alors qu'il est incomplet, puisque les dispositions requises pour la protection juridique ne sont pas encore mises en oeuvre.

The Delegation of **South Africa** requested clarification from the State Party about the status of legal protection of the property.

La délégation d'**Andorre** (observateur) explique qu'aux termes d'une loi entrée en vigueur le 17 juillet 2003, le bien a été classé dans la catégorie des paysages culturels, ce qui lui confère un statut de site protégé. Il reste cependant à préciser les modalités d'application de la loi au bien en question, ce qui ne peut se faire qu'à l'issue des consultations en cours entre habitants et dans le respect des délais de procédure en vigueur.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed the opinion that as generic protection was already available, there were two options before the committee: to inscribe the property immediately, or to refer it back to the State Party for re-submission when the legal process had been completed.

ICOMOS clarified that it had recommended either deferral or referral.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported referral.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Chile**, on a point of order, asked for a vote.

La Délégation du **Bénin** rappelle au Comité qu'une majorité des deux tiers est nécessaire si la décision d'inscrire le site est mise aux voix.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it would have preferred a decision to refer the property back to the State Party, but in consideration of "horizontal equity", it would be in favour of inscription.

The **Chairperson**, noting that the majority was in favour of inscription, declared the decision inscribing The Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape, under culture criterion (v) adopted, as revised to incorporate the five ICOMOS recommendations contained in the paragraphs pertaining to the property in document *WHC.04/28.COM/14B Rev. (28 COM 14B.36)*

La délégation d'**Andorre** (observateur) remercie le Comité et l'assure que le processus de protection juridique sera consciencieusement mis en oeuvre.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape |
| Id. N° | C 1076 |
| State Party | Azerbaijan |
| Criteria | |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

It said that the property appeared to have potential outstanding universal value, but that that could not be established at the present time because the site had not been fully explored or completely documented.

Remarking that a comparative analysis of rock art sites was a difficult but necessary undertaking, it recommended to the Committee that inscription of the property be deferred until further research had established without doubt its outstanding universal value and had enabled the State Party to re-examine the proposed boundaries of the site with a view to protecting its integrity.

La délégation du **Liban**, constatant que l'ICOMOS recommande que l'examen du site soit différé jusqu'à ce qu'une analyse appropriée soit faite, observe qu'il y a de nombreux autres sites comparables et qu'une étude approfondie serait difficile. Elle attire l'attention sur la différence qui existe entre inventaire et étude comparative, et cite le cas du site culturel japonais du Mont Kii inscrit par le Comité la veille, qui n'avait fait l'objet d'aucun inventaire, mais qu'une étude comparative avait permis de mieux évaluer. Enfin, elle demande des précisions quant à l'évaluation faite par l'ICOMOS à ce sujet et souhaite savoir si un spécialiste de l'art rupestre de cette région a participé à l'étude du dossier et à la mission d'évaluation.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked whether ICOMOS would be prepared to recommend inscription of the property under the single criterion (iii). It also asked the State Party to comment on the current state of knowledge/research concerning the site.

ICOMOS declined to say whether the nominated property could be inscribed under criterion (iii) alone, stating that its recommendation was to defer inscription pending further research.

The Observer Delegation of **Azerbaijan** informed the Committee that considerable research had been undertaken on the site since 1939, under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and more recently by Italian and Azerbaijani scholars. The results of that research had been published, albeit mostly in the Russian language.

The Delegation of **Egypt** concurred with Lebanon concerning the impracticality of requiring that a comparative study of rock art sites be undertaken prior to consideration of the property for inscription. The property had outstanding universal value and Egypt was in favour of immediate inscription.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked that scholarship concerning the site had been extensive, albeit in Russian, and that the level of knowledge about the site appeared to be comparable to that concerning Tamgaly. In its evaluation, ICOMOS appeared to indicate that the property could have outstanding universal value under criterion (iii).

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the opinions expressed by the United Kingdom. It

asked whether ICOMOS considered the boundaries of the property as submitted by the State Party to be acceptable.

ICOMOS explained the ICOMOS evaluation process and reiterated that it had no recommendation regarding the criteria under which the site could be nominated at that time. With regard to the property's proposed boundaries, it considered the boundaries (as recently amended by the State Party) to be acceptable.

The Delegation of **Japan** informed the Committee that Japan had completed an inventory of the cultural landscape site of Mount Kii prior to nomination.

The Delegation of **India** supported deferral of inscription based on an inadequate definition of the extent and, therefore the integrity, of the property, and requested the State Party to provide additional information concerning the spatial integrity of the property nominated. It did not, however, consider a full comparative study of other rock art sites to be necessary.

ICOMOS said, in reply to the United Kingdom, that the ICOMOS evaluator sent to the site was a member of the ICOMOS Rock Art Committee.

La délégation du **Liban** demande à l'ICOMOS de communiquer le nom de ou des évaluateurs et propose que le Comité formule une décision à cet effet. Concernant l'examen du site, elle note que celui-ci a bien été fouillé et inventorié et se demande si la déficience de l'évaluation ne serait pas liée à un problème linguistique ou à un défaut de compétences ou de connaissances. Nombre de sites ont été inscrits sans étude comparative, et la délégation s'interroge sur la nécessité d'en mener une dans le cas présent.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported deferral.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the suggestion by Lebanon that, in future, ICOMOS evaluations should include the names of the evaluator(s). It returned to the issue of the evaluation of the nomination by the ICOMOS Rock Art Committee, and asked, again, for clarification as to the criteria under which ICOMOS had evaluated the property.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported deferral of inscription, pending further research.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that the large number of engravings on the site was an indication of its potentially outstanding universal value. The amount of research would not be the determining factor, but rather whether the research undertaken to date had led to an analysis of the site which would allow the Committee to evaluate its outstanding universal value.

The **Chairperson** remarked that it appeared that further analysis would be necessary before the property could be inscribed.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** was in favour of immediate inscription.

The **Chairperson** remarked that there appeared to be no consensus for inscription.

The Delegation of **India** supported deferral, stating that more information would be required before inscription.

La délégation du **Liban** pense qu'il faut différer l'inscription du site et demande une meilleure évaluation de la part de l'ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee appeared to be moving towards a consensus for deferral.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported deferral, also noting the Committee's need for more information – in English or in French.

The **Chairperson** summed up, noting the need for further study of the site; evaluation of the site by Russian-speaking experts; identification of the ICOMOS evaluator(s) by name, and re-examination of the boundaries of the nominated property to ensure the safeguarding of the site's integrity.

ICOMOS reiterated that what was necessary for a reconsideration of the nomination was not merely additional research, but analysis of that research.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.37** adopted, deferring the nomination of Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape.

| | |
|-------------|----------------------------|
| Property | Kuressaare Fortress |
| Id. N° | C 1125 |
| State Party | Estonia |
| Criteria | C (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed its support for the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recognized the regional importance of the property but doubted that the site was of Outstanding Universal Value. It said that properties of that kind could be found all over Europe, and referred to the Committee's discussion on Bremen in Germany.

The Delegations of **Norway, Oman and Kuwait** supported the inscription of the proposed property.

La délégation du **Liban** doute, comme le Royaume-Uni, de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Elle relève l'absence d'un plan de conservation et de gestion, tout en remarquant que cette circonstance n'a pas gêné l'inscription, la veille, de la Réserve de l'île Wrangel en Russie.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the comments of the United Kingdom and said that good state of conservation itself was not sufficient grounds for inscription.

The Delegation of **Colombia** sought clarification as to whether there were other castles of a similar nature in a good state of conservation.

ICOMOS confirmed that the property was indeed an excellent and well-preserved example of a kind of Bishop's Castle in the region.

The Delegation of **Norway**, following up the question raised by the Delegation of Lebanon, asked ICOMOS whether it was satisfied with the conservation plan being prepared by the State Party.

ICOMOS expressed its satisfaction with the plan, which would be implemented by a single organization.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** echoed the concern expressed by the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Lebanon. It asked whether the Outstanding Universal Value of the property had been clearly demonstrated, particularly since there were many similar properties in Europe.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported inscription of the proposed property while acknowledging the points made by the Delegations of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

The Delegation of **India** said that the property was well-preserved but that its Outstanding Universal Value was not obvious.

La délégation du **Liban**, se référant à la définition de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site, exposée à la page 102 de la version française du document d'évaluation de l'ICOMOS, s'interroge sur le sens de la phrase suivante: "Les réserves quant à certaines des interventions devraient être évaluées dans le contexte de la situation réelle et historique en Estonie".

ICOMOS explained that the upper part of the castle had been restored. While the reconstruction had been subject to criticism, ICOMOS considered that it was part of Estonia's cultural and historical heritage.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, referring to page 84 of the ICOMOS evaluation report, asked whether it would strengthen the nomination if it included the historic town of Kuressaare, as the report noted that the fortress formed an integral part of the ensemble which had been built to a seventeenth-century town plan. It recommended deferring the nomination with a recommendation to that end.

The Delegation of **Norway** asked what were the differences between the Kuressaare Fortress in Estonia and the Portuguese City of Mazagan (El Jadida) which had been inscribed the previous day, as both were cases of fortifications.

ICOMOS said that the historic town of Kuressaare would make a good ensemble, but it was the State Party which had preferred not to include the town in the nomination. In response to the Delegation of Norway, ICOMOS explained that the Moroccan case was a historic town which was included in the citadel area, while the Kuressaare Fortress was separate from the town. ICOMOS concurred with deferring the nomination.

The **Chairperson** recommended deferring the nomination.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.39**.

The Delegation of **India**, on a point of order, sought clarification as to whether the State Party intended extending the area of the property to include the town of Kuressaare.

The **Chairperson** noted that the State Party was not present and asked the Secretariat to convey the decision of the Committee to the State Party.

| | |
|-------------|---------------------------------|
| Property | Dresden Elbe Valley |
| Id. N° | C 1156 |
| State Party | Germany |
| Criteria | C (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) CL |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report and noted that the State Party had provided supplementary information in December 2003 concerning the management system of the site.

La délégation du **Liban**, tout en reconnaissant la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site, demande à l'ICOMOS de préciser ce qu'il entend par "pressions en faveur de changements" dans la recommandation formulée au titre du critère (v), à la page 84 du rapport d'évaluation. Elle recommande en outre d'examiner la possibilité d'inclure le critère (vi), dans la mesure où le site est représentatif du drame et de la reconstruction de toute une ville et de tout un peuple.

ICOMOS explained that the statement on criterion (v) referring to urban development had been included to assist the conservation effort for the property. Concerning criterion (vi), ICOMOS agreed that it was relevant to the property in view of the historic event, but the property had been nominated primarily as a cultural landscape and not as a town centre, which was why it had not included criterion (vi).

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the inscription of the property as it was a good example of urban cultural landscape with a long and complex history.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the inscription of the property and commended ICOMOS on recognizing the importance of the valley's cultural and natural aspects.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the inscription. It asked ICOMOS to clarify its position concerning management plans: in one case, the Estonian authorities had been encouraged to finalize the conservation plan for the Kuressaare Fortress after

its inscription, and in another case the management plan for the Etruscan Necropolises of Cerveteri and Tarquinia in Italy, which ICOMOS recommended for inscription, had not been completed. Only a good management system existed for the Dresden Elbe Valley in Germany. ICOMOS seemed to value the effectiveness of management systems above management plans.

ICOMOS replied that a commission had been established to implement the management plan of the properties as a direct result of the ICOMOS assessment mission.

The Delegation of **India** wholeheartedly supported inscription of the property and hoped that other States Parties would be able to learn from Germany's experience in preparing the nomination dossier.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the nomination and also favored the proposition by the Delegation of Lebanon concerning the possible inclusion of criterion (vi).

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the Draft Decision, particularly given the important historic event associated with the property, which had been heavily reconstructed. It supported the proposal by the Delegation of Lebanon concerning the possible inclusion of criterion (vi).

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the inscription of the property and suggested that the Committee should seek the opinion of the State Party concerning the inclusion of criterion (vi).

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** appreciated the comments made by the United Kingdom and Lebanon and stated that it would welcome the inclusion of criterion (vi).

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that the Committee had decided not to add new criteria during its session and that the Advisory Bodies would need to evaluate any additional criteria.

La délégation du **Liban** propose d'inclure, dans la décision du Comité, une recommandation pour que l'adoption du critère (vi) soit examinée à l'avenir.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the comment made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia and stated that, while it considered that the criterion (vi) was appropriate, this would have to be evaluated by the Advisory Bodies.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.40** with an amendment to recommend that the State Party should consider a possible inclusion of criterion (vi) in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Committee on behalf of the Government of Germany, which had started to prepare the nomination dossier in 1989. Quoting a poem, it emphasized the beauty of the property and invited the members of the Committee to visit the site.

| | |
|-------------|---------------------------------|
| Property | Þingvellir National Park |
| Id. N° | C 1152 |
| State Party | Iceland |
| Criteria | C (iii) (vi) CL |

ICOMOS and **IUCN** presented the site and their evaluation report.

La délégation du **Liban** souhaite tout d'abord savoir si le problème relatif au projet de nouveau tracé de la route, évoqué dans la recommandation du rapport d'évaluation de l'ICOMOS, persiste. Elle s'interroge également sur la faisabilité des projets de fermeture du parking à l'est du site et de démolition d'un pont de béton, mentionnés dans la même recommandation.

ICOMOS explained that, after extensive consultations with the State Party, it had become clear that the road would be constructed outside the proposed area and was therefore no longer a conservation issue. Concerning the recommendation to replace the steel and concrete bridge over the Öxará River with a bridge of lighter construction, ICOMOS emphasized that it was a recommendation and not a condition. The idea had been to harmonize the structure with the landscape as the structure had a substantial visual impact on the open environment.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the inscription of the property and remarked that it could be extended in future to form part of a serial nomination with other Þing sites, such as those situated in the Isle of Man.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the inscription of the property and commended the State Party on completing a management plan for it. It further underlined the importance of the property, which helped understanding of the prehistoric period.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the nomination and emphasized the importance of the property, as it was one of the oldest free parliaments, signifying the role of democracy.

As the Delegation of **Iceland** requested the floor, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, on a point of order, said that States Parties should intervene only if they had objections to raise.

The Delegation of **China** supported the point made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia and also expressed its endorsement of the Draft Decision.

La délégation du **Bénin** se demande s'il est judicieux de remplacer le pont par une structure légère, comme le recommande l'ICOMOS, compte tenu du nombre élevé de visiteurs sur le site.

The Delegations of **Portugal** and **India** supported the inscription of the property.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B 41**.

The Observer Delegation of **Iceland** thanked the Committee and the Chinese authorities on behalf of the Government of Iceland and said that the property was Iceland's first on the World Heritage List. It reassured the Committee of its intention to follow up ICOMOS's recommendations and also thanked the Nordic countries for their cooperation.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Observer Delegation of Iceland and stated that the Committee had thus far in this session inscribed five properties on the World Heritage List from States Parties previously without any World Heritage sites.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | The Incense and Spice Route and the Desert Cities in the Negev |
| Id. N° | C 1107 |
| State Party | Israel |
| Criteria | |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

La délégation du **Liban** doute en premier lieu de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site en raison de sa taille, car il représente un petit segment d'une route qui s'étend sur 2,000 km. L'analyse comparative, qui fait à peine trois pages, ne

contient que des informations sur la partie proposée pour inscription, sans aucune référence aux autres sites de la région. Dans son évaluation, l'ICOMOS justifie le manque d'information par la nature inaccessible de la région, argument que la délégation rejette en faisant un parallèle avec un site équatorien, proposé dans le contexte du programme de la route des Incas, qui à lui seul n'a pas réussi à convaincre de sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. En second lieu, la délégation pose le problème de l'intégrité du site, qui a subi de nombreux travaux de reconstruction au XIXe siècle. Elle cite notamment l'exemple d'une porte reconstruite sur le modèle d'une autre porte d'une autre ville. Invoquant le paragraphe 24 des *Orientations*, elle rappelle les critères, notamment d'authenticité, auxquels un site doit satisfaire pour pouvoir prétendre avoir une valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Elle demande enfin quelles mesures de gestion ont pu être mises en place en prévision d'une inscription, encore que cet aspect puisse être considéré comme secondaire vu la tolérance manifestée jusqu'ici par le Comité à cet égard.

ICOMOS pointed out that its evaluation report was not accurate in stating that the State Party had not provided a comparative analysis. Furthermore, ICOMOS itself had faced difficulties in finding comparable examples. Concerning the integrity of the site, it said that although certain aspects of reconstruction had been of concern, it was not considered to be a major issue. On the management plan, the recommendation was to prepare a detailed work plan and the management plan had already been prepared by the State Party.

La délégation du **Liban** insiste sur le fait que l'analyse comparative ne fait que trois pages et contient peu d'informations.

The Delegation of **Egypt** endorsed the statements made by Lebanon and expressed alarm concerning military training taking place within the nominated area, as safety would be an issue for the management of the site and its archaeological content as well as for visitors. It wondered whether ICOMOS had received that information and further questioned the authenticity of the property.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked on what basis ICOMOS had justified the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as it was not clear whether enough research had been undertaken to demonstrate its value. It called for consistency in the approach taken by ICOMOS on nominations,

and referred to the nomination of the Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape in Azerbaijan, where ICOMOS had recommended deferral due to insufficient research on the interpretation of rock art.

ICOMOS explained that the assessment of the site's Outstanding Universal Value had been made considering the route as a whole, and not individual settlements and monuments.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** stated, for the information of the Committee, that the long incense route went through the desert which had been controlled by the Romans and not because the traders had wanted to avoid the Romans.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed deferring the nomination, which should be further strengthened in line with the ICOMOS recommendations to put in place an archaeological strategy for the whole site and also for each of the major towns, to have active management of Haluza and to take steps to consolidate those parts of the site which had been excavated, as well as to amplify existing management plans.

The Delegation of **Japan** commented that comparative analysis was one of the crucial components of any nomination dossier and asked the State Party to specify its plans for the preparation of a comparative analysis for the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** explained that it had already provided information concerning the management plan prepared by national experts which included an archaeological strategy. Concerning Haluza, the archaeological excavation was being back-filled to be consolidated. It emphasized that management planning was an ongoing process which had to be carried out in the context of town planning schemes.

La délégation du **Liban**, soulevant une motion d'ordre, précise que la réponse de l'Etat partie ne doit comporter que des éléments d'information sur l'étude comparative.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** replied that the existing comparative analysis had referred only to those sites in the Negev Desert which were inhabited, and which were grouped together near the Mediterranean Sea.

The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed deferring the nomination in light of the lack of information provided by the State Party. It noted that the evaluation report should be re-written to contain new information.

The Delegation of **India**, having recognized that only certain sections of the trade route were being nominated, asked ICOMOS whether further research would highlight any other sites that would merit inscription on the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS said that the location of the settlements was explained by the need to manage the incense trade and that the nominated areas were part of the inhabited sections which had led to the growth of towns. ICOMOS was of the view that further research would not provide much additional information.

The Delegation of **Oman** disagreed with the remark made by ICOMOS and, supported by the Delegation of **Portugal**, suggested referring the nomination back to the State Party in order to obtain more information.

The **Chairperson** summed up, saying that the Committee decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party to allow it to obtain additional information on the comparative analysis.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Etruscan Necropolises of Cerveteri and Tarquinia |
| Id. N° | C 1158 |
| State Party | Italy |
| Criteria | C (i) (iii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report and highlighted the excellence of the management plan which had been submitted recently by the State Party and would serve as a good example in Italy.

La délégation du **Liban**, sans disconvenir de la beauté du site, demande à l'ICOMOS d'en préciser la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Si importants que soient les vestiges meubles du site, il ne saurait être question d'inscrire les musées, bâtiments modernes sans intérêt particulier, qui les renferment. Dans ces conditions, peut-on encore parler de valeur universelle exceptionnelle? Enfin, compte tenu de la soumission tardive du plan de gestion, il vaudrait peut-être mieux différer l'examen de la proposition.

ICOMOS drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the State Party had originally nominated the property to include the Caerean Archaeological Museum in Ceveteri and the National Archaeological Museum in Tarquinia. However, the *World Heritage Convention* did not provide for nominations of movable property. According to ICOMOS, the nominated property possessed Outstanding Universal Value as it was one of the earliest urban societies in the region which introduced classical influences from Greece. Concerning the question of a management plan and the timing of a nomination of a property, ICOMOS considered that lack of a management plan itself was not a reason to make a recommendation against inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the inscription of the property. It asked whether those paintings which had been removed could be restored to their original setting and remarked that it was a modern trend to develop on-site interpretation centres.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recognized the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and supported its inscription. Having stated the importance of monitoring the property, it remarked that the management system was effective.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the inscription of the property and commented that the management system for the property was well-established.

The Delegation of **India** took note of the comments made by the Delegation of Lebanon and congratulated the State Party on the excellent nomination. It remarked that the management system for the property was well-developed.

The Delegations of **Colombia, China, Saint Lucia, Portugal, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Nigeria, Argentina** and **Kuwait** supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Portugal** referred to the earlier discussion on the relevance of the museum and movable objects and suggested that the Committee should insert the following text in paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision: “underlining, nevertheless, the extraordinary value of the collections to the understanding of the two necropolises”.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** recalled that the *Convention* did not provide for the nomination of movable objects.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, while supporting the Draft Decision, remarked that there had to be a formalized procedure for assessing the adequacy of a management plan for a nominated property.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the point made by the Delegations of Portugal and Colombia and said that the museums were an integral part of the property. It noted that lack of funding for establishing museums was often a problem in the Latin America region.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.43**, as amended.

La délégation de l'**Italie** exprime son émotion et ses remerciements aux membres du Comité et à l'ICOMOS en donnant des précisions sur l'historique du site, vestige d'une civilisation urbaine précoce. Elle note avec joie que la majorité des intervenants connaît le site et ses musées et explique que le retard dans la préparation du plan de gestion est lié à la volonté de mettre au point un nouveau modèle, qui pourrait être mis à la disposition de tous. Elle précise à ce sujet que l'Italie organise en 2005 une conférence internationale sur l'élaboration de plans de gestion. A propos des musées, la délégation reconnaît qu'il s'agit d'un problème d'ordre général mais, compte tenu de la réglementation en vigueur, les vestiges bénéficient de la même protection au niveau national que le reste du site. Pour conclure, la délégation remercie vivement le gouvernement chinois et le président du Comité pour leur accueil et leur gentillesse et félicite les autorités pour la splendeur du centre dans lequel se tient la réunion.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | Kernavė Archaeological Site (Cultural Reserve of Kernavė) |
| Id. N° | C 1137 |
| State Party | Lithuania |
| Criteria | C (iii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the inscription of the property.

La délégation du **Liban**, après avoir obtenu confirmation qu'une partie de la ville de Kernavė

fait partie de la zone tampon, demande si le plan de gestion suffit à protéger le site du développement de la ville.

ICOMOS confirmed that a management plan for the property had been developed by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the inscription of the property and remarked that Lithuania was under-represented on the World Heritage List.

La délégation du **Bénin** soutient l'inscription du site à la fois pour sa profondeur historique et pour sa typologie, ne doutant pas qu'elle contribuera à créer des liens entre l'Europe et l'Afrique.

The **Chairperson** asked that the Delegations wishing to make interventions in favour of the nomination, namely, the Delegations of Oman, Norway, Nigeria, New Zealand, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Lebanon, Japan, India and Colombia, be noted.

La délégation du **Liban** recommande, à propos du critère (iii), d'inclure, dans le projet de décision, une référence à la nécessité de mesurer la croissance de la ville.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.44**.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** thanked the Committee and ICOMOS and, referring the property as one of the most sacred sites in Lithuania, renewed its commitment to safeguarding it.

| | |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| Property | Dečani Monastery |
| Id. N° | C 724 |
| State Party | Serbia and Montenegro |
| Criteria | C (ii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegation of **China** supported the inscription of the property, particularly since the State Party had resubmitted the nomination after having defined a buffer zone and provided adequate protection for the site.

The Delegation of **India** supported the nomination but made a reference to the difficult political situation.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its support for the nomination and underlined the need to conserve some of the mural paintings of the property.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that the nomination did not include a comparative analysis and asked ICOMOS to clarify the value of the site, as it considered that the value possessed by the property was not universal.

ICOMOS explained that the comparative analysis of the property had been thorough and had been assessed by an appropriate expert. As the World Heritage site of Studenica Monastery represented the first phase of the Byzantine traditions, the nominated property, representing the final phase, thereby completed the chronological sequence for the Byzantine period on the World Heritage List. It explained that the paintings made the site of Outstanding Universal Value.

In conclusion, it noted the comments made on the assessment of management plans by the Advisory Bodies and undertook to include this aspect in the future.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.47**.

14B. Nominations of properties to the World Heritage List (continued)

Inscriptions de biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial (suite)

Documents:
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.14A,
HC-04/28.COM/14.Rev

| | |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| Property | Varberg Radio Station |
| Id. N° | C 1134 |
| State Party | Sweden |
| Criteria | C (ii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegations of the **United Kingdom**, the **Russian Federation**, **Norway** and **New Zealand** expressed strong support for the inscription of the industrial heritage site.

La délégation du **Liban** estime que l'examen du dossier soulève de sérieuses questions. En particulier, la station radio en question n'est pas le seul exemple représentatif de cette catégorie particulière de patrimoine industriel, puisqu'il en existe également en Norvège et aux Etats-Unis, et celle-ci n'a rien d'exceptionnel en soi. Ce type de station de transmission, dont il reste peu de trace dans le monde, représente certes une époque mais il est impossible de figer la symbolique de la communication sur un bâtiment. Une proposition d'inscription sérielle serait plus indiquée.

ICOMOS said that there were different sites relating to the development of communication technology and systems, and that the present site could indeed be the first in a serial inscription. It expressed the opinion, however, that the site in itself was of outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** referred to the importance of technological development and said that it was of the view that it was not worth waiting for a serial nomination to be submitted for the site to be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** questioned the terminology used by ICOMOS in describing the site as 'functional industrial heritage'.

ICOMOS said that the station was potentially functional and could still be used in case of emergency.

La délégation du **Liban** demande si le bien peut être considéré comme un monument au sens strict de la *Convention*. Elle s'interroge sur la nature précise de l'objet proposé pour inscription, notant que ni les instruments utilisés par la station ni un ensemble de biens meubles ni un réseau d'information ne peuvent être inscrits sur la Liste.

ICOMOS said that the concept of monument was not limited to monumental structures but could also cover the functioning of a transmitter of a message.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed the opinion that as it was the first example of industrial heritage, much more documentation was needed in the form of a comparative study in order to provide

the Committee with sufficient elements for a decision.

La délégation du **Bénin**, partageant les sentiments des délégations du Liban et de la Colombie, pense que le bien présenté est défini comme "monument" mais que cette définition est poussée à l'extrême. Elle remarque qu'il n'existe pas d'éléments permettant de parler d'un monument d'exception et qu'il n'y a aucune base constitutive de valeur universelle exceptionnelle. A son avis, la protection de ce bien relève plutôt de l'Organisation mondiale de la propriété intellectuelle (OMPI).

The Delegation of **India** recalled that industrial heritage was not a frequently-used category. India had always supported innovative nominations, which were watersheds in the development of the World Heritage List. It asked whether the property should be inscribed with a recommendation for a future serial extension, or whether the nomination should be deferred to allow for consultation on a possible serial nomination.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the recommendation of ICOMOS to inscribe the site and congratulated ICOMOS on its excellent presentation. The fact that the nomination could be the first in a series should not penalize it if the property had outstanding universal value in its own right.

The Delegation of **Lebanon**, on a point of order, said that it was not up to ICOMOS to define a "monument."

The Delegation of **Argentina** emphasized that in the case of industrial heritage one should not expect to find monumental architecture in order for such a site to qualify as a monument. If the Committee wished to fill the gaps in the List, it should recognize that there were biases in the conventional definition of "monument."

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that it was not the first industrial site to be inscribed and had no objection to inscription. It would also support a serial nomination, and the Committee could still include a recommendation to that effect.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it would be happy to participate in such a serial nomination in due course.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed that, in that case, the nomination should be deferred to allow for preparation of a serial nomination.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that the site was an outstanding example and asked whether the State Party had undertaken a comparative analysis.

The Observer Delegation of **Sweden** informed the Committee that the station functioned whenever needed by the armed forces. In its comparative study, it had identified approximately twenty stations constructed worldwide but Varberg Radio Station was the only one remaining. It was important as the only example of a long-range transmitter of Morse signals.

The **Chairperson** thanked the State Party for elaborating on the issue of the comparative study.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** clarified its earlier statement. It had not intended to imply that the property should not be inscribed at the present session.

The **Rapporteur** reminded the Committee that in a previous case during its present session it had taken the position that a serial nomination should not be a condition for inscription.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed support for the nomination.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it had already expressed support for the inscription but with a recommendation for a possible future serial extension. It is therefore not a condition for inscribing.

The Delegation of **Egypt** observed that there was no consensus in the case. Furthermore, it was of the opinion that the building of the 1920s was very modest and that the particular site did not meet the criterion of outstanding universal value. It would feel very uncomfortable about inscription.

The Delegation of **India** requested clarification on the Committee's recommendation. At the present session, the Committee had inscribed sites that on their own did not have outstanding universal value but would have in the context of a serial nomination.

ICOMOS said that the nomination itself was based upon a recommendation of the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial

Heritage (TICCIH) that the value of the site was scientific and that it had outstanding universal value in its own right. Nevertheless, an association with other sites was also possible.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed strong support for the nomination. It recalled that the Committee had already inscribed several sites with recommendations for future serial inscriptions.

The Delegation of **India** stressed that it did not want to hold up the inscription but that for the future it would not want to see a string of independent inscriptions but a single serial inscription.

Upon the Chairperson asking whether any member had an objection to inscription, the Delegation of **Egypt** declared that, in its view, the site had no outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether the vote would be on inscription under criteria (ii) and (iv) with a recommendation on a serial extension.

The **Chairperson** said that no member of the Committee had asked to move to a vote, and he therefore declared the decision to inscribe Varberg Radio Station on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv) with the recommendation to look into the possibility of a future serial nomination adopted. (Decision **28 COM 14B.48**).

The Observer Delegation of **Sweden** thanked the Committee for its decision and said that it was accompanied by representatives of the owner of the site and the local authority.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Property | Liverpool - Maritime Mercantile City |
| Id. N° | C 1150 |
| State Party | United Kingdom |
| Criteria | C (ii) (iii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report. It informed the Committee that a harbour development project was under preparation that could affect the value of the site and that it recommended that the Government of the United Kingdom should monitor new developments carefully and provide clarification of the 'Pier Head' and 'Fourth Grace' development project.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed support for the nomination. It said that Liverpool had been the major port of the British Empire and once one of the most cosmopolitan ports in the world. It had been a melting pot of ethnic and racial groups that had lived together in racial and cultural tolerance, rare in many parts of the world.

La délégation du **Liban** souligne l'importance de la ville de Liverpool sur le plan tant historique que patrimonial. Elle estime toutefois que le Comité est confronté dans le cas présent au même problème que celui qui s'était posé deux ans auparavant lors de l'inscription de Vienne. Beaucoup de temps, d'énergie et de longues négociations furent nécessaires pour éviter que les gratte-ciels prévus sur le site de cette ville ne dépassent une certaine hauteur. A l'époque, le retrait du site de la Liste avait même été envisagé et les représentants du Royaume-Uni avaient alors été très fermes sur cette question lors des débats. Il importe de garder en mémoire l'expérience passée afin d'éviter de perdre encore beaucoup de temps pour réparer les erreurs commises. Pour toutes ces raisons, la délégation s'interroge sur l'opportunité d'inscrire Liverpool alors qu'un projet de construction sur le site même est en cours de discussion.

La délégation de **Sainte-Lucie** demande à être informée par l'Etat Partie et par l'ICOMOS de l'état d'avancement exact de ce projet.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that the development project was the result of a competition for what was at present a parking area. The project had not been finalized, no planning permission had been formally submitted, and no funding had been secured for the development. The project was already under revision. It assured the Committee that if Liverpool were to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, it was a factor that would certainly be considered in any evaluation of an eventual project.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked why no comparison had been undertaken with the harbours of Rotterdam or Amsterdam and said that the reference to the Beatles in the ICOMOS evaluation related to the intangible heritage of Liverpool. As to the comments made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the Delegation stated that it was turning things upside down. The Committee should wait to see the results of the project development in order to have the assurance that the site's outstanding universal value would not be affected.

The Delegation of **South Africa** asked ICOMOS how the particular legacy of the slave trade impacted on the value of the site.

ICOMOS said that there was a museum in Liverpool dedicated to the slave trade within the boundaries of the proposed site.

The Delegations of **Oman**, the **Russian Federation** and **Japan** supported the inscription of the site.

La délégation du **Bénin** souscrit aux propos tenus par la délégation du Liban quant au devoir de mémoire et salue l'intervention de l'Afrique du Sud, qui associe le souvenir de l'Afrique à cette inscription. Elle remarque à ce sujet que le texte de l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS est très centré sur l'Empire britannique et que le projet de décision devrait faire une référence expresse à l'origine "africaine" des esclaves, qui serait d'autant plus appréciée que 2004 est l'Année internationale de commémoration de la lutte contre l'esclavage et de son abolition. Au-delà de l'inscription du site, c'est la défense des valeurs humaines qui est affirmée, le devoir de mémoire qui est accompli, et dont le projet de décision devrait se faire l'écho.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the recommendation of ICOMOS and the statement of the Delegation of Benin.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported the inscription but stated that the project should not be accepted. He was sure, however, that the elders of Liverpool would not tolerate the kind of intrusion the Committee was discussing.

The Delegation of **Portugal** remarked that Lisbon should also be included in a comparative study and that that very week a study meeting was taking place in Lisbon on ports and related intangible values. As to the reference to the case of Vienna made by the Delegation of Lebanon, the Delegation observed that World Heritage inscription had helped Vienna find an appropriate solution, and that, having heard the State Party, it could support inscription.

The Delegation of **Norway** accepted the declaration of the State Party and supported the inscription. It proposed, however, strengthening the text in paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision as to the recommended monitoring of urban development processes.

Evoquant l'inscription de Vienne, la délégation du **Liban** rappelle qu'à l'époque l'Etat partie avait assuré ne pas connaître tous les détails du projet alors qu'un permis de construire était accordé quelques semaines à peine après l'inscription du site. Après l'intervention du Centre du patrimoine mondial, du Comité et des organisations consultatives, la hauteur des bâtiments avait été révisée alors que de l'avis général cette construction n'aurait pas dû voir le jour sur le site. La délégation recommande donc aux membres du Comité d'être très vigilants sur cette question car une fois le site inscrit, il est trop tard pour agir.

The Delegation of **China** requested clarification on the legal protection of the area.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** informed the Committee that the whole site was under planning guidelines and that a comprehensive management plan had been prepared.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** stated that the possibility of such a development should not prevent its inscription.

ICOMOS recalled that in the case of Vienna the building permit had already been given but that the Committee had not been aware of that at the time of inscription. The Committee could either refer the nomination back and request the plans for the development project, or inscribe the site with a strong recommendation on the new development. It said that ICOMOS was not against development as such, but it should be in line with the character of the place.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its complete agreement with Lebanon. As there appeared to be a majority for inscription under specific conditions, the Committee could simply remove the site from the List if the conditions were not met.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the site be inscribed under the condition that any development was in harmony with the historic character of the site.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it admired the creativity of the Delegation of Saint Lucia but asked who would determine whether or not the project was in harmony with the character of the site. If it were the Committee deciding, then it would come back to the Committee in any case,

and the Committee could, without any problem, refer the nomination to the next session.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that it understood the position of the Delegation of the Netherlands but observed that the project might never be built and that it therefore agreed with the position expressed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the Committee could inscribe the site and then, if needed, could inscribe it on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La délégation du **Liban** partage le point de vue de la délégation des Pays-bas, regrettant l'absence d'un cadre juridique, qui simplifierait grandement la situation.

The Delegation of **Norway** asked what building guidelines were in place for the area in question.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that there were guidelines governing the height of buildings to guarantee that new development was in harmony with the historic surroundings. It confirmed that the project would of course be submitted to the Committee and that the City of Liverpool had already consulted ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Norway** found the guidelines acceptable.

La délégation du **Liban** précise que tous les permis de construire et plans d'urbanisme mentionnent la protection de la zone dans laquelle est prévue la construction. Cette mention est générale et pratiquement sans effet. Le seul moyen de contrôler les constructions consiste à en limiter la hauteur.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked ICOMOS whether it knew what it would not want to see to happen in Liverpool and if so, whether it could be written into the recommendation.

ICOMOS said that it was not so simple but, as a general rule, new buildings should not be higher than existing ones.

The **Representative of the Director General** said that the Committee had the full right to express its opinions and that the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS would have the technical capacity to assess any future project proposal and present it to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision to inscribe Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City, United Kingdom, on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) with recommendations as discussed, adopted (decision **28 COM 14B.49**).

The representative of **Liverpool City Council** thanked the Committee for its decision, citing a text by John Lennon. He assured the Committee that its observations and recommendations would guide the city's development process.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | The Town Hall and Roland on the Marketplace of Bremen |
| Id. N° | C 1087 |
| State Party | Germany |
| Criteria | C (iii)(iv)(vi) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

La délégation du **Liban** rappelle qu'à la précédente session, la proposition avait été renvoyée à l'Etat partie pour une étude comparative sur les Hôtels de Ville. Celle-ci a été réalisée, mais elle ne suffit pas à prouver que Brême possède une valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Le bien revêt sans aucun doute une valeur régionale importante mais il est difficile de lui attribuer une valeur universelle.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the view expressed by the Delegation of Lebanon. It expressed surprise that no reference was made to the Hanseatic cities already on the World Heritage List and that the site should be considered as an extension to them.

The Delegation of **Oman** expressed strong support for the nomination.

The Delegation of **Norway** considered the site to be of outstanding universal value but asked whether it could be said to be of outstanding universal value in comparison with other medieval town halls already on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** informed the Committee that a study of other town halls had been undertaken in a broader European context and that it had been revised by two external experts. It

started to describe the site's outstanding universal value.

Soulevant une motion d'ordre, la délégation du **Liban** souhaite que l'Etat partie s'abstienne de s'exprimer en faveur de son propre site.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed satisfaction with the study and peer review and supported the nomination.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the nomination on the basis of its continuous use as a seat of local authority.

The Delegations of **Lithuania, Egypt and Japan** supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** agreed with the Delegations of Oman and Colombia.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported inscription and proposed that the property could be renominated as a serial property together with other German cities already inscribed on the List.

The Delegation of **India** did not share the enthusiasm for inscription and asked if no way could be found to inscribe the site in connection with other sites already on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** made reference to other properties already inscribed at the present session that did not compare favourably to Bremen. Accordingly, it supported the inscription.

ICOMOS said that the comparative study undertaken by the State Party had been very convincing. It also referred to the value of the Roland statue as being highly significant with an important spiritual meaning. It confirmed that a number of experts had been convinced of the values of the nominated site. As to a serial nomination, Bremen Town Hall could not be immediately associated with other Hanseatic towns.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the Committee adopt the Draft Decision with a recommendation to the State Party that it consider a serial nomination in the future.

The Delegation of **India** repeated that it had proposed including the site among similar Hanseatic cities already inscribed in the State Party.

Tout en réitérant ses doutes quant au caractère universel du bien, la délégation du **Liban** dit qu'elle se ralliera à la décision de la majorité.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked for clarification as to whether the Committee was adopting the proposal of the Delegation of India.

The **Chairperson** said that a majority of the Committee was in favour of inscription.

The Delegation of **India** restated its position that a recommendation should be added to the decision regarding a serial nomination.

The **Chairperson** declared the Town Hall and Roland on the Marketplace of Bremen, Germany, inscribed under criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi) with a recommendation that the State Party consider the possibility of renominating the site, together with other Hanseatic cities already inscribed in Germany (Decision **28 COM 14B.50**).

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Committee for the inscription.

| | |
|-------------|--------------------|
| Property | Val d'Orcia |
| Id. N° | C 1026 Rev |
| State Party | Italy |
| Criteria | C (iv) (vi) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report, informed the Committee that it had recently received additional information from the State Party and said that it could recommend inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked why the additional information had not been included in the addendum to the working document. The Committee could not accept oral information.

ICOMOS answered that the information did not change the recommendation as such but was a response to certain observations expressed by ICOMOS on the comparative analysis. Additional comparative research had been undertaken by ICOMOS and the only comparable site was the 'Beemster Polder' in the Netherlands.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its satisfaction and support for the nomination.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** accepted the response of ICOMOS but insisted that new information should have been submitted to the Committee in writing.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the nomination.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported both the statements of Saint Lucia and Nigeria.

The Delegations of **New Zealand, India** and **China** supported inscription.

The **Chairperson** then declared the decision adopted to inscribe the Val d'Orcia, Italy, as a cultural landscape under criteria (iv) and (vi) (Decision **28 COM 14B.51**).

La délégation de l'**Italie** (observateur) exprime sa joie et sa fierté de voir ce site magnifique inscrit sur la Liste et précise que c'est ce même paysage que l'on retrouve dans de nombreuses peintures de la Renaissance italienne, notamment chez Léonard de Vinci. Ce paysage est resté identique au cours des siècles et c'est ce qui fait son caractère unique. La vie artistique dans la région du site est très présente et en continuel développement.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | Landscape of the Pico Island Vineyard Culture |
| Id. N° | C 1117 Rev |
| State Party | Portugal |
| Criteria | C (iii) (iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegation of **Chile** expressed support for the nomination and recalled the importance of the site in connection to Latin America.

The Delegations of **Lithuania, Egypt, Benin, China, Nigeria** and **Oman** supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked about risk management as regarded the impact of the new airport on the island.

ICOMOS said that any airport had an impact but it was necessary for the development of the island. Assurances had been given that impact would be limited to the extent possible.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the inscription and referred to the fact that Argentina also had that type of site where there was a close interaction with the land.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** said that it had a ‘problem’ with the outstanding universal value of the site but that for the sake of unity it would accept inscription before having tasted the excellent wine of the island.

ICOMOS reiterated the outstanding universal value of the nominated site, in particular regarding the way the walls divided the area into small fields and allowed production in harsh conditions.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision to inscribe the Landscape of the Pico Island Vineyard Culture, Portugal, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape under criteria (i), (iii), (iv) and (v) adopted. (Decision **28 COM 14B.52**).

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Property | Muskauer Park / Park Muzakowski |
| Id. N° | C 1127 |
| State Party | Germany/ Poland |
| Criteria | C (i)(iv) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegations of **Colombia**, **Egypt** and **Lebanon** expressed support for the nomination.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision to inscribe the Muskauer Park / Park Muzakowski, Germany/Poland, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape under criteria (i) and (iv) adopted. (Decision **28 COM 14B.53**).

He expressed his appreciation for the transboundary nomination and the close collaboration established between the States Parties concerned.

The Observer Delegations of **Poland** and **Germany** expressed their gratitude for the inscription of the cultural landscape, stressing the fact that it was a symbolic inscription which built and reinforced cooperation between the two countries in precisely the same area that had been the theatre of the beginning of two World Wars.

| | |
|----------|----------------------------|
| Property | Luis Barragán House |
|----------|----------------------------|

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| | and Studio |
| Id. N° | C 1136 |
| State Party | Mexico |
| Criteria | C (i)(ii) |

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report and informed the Committee that it had received information that the whole site was now legally protected.

The Delegation of **Colombia** referred to the enormous importance of the property for the architecture of Latin America, and, supported by the Delegations of **Egypt** and **Chile**, expressed strong support for its inscription.

The Delegation of **Argentina** emphasized the importance of the work of the architect Luis Barragan.

La délégation du **Liban** soutient la proposition d'inscription et demande l'avis de l'ICOMOS sur l'idée d'une proposition d'inscription sérielle, qui lui paraît souhaitable.

ICOMOS said that a serial nomination of the work of Barragan could indeed be envisaged.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision to inscribe the Luis Barragan House and Studio, Mexico, adopted under criteria (i) and (ii) adopted, with the recommendation that the State Party should examine the possibility of a serial extension of the work of Barragan (Decision **28 COM 14B.54**).

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** and the Director of the Fundación Luis Barragán thanked the Committee for the inscription and informed the Committee that it would look into the possibility of presenting a serial extension of Barragan's work.

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Property | Bam Citadel (Arg-e Bam) and its Related Sites |
| Id. N° | C 1208 |
| State Party | Islamic Republic of Iran |
| Criteria proposed | C (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) |

The **Chairperson** explained the procedures set out in paragraph 67 of the *Operational Guidelines* under which the Bureau could waive the normal deadlines for properties proposed on an emergency basis. At its session the preceding Sunday, the

Bureau had approved the waiver of the deadlines, and had recommended that the Committee should consider the inscription of the property. Two Draft Decisions were proposed, one for inscription on the World Heritage List, the other for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report of Bam and its Cultural Landscape, noting the request of the State Party for a modification to the name as originally proposed.

La délégation du **Liban** remarque que le Comité se trouve devant un cas d'espèce et déclare soutenir pleinement l'inscription de Bam et de son paysage culturel simultanément sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Committee** decided unanimously to inscribe Bam and its Cultural Landscape on the World Heritage List (Decision **28 COM 14B.55**) and on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Decision **28 COM 14B.56**).

Prenant la parole à l'invitation du Président, la délégation du **Mali** (Observateur) remercie le Comité ainsi que le Secrétariat et les différentes ONG consultées dans le cadre de la préparation du dossier d'inscription du bien. Elle précise qu'un responsable de la conservation des biens vient d'être nommé et assure le Comité que le bien sera géré et préservé au bénéfice de l'humanité tout entière.

14B. Nominations of properties to the World Heritage List (continued)

Inscriptions de biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial (suite)

Documents:

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.14A,

HC-04/28.COM/14.Rev

The **Chairperson**, noting the 'typhoon devil' that had cleaned and freshened the air the previous day, hoped that the delegates would be similarly refreshed after their Saturday break.

The **Secretariat** announced that a representative of UNESCO's Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs had now joined the meeting and

would be available should any legal questions arise.

The Observer Delegation of **Denmark** took the floor on behalf of the Danish and Greenland Home Rule Governments, and the municipality of Ilulissat, to thank the Committee for its decision to inscribe Ilulissat Icefjord on the World Heritage List. Although for unforeseen reasons its arrival had been delayed and it had not had the pleasure of being in the room during the IUCN presentation, it expressed its appreciation for its work. The Home Rule Government, in close collaboration with the municipality of Ilulissat, would ensure that the recommendations of the Committee and of IUCN would be implemented as soon as possible. The Delegation concluded by inviting everyone to visit Ilulissat.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Indonesia, who had also not been able to make a statement following the inscription of the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** thanked the Committee for its deliberations and decision to inscribe the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra on the World Heritage List. It thanked IUCN for its hard work and presentation, and concluded by thanking the Government and people of China for their warm welcome and hospitality.

The **Chairperson** noted that several Committee members had asked for time to address general issues surrounding the nomination process, and he therefore opened that debate.

ICOMOS wished to take the opportunity to acknowledge the hard work of the ICOMOS team that had prepared the evaluations for the Committee and the presentations over the preceding days. It was also grateful for all the comments made by Committee members during that period, and for any other comments that might be made in the days to come. It underlined the importance of improving communication between the Advisory Bodies and the Committee, so that the working methods of the Committee would be transparent and clear.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that nominations were the culmination of often years of effort by States Parties, and that the hopes and aspirations of communities and sometimes nations rested on such work. It was therefore very important to ensure that the evaluation process was

transparent and equitable. The Delegation highlighted the issue of consistency that it believed had been absent during the previous days of discussions: consistency of assessment of outstanding universal value, of presentation in the nominations, in application of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (including application of the criteria), consistency in the Committee's decision-making, and consistency in process. For the sake of the credibility of the Convention, it was important for those issues to be addressed. When the revised *Operational Guidelines* came into effect, such problems would be compounded if not resolved. It would be important to put in place transitional arrangements for the introduction of the new *Guidelines* and inform all States Parties. It seemed from the documents distributed that there was already some confusion about which version of the *Operational Guidelines* was in force. The Delegation said that they had prepared a Draft Decision for the consideration of the Committee which addressed those points, as well as others raised by other Committee members.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** concurred with most of the observations made by the United Kingdom. It added that it was important that the Committee always take its decisions on the basis of expert knowledge and sound argumentation. When it had joined the Committee, it had waived the right to bring forward new nominations during its mandate, so that it could speak freely. In relation to decisions on inscription, it reminded the Committee of a maxim, "If in doubt, leave it out" and suggested that it was sometimes wise to be tough and wait until missing information had been supplied before inscribing a site. The Delegation also commented on the need to be clear about what was expected concerning management plans: was the western experience with management plans an unnecessary imposition on traditional cultures which already had management structures in place, but little documentation? The Delegation also commented on the importance of delegations receiving the necessary documentation in sufficient time -- six weeks before the meeting as required -- if they were to consult the necessary experts before coming to the Committee session. Recalling the Delegation of Lebanon's comments at a previous meeting, the Delegation of the Netherlands noted that it was the Committee that took decisions, based on expert advice, and Committee members should be able to consult their own experts in addition to the Committee's Advisory Bodies. With regard to the often excellent presentations, it asked

that a means be found to make them available to Committee members before the session. Finally, it asked that the Committee set aside time in the future to discuss the concept of outstanding universal value. It seemed from the presentations by the Advisory Bodies that there were two concepts: outstanding universal global value, and outstanding universal regional value, based on sites that were only representative of a theme. At the present Committee session, sites of different orders of outstanding universal value had been inscribed. Committee members had observed the difference between nominations presented by IUCN (using standards of outstanding universal global value); and those presented by ICOMOS, whose outstanding universal value was presented in a regional context.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** endorsed most of the comments expressed by the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. It noted that the credibility of the World Heritage List depended on the credibility of the Committee, of the Centre and of the Advisory Bodies. There were many improvements that could be made to all three organs, but one issue was crucial: State Parties should not put forward sites for inscription while they were members of the Committee. It is of course obvious that such a measure could not be adopted immediately, since the governments of Committee members might already have made plans to propose nominations and Committee members must be therefore able to make informed decisions before proposing their candidature for a seat in the Committee. It had prepared a draft decision on that proposal and would explain the rationale behind it when the debate takes place. It further noted that such a measure should not apply to Committee members with no properties on the World Heritage List.

La délégation du **Liban**, partageant les inquiétudes des orateurs précédents, pense que le Comité se trouve dans une situation de crise de croissance, rançon sans doute du succès qu'ont valu à la *Convention* plusieurs décennies de travail. Les Etats parties sont de plus en plus actifs et subissent souvent des pressions locales et nationales, ce qui aboutit à la présentation de nombreuses candidatures et, si l'on ne prend garde à cette dérive, la crédibilité de la Liste risque d'en souffrir. Une inflation de sites dont la valeur universelle exceptionnelle n'est pas manifeste ne manquera pas en effet de déprécier ceux dont la valeur est incontestée. Cette question, qui mérite d'être sérieusement examinée, concerne le Comité, le

Centre et les organismes consultatifs. La délégation soutient le projet de décision présenté par la délégation du Royaume-Uni sous réserve de quelques modifications. Elle pense en outre, comme la délégation de Sainte-Lucie, qu'il ne faut pas permettre aux membres du Comité de soumettre d'autres propositions d'inscription, car on ne peut être juge et partie. Raison pour laquelle, malgré un dossier en cours dont l'examen est différé, le Liban s'est engagé à ne présenter aucun site pendant la durée de son mandat, position qui confère à la délégation une plus grande indépendance.

The Delegation of **Japan** thanked the United Kingdom for its efforts to improve the decision-making process, and agreed with the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Argentina**, while concurring with the statements of the United Kingdom and Saint Lucia, underlined the importance of respect for deadlines. The deadlines established for the evaluations had not been respected. Concerning the substance of the evaluations by the Advisory Bodies, the Delegation observed that in the Latin America and Caribbean region, the shortcomings of nominations noted by the evaluations were due to lack of resources, not lack of goodwill or knowledge. Countries of the region should enlist the financial support and aid of those countries with greater financial resources. The Delegation, while noting that its comments were intended as constructive criticism, observed that some nominations seemed to have been rushed through the process, not taking the rules into account. It had the impression that some of the additional information requested from the State Party had been submitted after the deadline.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that although the *Convention* established a set of rules for the inscription of sites, the concept of heritage was an evolving one. The moment was one of change, in which new ideas of contemporary heritage, industrial heritage, cultural landscapes, serial and transboundary nominations called for new approaches. The recent decision to abolish the Bureau was still being evaluated. During this period of transition, the Committee should be prepared for an evolution in its procedures. Echoing the concerns expressed by Argentina, the Delegation recalled the problems of financing nominations, which involved a large number of people and resources. A Committee decision not to inscribe a site was a great frustration for the people concerned. There was a clear need to revise the

procedures and technical aspects of the Committee's work. The Delegation called for an extraordinary session of the Committee to examine those issues.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that while it appreciated the suggestions of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, it looked forward to seeing them in written form so that they could be studied.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the points raised by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Saint Lucia and other delegations, and asked to see the proposed Draft Decision referred to. In the decisions taken during the previous week, there existed inconsistency regarding different nominations. He noted that the decisions of the Committee had been based on the evaluations, not on an examination of the actual nomination dossiers.

The Delegation of **Oman** commended the Draft Decision of the United Kingdom, as it placed a number of the concerns voiced by Committee members in a clearer framework. The draft decision covered information which Committee members would need in order to take appropriate decisions. The proposals made by Portugal should be considered in a more general framework.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the previous speakers, and in particular with the content of the Draft Decision proposed by the United Kingdom about the evaluation of nominations. It also expressed support for the spirit of the statement of the Delegation of Saint Lucia, but not with its proposal to ask Committee members to refrain from proposing new sites for inscription on the List. It also specified that it was not always necessary to have a management plan *per se*, but that where exemplary management plans existed, they could be used as models for other nominations. The Delegation agreed that the process of presenting nominations was a costly one.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** thanked the United Kingdom for its draft proposal and agreed with most of the points raised. However, it disagreed with the views expressed by Saint Lucia and Lebanon in which they advocated a rule preventing Committee members from presenting nominations of properties in their own State. With a six-year Committee term of office, it would be difficult to prohibit a State Party from submitting nominations.

It was a subject that should be considered at greater length at another time.

The Delegation of **China** wished to raise five points based on the discussion that had just taken place. First, it thanked the members of the Committee which had spoken in favor of improving the Committee's decision-making process, and supported all those points which would improve the credibility of the Convention. Second, it agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia concerning the coordination of the three organs of the *Convention*. Every possible means should be found to achieve coordination and harmonization. Third, since the Committee's decision in Cairns, some Committee members had willingly waived their right to present nominations, and the Delegation extended its heartfelt thanks to them. Fourth, in the face of the limited resources available to the Centre, Advisory Bodies and the Committee, the Committee did need to retain a limit on nominations. It was important to resolve that issue by enhancing the capacity of the Committee to better implement the *Convention*, and by enhancing the capacity of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Last, it supported the position advanced by the United Kingdom, but would like time to study the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that its Draft Decision, which had been partially circulated, was still in draft form, and recommended that the Committee should assign a drafting group to finalize the text.

IUCN said that it had taken note of the constructive comments of the Committee members, for which it expressed its thanks. It considered that there was clear guidance in the *Operational Guidelines* (paragraph 6(i)) as to what constituted outstanding universal value. In interpreting that concept, IUCN was guided by its global strategy assessments (reported earlier to the Committee) and by its thematic studies. The credibility of natural World Heritage sites in the eyes of many external audiences lay in part in the rigorous interpretation by the Committee of outstanding universal value. As an example, it cited Shell's and ICMM's (International Council on Metals and Mining) "no-go" commitment to avoid working in natural World Heritage properties. IUCN agreed with several members of the Committee that it was in the interests of all that the right nominations should be brought forward. Therefore, in relation to natural heritage, it suggested that States Parties use IUCN's global analysis and thematic studies in the

preparation of Tentative Lists. Furthermore, both the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies should encourage best practice in the preparation of those Lists, and exemplary lists should be circulated. While acknowledging that it was the Committee itself that must organize its work, it noted that the abolition of the annual Bureau meeting did make it more difficult for the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties to iron out any misunderstandings before the Committee made its final decision: that issue should be addressed if the Advisory Bodies and States Parties were to have full confidence in the process. Finally, IUCN underlined the importance of finalizing the global strategy documents of both Advisory Bodies as soon as was possible. It noted, however, that a number of the issues raised, such as management plans, had already been addressed in the revised draft of the *Operational Guidelines*. The general point, it stressed, was to encourage more effective dialogue between the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, and the States Parties.

ICOMOS agreed with the statement of IUCN. In a time of transition, there was a need for consistency. The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre had already been working for several years on revising the *Operational Guidelines*, which everyone expected to be finalized soon. As the *Guidelines* included a definition as to whether a nomination was complete, it was not necessary to have special guidelines on that point. In most nominations there was always something missing, and it would not be desirable to paralyze the system with bureaucratic procedures.

The Observer Delegation of **Malta** called the Committee's attention to the ethical dimensions of its work. The protection of heritage had become a multi-million dollar industry. The Advisory Bodies were not-for-profit organizations, and, as such, could be viewed as susceptible to the special interests of consultancy firms, and other individuals and organizations that might have a special interest in seeing the Advisory Bodies reach a certain conclusion. In the interest of the credibility of the Committee and the Advisory Bodies, it urged the Advisory Bodies to maintain their high level of credibility.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** agreed with many of the points raised by Committee members. It urged the Committee to consider four points in its draft decision: Firstly, it should strongly recommend that the *Operational Guidelines* be finalized and approved as soon as was possible;

secondly, Tentative Lists should receive a formal evaluation by the Advisory Bodies; thirdly, given the confusion about the concept of outstanding universal value, between the "best of the best" and "representative of the best", the Committee should conduct a substantive debate on the issue, and finally, Committee members should hold back from presenting nominations during their terms of office, in order to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy**, noting the many sound ideas in the draft decision promoted by the United Kingdom, concurred with the position stated by ICOMOS: the Committee should not paralyze its work with bureaucratic constraints, such as management plans. If a good management structure existed, but not necessarily a management plan *per se*, States Parties should not be penalized. There should be a certain margin of flexibility in the procedures. New procedures for nominations were also necessary, as were capacity-building measures for countries that were under-represented on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for its commitment. It was in the middle of a reform process, and it would not be "plain sailing" until some of its procedures had been worked out. He asked the Committee to establish a drafting group in order to prepare a final version of the United Kingdom proposal.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its great concern as to the lack of clarity in some of the decisions that had been adopted the previous day by the Committee, and asked the Chairperson to spell out the elements of each decision when adopting.

15. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

EXAMEN DE L'ETAT DE CONSERVATION DES BIENS INSCRITS SUR LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL EN PERIL

15A PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

BIENS INSCRITS SUR LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL EN PERIL

Document : WHC-04/28.COM/15A

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (proposed by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) (C 148)

The **Chairperson** explained that informal consultations have taken place with the aim of achieving consensus on the issue under discussion. Expressing his personal gratitude to all who had contributed to bringing a very positive result, and in particular the Italian Ambassador Francesco Caruso, who continued his remarkable diplomatic efforts initiated at the last General Conference of UNESCO in the interest of the safeguarding of the World's cultural and natural Heritage. He proposed that the Draft Decision, which had been circulated in the room be adopted unanimously and without discussion.

The **Committee** adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.31** by consensus.

Manovo-Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) (N475)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and said that no new information had been received since its preparation.

La délégation du **Bénin** demande des précisions sur la coopération avec le Tchad et le Soudan, dont la nécessité est évoquée au paragraphe 1 du projet de décision, et souhaite savoir si le protocole d'accord qui devait être signé entre l'UICN et l'État partie l'a été.

The **Secretariat** said that cooperation between the Central African Republic, Sudan and Chad had been requested by the Committee at its 27th session following reports of poaching pressures originating in those two countries. Since no new information had been received on the issue, it recommended that a reference to the need for such cooperation should be included once more in the decision.

IUCN informed the Committee that the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of the Central African Republic had been delayed but that it would continue to work

closely with the State Party on the conservation of natural heritage, including the Manovo-Gounda St. Floris National Park.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.1**

Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N227)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and explained that the poor security situation in the country had meant that the mission requested by the Committee at its 27th session could not take place.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that it would be helpful to reiterate the mission's objectives, and queried the feasibility of the time frame for it. It asked for UNESCO be placed ahead of the Advisory Body in references to joint missions, and suggested that the Secretariat use the agreed-upon formula.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.2**

World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (N137)

Virunga National Park (N63)

Garamba National Park (N136)

Salonga National Park (N280)

Okapi Wildlife Reserve (N718)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working documents along with the revised Draft Decision provided that morning. It noted that the security situation had deteriorated considerably, especially in the east of the country, where an army mutiny had broken out. The main continuing problems included the presence of armed groups in and around the properties, and illegal encroachment and mining activities. In Kahuzi-Biega National Park, serious setbacks to recent improvements had resulted in the looting of the Park headquarters and its occupation by armed groups. It also reported that with prices for the mineral colombo-tantalite rising again, a fresh increase in illegal mining activity was to be feared. In Virunga National Park, armed groups were making it impossible to consolidate any gains that might have been made in the preceding months. In June, a World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)/Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature (ICCN) mission had been ambushed, a guard killed and guard posts looted and destroyed.

Encroachment near the Rwanda border into prime gorilla territory was allegedly on the orders of Rwandan military commanders. However, recent action by the World Heritage Centre, diplomatic missions and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) seemed to have led to a halt in deforestation. In Garamba, poaching continued and at least six northern white rhinos (of an estimated total population of only 30) and over 1,000 elephants had recently been killed. The poaching was reported to be from Sudan and focussed on the ivory trade. Two ICCN park guards had been killed in an armed encounter with Sudanese poachers in May.

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre provided additional information on the high-level fund-raising conference concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo due to be held in September 2004 at UNESCO Headquarters.

La délégation du **Bénin**, qualifiant la situation que vit la République démocratique du Congo de grande tragédie humaine et africaine, appuie le projet de décision et suggère d'ajouter le parc national Okapi à la liste des parcs nationaux à évaluer, cités au paragraphe 9.

The Delegation of **South Africa** shared the concern expressed by the Delegation of Benin with regard to the human and natural tragedy taking place in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and thanked the Centre and IUCN for their attempts to mediate solutions.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed concern that the recommendations in the Draft Decision would not be sufficient to achieve the desired objectives. Actions needed to be taken at different levels. It suggested that the Centre should work with other international conventions such as CITES and with other United Nations agencies. It noted that the September conference on the Democratic Republic of the Congo would be an opportunity for the international community to cooperate in finding solutions to the challenges faced by the properties.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its solidarity with the State Party, and noted that it experienced similar difficulties of conflict in protected areas. In such situations, it was difficult for a government to give high priority to conservation issues.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for appropriate mention of regret over the loss of park

wardens' lives in the conflict to be included in the decision.

La délégation de la **Belgique** (observateur) indique que son pays organise une exposition à la conférence sur la conservation du patrimoine naturel de la République démocratique du Congo qui doit se tenir en septembre, au Siège de l'UNESCO. Elle espère que les pays répondront de manière positive à la demande d'appui financier, et qu'ils enverront à cette conférence des représentants du plus haut niveau possible. Son pays a décidé, compte tenu de la situation des parcs nationaux en question et de la priorité que l'UNESCO leur a accordée, de concentrer ses contributions extrabudgétaires sur la protection de la biodiversité en Afrique centrale. La délégation se dit par ailleurs préoccupée par la diminution des effectifs du personnel spécialement chargé du patrimoine naturel, et évoque avec regret le départ de M. Natarajan Ishwaran, en le remerciant du dévouement avec lequel il a dirigé la Section du patrimoine naturel au Centre.

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre said that the Democratic Republic of the Congo conference was one of the Centre's most important projects. He thanked the United Nations Foundation for having contributed US\$3 million towards the DRC project. Given the government commitment to cooperate with international organizations, UNESCO had decided to host the September meeting for the mobilization of funds and the organization of an exhibition. He noted the financial support of Italy and Belgium. With regard to the staffing issue raised by the Observer Delegation of Belgium, he assured the Committee that recruitment processes were underway.

The **Chairperson** noted the work of the Centre in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and said that much remained to be done. He declared Decision **28 COM 15A.3** adopted, as amended.

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N9)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document. It noted that the State Party had provided a report on 25 May, indicating that wildlife numbers had increased and that the re-demarcation of the park boundaries was complete. The report did not, however, include any maps nor did it provide further information with regard to the benchmarks set by the Committee for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.4** without discussion.

Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N155/257)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.5** without discussion.

Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N573)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and said that no new information had been presented, which meant that the State Party had not provided the information on the issue of stolen vehicles repeatedly requested by the Committee. It suggested that IUCN provide further comments with regard to the delays in the planned mission to the property.

IUCN said that it was in communication with the State Party but that due to logistical difficulties, had not yet been able to carry out the mission. It would soon reschedule it and would report back at the next Committee session.

La délégation du **Liban** suggère que l'UICN et le Centre organisent cette mission le plus tôt possible et que le fait soit consigné dans la décision.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed concern over the lack of response to the Committee's request to the State Party on the fate of the vehicles purchased with International Assistance funds. Specific measures should be taken if the State Party did not reply to the request by a certain deadline.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15A.6** adopted.

Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N25)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document, noting that no new information had been received since its preparation.

Decision **28 COM 15A.7** was adopted without discussion.

Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N684)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and provided further details on its recommendation to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN informed the Committee that the ten-year General Management Plan referred to in the working document had been completed and was due to be approved in June. For the preceding two years, the security situation on the ground had been unchanged, management facilities had been deployed and tourism had picked up again. **IUCN** noted that a number of threats remained that required management to limit their impact. It commended the Uganda Wildlife Authority for its strong commitment to the protection of the property and supported the recommendation to remove it from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It highlighted the case as a success story for the *World Heritage Convention*.

La délégation du **Bénin**, tout en remerciant l'organe consultatif et le Centre, remarque que la majorité des biens en péril se trouve en Afrique. Elle recommande qu'à l'occasion de la première session que le Comité va tenir en Afrique subsaharienne au cours de l'année à venir, le Centre envisage de lancer, conjointement avec les instances de l'Union africaine et d'autres structures africaines nouvelles, une initiative visant à étudier les moyens d'inverser la tendance. Elle recommande en outre que le Centre collabore avec le groupe africain à l'UNESCO à la poursuite de ces objectifs.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated the State Party on its work and said that it fully supported the Draft Decision.

La délégation du **Liban** note que cette remarquable réussite montre que l'inscription d'un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril n'est pas une punition, mais une façon d'aider un État Partie à sauvegarder ses biens.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.8**

Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N8)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and announced that no new information had been received since its preparation.

The Delegation of **Colombia** remarked that the property had received a considerable amount of aid and that the State Party should make an effort to make more information available.

The **Secretariat** responded that the State Party had indeed provided a good deal of specific information on improvement of the state of conservation of the property. However, no written confirmation had yet been received regarding its commitment to ensure a minimum flow of water to the property.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that more precise indications on requirements for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger would be useful for the State Party, and expected **IUCN** and the Centre to provide clear advice in that regard.

The **Secretariat** replied that improved conditions at the property were mostly due to more favourable weather conditions over the previous two years. A few successive years of drought might once again lead to a critical situation. Without minimum water provision assurances from the State Party, there were no guarantees that the property's integrity would be maintained.

IUCN added that additional commitment from the State Party was indeed required on the issue and that recent high rainfall showed the ability of the ecosystem to recover if adequate water flows were ensured.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the United Kingdom's proposal and said that the Draft Decision request was beyond the capacity of the State Party. It recommended that the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated the need for the State Party to be clearly informed on what was required from it in order to have the property removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation did not suggest removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger at present.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the Committee should keep recommendations in

general terms. In that case, however, the recommendations should be re-drafted with specific information for the State Party on what was required to have the property removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** agreed that the State Party should have clear recommendations. He suggested that IUCN and the Secretariat re-phrase the text and declared Decision **28 COM 15A.9** adopted, as amended.

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N338)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and highlighted the cooperation of the State Party with the United Nations Foundation and UNESCO.

IUCN noted that it had received recent reports that Bodo militant camps in and around the park had been removed and that tourism was being actively promoted again, which was a positive sign after two decades without tourism. It asked the State Party to confirm that information. It recommended a monitoring mission to further investigate the situation and evaluate the damage to the property in collaboration with the State Party.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15A.10** adopted.

Everglades National Park (USA) (N76)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and informed the Committee that no additional information had been received. It corrected a typographic error in the original report from the State Party in paragraph (b) on page 17 (English version) and page 18 (French version) of the working document – year 2116 should read 2016.

La délégation du **Liban** demande au Centre si le parc doit demeurer sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril jusqu'en 2016.

The **Secretariat** suggested that the State Party should provide additional information on the revised deadline.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it had noticed that in most Draft Decisions there were provisions commending States Parties on their efforts and congratulating them on their actions, but that no such provision

was made regarding Everglades National Park, despite the fact that the State Party had made considerable efforts and invested over US\$8.3 billion to address the threats to the site. It explained that its Government had viewed the List of World Heritage in Danger as a tool that could help States Parties take purposeful action and mobilize necessary support. The Observer Delegation suggested that once the Committee was convinced that the State Party was making a concerted effort to deal with the threats, it should remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It presented an addition to the Draft Decision for consideration by the Committee.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that the State Party had answered only parts of the questions raised. It had indeed carried out a great deal of work, but it was not yet clear what the State Party needed to accomplish before the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** reminded the Committee that it was the Committee's responsibility to draft decisions and not the State Party's.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that it was IUCN's responsibility to identify the necessary conditions required to suggest removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN commended the State Party on its detailed report and considerable efforts to work with all sectors and stakeholders to restore the natural ecosystem. It recommended that IUCN, the Centre and the State Party work together to identify benchmarks and the steps the State Party needed to take before the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to report on those issues to the Committee at its next session, in 2005. As things stood, it would be inappropriate to give a time frame for the possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for IUCN's recommendation to be integrated into the final decision.

The **Chairperson** thanked the State Party for its tremendous effort and declared Decision **28 COM 15A.11** adopted as amended.

Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N260)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and announced that no new information had been received since its preparation.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for clarification of the expression “conflicts between wildlife and humans”.

IUCN said that the expression was commonly used to refer to threats to wildlife because of agricultural activities.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15A.12** adopted.

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N196)

The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and said that no new information had been received since its preparation.

La délégation du **Liban** se félicite de la clarté de la décision proposée, qui désigne à l'État partie des actions précises à exécuter pour que le site soit retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, et demande au Centre et à l'UICN d'employer des formulations aussi claires dans les futurs rapports sur l'état de conservation.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed surprise that the closure of the legal loopholes allowing the extraction of timber from the property had not been included in the Draft Decision.

The **Secretariat** reported that it had received information that the loopholes had already been removed.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15A.13** adopted.

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission had taken place from 31 May to 4 June 2004 and that the mission report was being finalized. It had noted that the State Party had carried out commendable conservation work on the property since 1998 in collaboration with partners such as the Governments of Japan, the United States of

America and the Netherlands. Further conservation issues would need to be addressed, such as updating the existing management plan, establishing a national legislative and administrative mechanism for the protection of cultural heritage in Benin, intensifying restoration and conservation of the site and developing site interpretation.

La Délégation du **Liban**, très préoccupée par le rapport présenté, demande que le Secrétariat remanie le paragraphe 3 de la décision de façon à y inclure les conclusions de la mission.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that the property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 1985, when the property had obtained its World Heritage status. It expressed its serious concern at the situation and asked why more effort could not have been spared for the conservation of the property.

The **Secretariat** said that the effort required to restore earthen architecture of the kind represented at the site was complex, requiring constant attention, particularly given climatic conditions with high precipitation.

The **Chairperson** noted that on-site conservation was being undertaken.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** considered that the Draft Decision should be revised to include more detailed recommendations on activities to be undertaken and benchmarks.

The Delegation of **Colombia** also suggested that the Draft Decision should be revised to specify details of the restoration and presentation work to be undertaken and to refer to the need for regular maintenance.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed regret that 19 years after the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, serious conservation problems remained, and called for more coordinated regional and international efforts for the safeguarding of the property.

The **Chairperson** also encouraged international cooperation for the conservation of the property.

La délégation du **Bénin** félicite le Comité, le Centre et les organisations consultatives qui ont permis à son pays de dissiper les menaces qui pesaient sur le site. Elle approuve les modifications

que la délégation du Liban propose d'apporter au paragraphe 3 et demande que le paragraphe 2 de la décision soit également modifié afin que les gouvernements italien et japonais soient remerciés de leur aide financière et technique. Elle encourage les pays donateurs à continuer de verser des contributions extrabudgétaires.

The **Chairperson** thanked the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and international stakeholders for providing assistance to the State Party and called for continued effort in that regard. He declared the decision adopted, as amended. (28 COM 15A.14)

Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no further information since finalization of the working document.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the Draft Decision would need to refer to the management and conservation plan to be prepared under Emergency International Assistance.

La délégation du **Liban** souscrit aux observations du Royaume-Uni. Elle juge par ailleurs incohérente, dans le texte français, la phrase qui recommande de prendre des mesures pour prévenir les inondations à Tombouctou, et demande d'en modifier la formulation.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision adopted, as amended. (28 COM 15A.15)

Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)

The **Secretariat** drew the attention of the Committee to the new information provided by the State Party to the effect that the roofing of the storage facilities had been repaired and the general legal reform system put in place, which opened up the possibility of preparing a conservation plan, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 27th session and set as one of the conditions for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Le **Directeur général adjoint pour la culture**, en tant qu'ancien responsable du site, explique que les problèmes auxquels celui-ci est confronté

découlent des années qui ont suivi l'indépendance de l'Algérie. Les ouvriers qui, à l'époque, travaillaient à Tipasa, sont demeurés sur le site, et c'est désormais la deuxième génération qui y vit. Il informe ensuite le Comité des activités qui ont été menées au cours des deux dernières années en faveur du site.

La délégation de l'**Algérie**, (observateur), se référant à l'excursion organisée la veille par les autorités chinoises, exprime son émotion après la visite de Tongli, qui lui a rappelé Venise, donc l'Italie et par voie de conséquence Tipasa. Elle espère que Tipasa sera bientôt retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et jumelé à Tongli.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the site of Tong-li in Suzhou was not inscribed on the World Heritage List.

La délégation du **Bénin** demande que les informations apportées par le Secrétariat soient consignées dans le projet de décision. Elle rappelle qu'en Afrique, les problèmes de relogement des habitants vivant sur un site sont extrêmement fréquents.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the word "substantial" could usefully be deleted from paragraph 2 of the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the points made by the Delegation of Benin and congratulated the State Party on its efforts in safeguarding the property. It suggested removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Referring to the conservation issues (a) – (e) as set out in the working document, the Delegation of **Colombia** pointed out that the recommendations of the Secretariat's mission in September 2002 had been partially implemented by the State Party. The Draft Decision could include a list of those activities which would need to be undertaken. Furthermore, the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **China** asked why the Secretariat had prepared a revised Draft Decision.

The **Secretariat** explained that paragraph 1 of the revised Draft Decision acknowledged the efforts made by the State Party. The revised version did not reflect the comments made by the Delegations of Benin and Egypt suggesting the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in

Danger. It asked the Committee to clarify its position.

La délégation du **Liban** demande au Centre de dresser une liste de tout ce qui reste à mettre en oeuvre en indiquant les priorités, et une fois qu'elles seront mises en oeuvre, de proposer au Comité de retirer le site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Chairperson** agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon and asked the Secretariat to make the necessary amendments.

The Delegation of **Egypt** reiterated its wish to congratulate the State Party on progress made in safeguarding the property and expressed its support for removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

L'ICOMOS précise qu'il n'est pas de leur ressort de dire au Comité s'il faut ou non retirer le site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, mais au Comité de le décider.

La délégation du **Liban**, constatant que l'Etat partie concerné n'a pas demandé que le site soit retiré de la Liste du patrimoine en péril, invite celui-ci à faire connaître sa position. Elle estime cependant qu'il serait plus sage d'attendre la session suivante du Comité, dans la mesure où cette inscription ne remonte qu'à 2002.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested amending paragraph 4 of the revised Draft Decision to enable the Committee to examine the state of conservation of the property at its 29th session.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** (Observateur), remercie la délégation de l'Egypte de sa proposition, qui lui convient parfaitement mais demande que la décision comporte une recommandation très ferme.

The **Chairperson** said, to sum up, that the Committee could either remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger with a list of recommendations, or discuss the possibility of removal at its 29th session in 2005.

La délégation du **Liban** réitère que le site ayant été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril en 2002, ne saurait avoir réglé tous ses problèmes en deux ans. Elle suggère d'attendre encore une année pour le retirer de la Liste, donnant ainsi à l'Algérie une année de plus pour résoudre tous les problèmes.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** called the attention of the Committee to the reasons for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. If the Committee was satisfied that the danger no longer existed, then the property could be removed from that List, but if the danger remained, it should stay on it.

The Delegation of **Lithuania**, supported by the Delegations of the **Netherlands**, **New Zealand** and **Norway**, suggested retaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision adopted, as amended. **(28 COM 15A.16)**

The Vice-Chairperson (Nigeria) took the Chair.

Abu Mena (Egypt) (C90)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked the Secretariat and promised to submit to the Centre a state of conservation report by 1 February 2005.

The **Chairperson** declared the revised Draft Decision adopted. **(28 COM 15A.17)**

Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq) (C1130)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document. Security problems in the region had delayed the implementation of activities under the Emergency International Assistance request for the establishment of a site management coordination unit and the development of a management plan for the property.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision adopted. **(28 COM 15A.18)**

Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)

The **Secretariat** said that the State Party had suspended the project to construct a new market, notwithstanding the legitimate expectations of the local community. Taking that into account, it

referred to the revised Draft Decision which suggested removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Director of the Centre** referred to the visit to the site in December 2003 and commended the national authorities on their strong commitment to safeguarding the site.

The Delegation of **China** commended the State Party on its efforts in preparing a conservation plan for the property and its decision to suspend the project to build a new market. It supported the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegations of **Japan, Egypt and Kuwait** supported the revised Draft Decision.

La délégation du **Bénin** se réjouit du retrait du site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et félicite le Sultanat d'Oman pour le travail accompli.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** was concerned that the management plan had not been finalized and suggested that the revised Draft Decision should be amended to request a state of conservation report to be submitted to the Secretariat in that regard. It suggested amending paragraph 4 of the revised Draft Decision to substitute “concrete” with “positive” and “the establishment of” with “the implementation of”.

The Delegations of **Portugal, Nigeria, the Netherlands, Argentina, Norway, India, Colombia** and **Saint Lucia** endorsed the revised Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared the revised decision adopted, as amended. (28 COM 15A.19)

The Delegation of **Oman** expressed its appreciation at the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Historic town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked the State Party for additional information concerning the state of conservation of the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Yemen** informed the Committee that a conservation plan had been established, which was to be approved by the Ministry of Culture. The authorities of Yemen also intended establishing a heritage house in Zahid, and they were preparing a meeting in November 2004, with the assistance from the World Heritage Fund, to discuss the conservation issues of the site. It expressed the commitment of its Government to improving the safeguarding of the property.

ICOMOS commended the authorities of Yemen for taking appropriate conservation measures and hoped that the results of such work would bear fruit in the near future.

The **Chairperson** declared adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.20**.

Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 Rev)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the Draft Decision should request the State Party to submit a state of conservation report for examination by the Committee at its 29th session. In addition, it was important for all sections of UNESCO to work together in a concerted way.

La délégation du **Liban** ne comprend pas le sens de la phrase figurant au paragraphe a) du rapport, selon laquelle "le problème posé par la construction de la route ne relève pas de la responsabilité de l'UNESCO." Dès lors qu'un site est classé patrimoine mondial, il relève forcément de la responsabilité de l'UNESCO.

ICOMOS said that, unfortunately, the local situation in the field of cultural heritage conservation within which UNESCO had tried its best to operate was very difficult.

La délégation du **Bénin** demande elle aussi des explications à l'ICOMOS sur la dernière phrase du rapport, qui ne lui paraît pas claire.

Referring to paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked for clarification as to the details of the recommendations of the UNESCO mission.

La délégation du **Liban**, revenant sur la question de la responsabilité de l'UNESCO quant à la construction de la route, n'accepte pas la formulation proposée, malgré les explications fournies par le Secrétariat.

Le **Directeur général adjoint pour la culture** informe le Comité des actions entreprises, d'une part, par le Centre et, d'autre part, par la Division du patrimoine culturel. L'UNESCO est tout à fait concernée par la question de la route et en a fait part aux autorités afghanes, mais ne veut pas pour autant que les habitants de Djām soient pénalisés. Il faut trouver une solution, un autre accès pour les habitants.

La délégation du **Liban** se déclare satisfaite des informations données par le Directeur général adjoint pour la culture mais demande que le projet de décision soit modifié de façon à inclure ces nouveaux éléments.

ICOMOS said that the minaret was not in immediate danger of collapse.

Le **Directeur général adjoint pour la culture** confirme que le bien a reçu une assistance financière de l'Italie et de la Suisse, qui a servi à faire des relevés plus précis, des études sur l'environnement et les fouilles archéologiques, à l'instar de ce que l'aide financière du Japon a permis de faire dans la Vallée de Bamiyan.

La délégation de **Sainte-Lucie** remercie le Directeur général adjoint, mais trouve inquiétantes ces informations. Ce n'est pas aux sociétés privées de faire ce travail et l'on devrait, à tout le moins, consulter le Comité et les organisations consultatives.

Le **Directeur général adjoint pour la culture** précise que les missions envoyées par l'UNESCO sur le site ne sont pas des missions commerciales mais des missions composées d'experts internationaux qui connaissent très bien le pays et font partie du réseau de l'ICOMOS. Il convient cependant que toutes les informations recueillies par ces différentes missions devront figurer dans le rapport sur l'état de conservation de Djām, qui sera présenté à la 29^e session.

La délégation du **Bénin** remercie la délégation de Sainte-Lucie pour sa vigilance et se réjouit de ce que le Directeur général adjoint ait reconnu que le rapport ne comportait pas toutes les informations nécessaires. Les membres du Comité doivent être

bien informés et ils ne doivent pas l'être après coup.

The Chairperson declared the decision adopted. **(28 COM 15A.21)**

Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 Rev)

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that UNESCO's Division of Cultural Heritage had undertaken a mission to the site from 29 May to 4 June 2004 in order to meet and assist the relevant Afghan authorities in the preparation of the Master Plan, with the contribution of the National Research Institute of Cultural Properties. In accordance with the recommendation of the mission, the Afghan authorities would establish a planning commission to oversee the process.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** sought clarification concerning the issue of de-mining, as referred to in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision.

The **Secretariat** said that the relevant decision adopted at the Committee's 27th session had also mentioned the issue.

ICOMOS emphasized that de-mining was only one of the many difficulties that the site was facing and remarked that the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger had had a positive effect in mobilizing international effort, enabling the implementation of a number of conservation activities.

The Delegation of **Japan**, speaking with reference to the personal experience of the expert who had undertaken the mission to the site in June 2004, said that development pressure was clearly one of the factors affecting the property. The provincial and municipal authorities were committed to the conservation of cultural heritage. The fact that certain construction projects which could have affected the World Heritage property had been halted was one of the examples of international assistance that warranted continuation.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the Draft Decision needed to specify the measures needed for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the first meeting of the International Coordination Committee for the Safeguarding of Afghanistan's Cultural Heritage (ICC) had been postponed on grounds of security. It had been due to discuss the establishment of zoning and management plans as priorities, based on the model used for Angkor in Cambodia.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision adopted as amended. (28 COM 15A.22)

Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the state of conservation of the property had greatly improved, largely due to concerted international support.

The Delegation of **China** supported the Draft Decision which, if adopted, would remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and said that progress had been made thanks to international cooperation.

La délégation du **Bénin** félicite les autorités cambodgiennes pour les efforts considérables entrepris et les sacrifices consentis, y compris par d'autres Etats membres. Elle ne voit cependant aucune suite logique entre le rapport présenté et le texte de la décision. Elle approuve le contenu de la décision mais demande que le texte du rapport, dont l'argumentation ne lui paraît pas claire du tout, soit remanié.

La délégation du **Liban** se réjouit de ce troisième cas de réussite, rappelant qu'Angkor avait été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en 1992, immédiatement après son inclusion dans la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Mais de ce fait, le site est passé de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril à la liste des "sites en développement". Elle demande des éclaircissements sur une phrase du rapport, concernant le projet de développement touristique, qu'elle qualifie de sibylline.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its satisfaction at the progress made and acknowledged the international solidarity behind the conservation of the property. It also commended the authorities of France for hosting the Second Intergovernmental Conference on the Safeguarding and Development of Angkor from 14 to 15 November 2003.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the State Party but said that there remained a number of outstanding conservation issues.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the Draft Decision and said that the case was a successful example of shared responsibility and common heritage.

The Delegation of **India** strongly supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the donor countries and said that some of the Delegation had had the honour of visiting the site.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the Draft Decision and remarked that the case was a success story. It underlined the importance of establishing an overall strategy for the management of the site as the rescue stage was over in terms of the state of conservation of the property, and requested the State Party to explain its plans in that connection.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked the State Party to conduct regular monitoring and to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of the state of conservation of the site.

The Delegation of **Oman** supported the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision adopted. (28 COM 15A.23)

La délégation du **Cambodge** (observateur) exprime sa gratitude au Secrétariat et aux membres du Comité. Elle se réjouit de voir son pays soit récompensé pour le travail réalisé en parfaite osmose avec le Comité international de coordination (CIC) et la communauté internationale dans son ensemble. Elle informe le Comité du dernier arrêté, pris en juin 2004 par le gouvernement du Cambodge, relatif à la lutte contre les constructions illicites dans le parc d'Angkor.

La délégation de la **France** (observateur) se réjouit de voir que la décision a été adoptée, comme elle l'espérait. Elle voit dans Angkor un cas exemplaire de coopération internationale exceptionnelle. L'APSARA est chargé de la préservation des monuments mais aussi de tous les problèmes afférents à la restauration du site lui-même, tels que les problèmes de l'eau, des routes et de l'afflux

touristique, considéré comme un bienfait dans le cas du Cambodge. Le retrait de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril est un hommage rendu à ce pays, qui travaille depuis dix ans à sa reconstruction.

Le **Directeur général adjoint pour la culture** confirme qu'il s'agit d'une décision très importante. Il était présent à la session du Comité à Santa Fé, en 1992, lorsque le site a été inscrit simultanément sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Angkor est un exemple concret de ce que le Comité peut faire pour un site en danger. Tous les efforts se sont conjugués pour aider les autorités cambodgiennes à rédiger une loi, à créer l'APSARA, à faire l'inventaire du Musée et à réduire le trafic illicite. A la tête du Bureau de l'UNESCO à Pnomh Penh se trouve un excellent directeur, M. Etienne Clément, spécialiste du trafic illicite, et à la tribune même de la 28e session, Anne Lemaistre, qui est venue au Centre pour remplacer Sarah Tichen, a travaillé des années durant sur Angkor avec Azzedine Beschaouch, ancien Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Les résultats obtenus à Angkor montrent que le Centre a eu raison d'inscrire Angkor sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that as part of the implementation of an Emergency Assistance Grant from the World Heritage Fund, a workshop had been held on site from 7 to 11 June 2004 to elaborate a site management plan. The issues identified at the workshop had included the threat to the integrity and authenticity of the property posed by rural development pressures and *ad hoc* construction work at the site, and the fact that the Hampi Development Agency had not been functioning as expected.

La délégation du **Liban**, constatant que le projet de construction d'un très grand centre commercial aux abords du site, évoqué dans le rapport, n'est pas repris dans le texte de la décision, alors qu'il constitue une menace très grave pour le site, demande des informations au Secrétariat et à l'ICOMOS.

The **Secretariat** said that the revised Draft Decision took account of the comments on the

Visitor Centre made by the UNESCO mission of May 2003.

La délégation du **Bénin** n'est pas satisfaite de la réponse du Secrétariat. Une menace pèse sur le site, dont le projet de décision doit faire état. Par ailleurs, au paragraphe 4 de la décision, il est demandé à l'Etat partie d'élaborer un plan de gestion "dès que possible". Comment définir ce délai ?

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that there appeared to be three different management plans all in simultaneous preparation or operation by different agencies working at the site. It was concerned that the existence of multiple management plans would lead to confusion and possibly improper implementation. The three plans should be merged into a single comprehensive plan from which all concerned would work and that suggestion should be incorporated into the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** explained that the Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage (INTACH) had prepared an outline for a management plan, but that it had not been elaborated with any specific detail. The School of Architecture and Planning was preparing a comprehensive management plan which would, when officially adopted, become the authoritative management plan for the property. With regard to the commercial centre, it was a multi-purpose visitor centre which would have some commercial functions, and it had been built following a feasibility study which had indicated a need for such a facility to function as a "traffic node" to control visitor traffic.

The **Chairperson** declared the revised decision adopted as amended. **(28 COM 15A.24)**

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121)

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the World Heritage Committee of a range of activities undertaken to safeguard the property. In order to understand the situation, the World Heritage Centre had commissioned a work survey from the University of Venice IUAV, which had covered two out of several monument zones. With regard to the fire which had broken out at Swayambunath in September 2003, the damage had been repaired by local artisans using traditional materials, but it was to be regretted that the

UNESCO recommendations regarding fire prevention had not been acted upon by the State Party despite the availability of Emergency Assistance from the World Heritage Fund. He informed the Committee of the results of the stakeholder workshop held on site from 3 to 7 May 2004, and the subsequent work underway to prepare inventories of all seven monument zones that formed part of the property. That work would result in a proposed revision of the boundaries of the monument zones as well as the development of an action plan. The Director also mentioned that a comprehensive policy review was underway addressing the issue of finances, site management and responsibilities.

La délégation du **Liban** rappelle que l'Etat partie refusait de voir inscrire ce site, très important, sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, et que le Comité a dû menacer de le rayer de la Liste pour l'en convaincre, ce qui, en fin de compte, a eu un effet positif. Elle estime qu'il faut redéfinir les limites du site car, à l'intérieur de sa délimitation initiale, le bien n'a plus de valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Aussi propose-t-elle de modifier le libellé du paragraphe 7 du projet de décision, voire de redéfinir les critères. Enfin, elle attire l'attention sur l'utilisation, jugée par elle très maladroite, de l'expression "la valeur résiduelle du site" et propose son aide au Secrétariat pour remanier le paragraphe 4 de la recommandation.

The Delegation of **Portugal** welcomed the fact that some progress had at last been made in safeguarding the property. Referring to page 31 of the state of conservation report, it sought further information from the Secretariat as to why the State Party had stressed that "the different UNESCO experts should not have given conflicting advice and that better coordination could be exercised by the appointment of a single technical advisor". With regard to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, it requested information and clarification about the details and role of the aforementioned "international technical advisor".

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that a number of experts had worked on the state of conservation of the property and there had been perhaps a "superimposition of opinions" rather than "conflicting advice". The proposal to appoint an "international technical advisor" was intended to ensure oversight of the coordinated implementation of the Committee's recommendations with regard to the property, and the organization of periodic meetings of an

international working group of experts to advise on the conservation of the site.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that, at its previous session, the Committee had asked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in consultation with the State Party to organize a mission to Kathmandu Valley to assess the remaining World Heritage value of the property. It recalled that at its present session, the Committee was supposed to consider whether or not to remove the property from the World Heritage List after examination of the mission report. Having regretted that the previous request had not been implemented by the Centre, it further asserted that, with its current state of conservation, the property could not remain on the World Heritage List. It supported the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon to redefine the borders in order to renominate the monuments.

La délégation du **Bénin** s'interroge sur l'urgence de l'assistance évoquée au paragraphe 6 de la décision, huit mois après la survenue du sinistre. Dans le cas où le retard s'expliquerait par une difficulté de l'Etat partie à en formuler la demande, elle invite le Secrétariat à lui apporter son concours.

The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** renewed its Government's commitment to safeguard and conserve the monuments of the Kathmandu Valley. It informed the Committee that the Government was in the process of re-defining the boundaries of the seven monument zones, as requested by the Committee at its 27th session. Furthermore, more effective management mechanisms for the property as well as an action plan had also been prepared. According to the State Party, Pratappur Shrine within the Swayambunath Monument Zone had been repaired using traditional techniques and materials. It explained that the conservation problems at the site had arisen from rapid population growth and urban development. It appealed to the Committee to be realistic and objective in its assessment and expectations with regard to Nepal's capacity to implement its recommendations.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its satisfaction that the State Party had repaired the fire damage at Swayambunath. The core issue was that of the changing character of the Valley itself, and that the Committee had two options: it could remove the property from the World Heritage List and then re-inscribe it under different criteria and

with different boundaries, or it could require the definition of the boundaries of the seven inscribed monument zones. It asked the State Party to provide enough information for the Committee to be able to examine the remaining value of the property at its 29th session.

La délégation du **Bénin** ne parvient toujours pas à savoir, malgré les explications données par l'Etat partie, si celui-ci a reçu ou non une assistance d'urgence.

The Delegation of **Portugal** recommended that the property should be retained on the World Heritage List but the Committee must give clear instructions as to the need to redefine its boundaries.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that there had been no improvement in the conservation of the property since 1998, and that decision **27 COM B.52** had not been implemented. Given that the requested mission had not taken place, it considered that the Committee did not have the necessary information to decide what action to take with regard to delisting, re-inscription or redefinition of site boundaries.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** emphasized that if the State Party had heeded the recommendations of the Committee, particularly with regard to inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the state of conservation of the property would have been improved and the present difficult situation would not have arisen. It shared the opinions of the Delegations of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom,

La délégation du **Liban** partage l'avis des délégations du Royaume-Uni et des Pays-Bas, mais remarque que la redéfinition des limites d'un site doit obéir à une procédure précise. Il faut redéfinir les limites du site et soumettre une nouvelle demande d'inscription, une fois le rapport des organisations consultatives envoyé au Comité.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stressed the need for the Committee to be well informed by the 29th session in 2005 with regard to the definition of the boundaries of the property and the remaining World Heritage value of the property, so that it could consider whether or not to remove the property from the World Heritage List.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre had received the Emergency Assistance request from the State Party

on 27 June 2004 and the request had not yet been processed.

The **Director of the Centre** described how the recent rapid urbanization of the Kathmandu Valley had had such an adverse effect on the conservation of the inscribed property, and that it would justify the name change for the property. He did not consider that removing the property from the World Heritage List would be the most appropriate action for the Committee to take at that time - there should rather be a redefinition of the boundaries of the property and the buffer zones. He assured the Committee that a full report would be available to it in time for consideration at its 29th session in 2005.

ICOMOS observed that additional reactive monitoring missions would not bring an answer to the conservation problems in the Kathmandu Valley. It urged the elaboration of a comprehensive master plan which would provide specific and binding guidelines for the safeguarding of the heritage values of the property.

The Delegation of **Japan** agreed with the position taken by the Delegation of the Netherlands, namely, that there was no need to take a hasty decision to remove the property from the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that as no mission had taken place it was not appropriate for the Committee to take a decision as to whether to remove the property from the World Heritage List. It requested information about the justification for which the site had been inscribed on the World Heritage List and whether the value was still retained.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that a report would be available in time for consideration by the Committee at its 29th session in 2005.

The **Rapporteur** inquired if the Delegation of the United Kingdom had a proposal for a new draft decision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated that the Committee should consider the possible removal of the property from the World Heritage List at its 29th session in 2005.

The **Chairperson** then declared decision **28 COM 15A.25** adopted as amended.

Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) (C 171-172)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the condition of both the Fort and the Garden had been improving satisfactorily. However, the outstanding issue threatening the long-term conservation of the property was that jurisdiction for the site's management had recently been transferred from the federal authority to provincial administration, in apparent contradiction with national legislation concerning the management of properties in Pakistan inscribed on the World Heritage List.

La délégation du **Liban** demande à l'Etat partie d'étudier la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site, car un problème important se pose qui n'est cependant pas exclusivement du ressort des autorités pakistanaïses. Les organisations consultatives doivent être impliquées et il faut définir un calendrier pour préciser les limites de l'engagement de l'Etat partie.

La délégation du **Bénin** félicite le gouvernement norvégien de sa contribution, s'élevant à 900 000 dollars EU.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked if the implication of paragraph 3 of the Draft Declaration was that the boundaries of the property would be reduced.

The **Secretariat** pointed out that "support zone" in the Draft Decision should be read as "core zone".

La délégation de la **Belgique** (observateur) note que les paragraphes 3 et 5 de la décision sont identiques à ceux de l'année précédente, à savoir les points 3 et 7 de la décision **27 COM 7A.24**, ce qui nécessite à son avis une clarification.

The Delegation of **Norway** asked the State Party to provide information on the issue of jurisdiction and management authority with regard to the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Pakistan** assured the Committee of the commitment of the Pakistan Government to safeguarding the heritage values and ensuring the conservation of the inscribed property. It further informed the Committee that the issue of restoring jurisdiction and responsibility for the conservation and management of the property to the federal authorities (that was, to the

Department of Archaeology and Museums) was under consideration at the national level.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision adopted as amended. (**28 COM 15A.26**)

Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines) (C 722)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commended the State Party, Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat on the work undertaken to reverse the deteriorating state of conservation of the property, but reminded all concerned of the need to remain vigilant to ensure that improvements continued and were sustained.

The Delegation of **Portugal** also commended the progress made in improving the conservation of the property, and singled out the active involvement of local communities as a very positive development.

Les délégations du **Nigeria** et du **Bénin** félicitent l'Etat partie pour les efforts qu'il a entrepris.

The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15A.27** adopted.

On behalf of its Government, the Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its appreciation to the Committee, Advisory Bodies and Secretariat for their assistance in ensuring the conservation of the property.

Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission had taken place from 26 to 31 October 2003.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that there was an adequate management plan already, and that therefore paragraph 5 should be amended, replacing "to prepare" with "finalize".

The **Secretariat** explained that the management plan had not been officially adopted. It further highlighted the need to coordinate the management

plan with another Global Environment Facility project for the Ramsar site.

The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15A.28** adopted as amended.

**Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan)
(C 958)**

The **Secretariat** said that it had been developing an action plan in consultation with the State Party, the Advisory Bodies and UNESCO's Division of Cultural Heritage as requested by the Committee at its 27th session. The authorities of Azerbaijan planned to host a Round Table in October 2004, financed by the German World Heritage Foundation, to discuss ways to implement the action plan. It also referred to the ICCROM training course for heritage experts in Azerbaijan in June 2004 and confirmed that the State Party had submitted a state of conservation report on 2 June 2004.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that obtaining appropriate political support was crucial for the successful conservation of the property and invited the State Party to show increased political will in that respect.

ICCROM drew the attention of the Committee to the two-week ICCROM training course for experts from Azerbaijan in June 2004 which had addressed technical aspects of conservation as well as the role of political decision-makers in heritage management. It suggested an amendment to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision, replacing "Master Plan" with "Management Plan" in line with the outcome of the training course.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** endorsed the suggested amendment by ICCROM. It proposed a further amendment, the insertion of "urges that this Decree is fully enforced" at the end of paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15A.29** adopted.

**Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)
(C 366)**

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

The Delegation of **India** asked the State Party to describe progress made in the preparation of the management plan.

The Observer Delegation of **Peru** said that its Government appreciated the assistance rendered by UNESCO in combating the problem caused by the rising water level. The national authorities had submitted an International Assistance request in order to identify appropriate measures to combat the water-related problem, and intended organizing an international seminar to discuss technical solutions to the issue. What was known as the draft Chan Chan law (Draft Law number 3807) was being prepared for submission to the Parliament.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its concern over illegal construction activities at the site and asked whether that issue was addressed in the above-mentioned draft law, which had been pending in the Congress over the past years.

La délégation du **Bénin** remercie l'Etat partie des informations apportées, mais demande au Secrétariat des précisions sur l'expression "de nouveau" utilisée au paragraphe 3 de la décision.

The **Secretariat** explained that it referred to the decision taken by the Committee at its 27th session by which it had already invited the State Party to consider requesting International Assistance for that same purpose.

The Delegation of **Chile** asked about the submission of a International Assistance request by the State Party.

The **Secretariat** said that it had not received an International Assistance request concerning the property.

The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15A.30** adopted.

**17 B.II PROTECTION OF
PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND
NATURAL HERITAGE**

**PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE
CULTUREL ET NATUREL
PALESTINIEN**

*Documents: WHC-04/28COM/17B.II
Revised Draft Decision 28 COM
17B.II*

The **Representative of the Director-General** drew the attention of the Committee to a number of issues regarding decisions adopted at the 26th session of the Committee, held in Budapest, Hungary in 2002, and at its 27th session at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris in 2003. He explained that the item concerned 3 issues. On the first, the establishment of an inventory of the Palestinian cultural and natural heritage, an inventory of Palestinian cultural and natural sites of potential outstanding universal value had been prepared. It contained 20 properties (16 cultural, three natural and one mixed), and had been the result of a wide consultation process involving dozens of Palestinian specialists and various concerned institutions. The inventory would be published and made available to the Committee.

The second issue related to the evaluation of the state of conservation of the heritage and measures for its safeguarding. Four technical assessment missions had recently been sent to Jericho, Hebron, Nablus and Tell Rumeida. The reports were in preparation.

On the third issue, concerning capacity-building for the future implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, activities carried out to date included: a training workshop on the *Convention* held in September 2003 with ICCROM, in which 16 Palestinian specialists had been trained; the organization of a number of awareness-raising seminars; and the establishment of a Palestinian World Heritage working Unit. Other training workshops were foreseen, including one in July 2004 in Bethlehem.

In terms of the US\$100,000 agreed under decisions **26 COM 6.1** and **26 COM 6.2**, a work-plan had been agreed with the Palestinian authorities, including: the strengthening of a Palestinian World Heritage Unit; training on site management, and a special project on cultural landscape conservation. Funding had been decentralized for 2004 and activities would be implemented before the end of 2005.

During a recent mission of the Deputy Director-General to Israel and to the Palestinian territories, the question of the impact of the construction of a wall on archaeological remains had been raised.

The issue of the protection of the physical and living heritage of Palestine, on the other hand, would be addressed during a meeting between UNESCO and representatives of the Palestinian authorities, which would take place on 15 and 16 July 2004.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the African saying: "When eyes meet they may speak louder than voices", and explained that a series of informal consultations had taken place with the aim of achieving consensus on the issue under discussion. Expressing his personal gratitude to all who had participated, he informed the Committee that the revised Draft Decision that had been circulated in the room reflected that consensus, and proposed that it be adopted unanimously and without discussion.

The **Committee** adopted Decision **28 COM 17 B.II** by acclamation.

At the invitation of the Chairperson, the delegation of the **Observer Mission of Palestine to UNESCO** and the **Observer Delegation of Israel** each made a statement, which are included as annexes to the present Summary Record.

The **Chairperson** declared item 17 B.II closed.

15. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

ETAT DE CONSERVATION DE BIENS INSCRITS SUR LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

15B PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE

BIENS INSCRITS SUR LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Document: WHC-04/28.COM/15B

The **Secretariat** introduced the working documents. As decided by the Committee at its 27th session, the State of conservation reports listed under Part I in the document were for discussion by the Committee, whereas those in Part II would only be opened for discussion if a specific request was made to the Chairperson by a Committee member.

W National Park (Niger) (N 749)

The **Secretariat** said that the planned meeting organized by the World Heritage Centre and Ramsar had taken place in "W" Park from 18-22 May 2004, UNESCO being represented by a consultant. The consultant had received confirmation from the Deputy Director of the Ministry of Wildlife and Fisheries that the two projects (construction of the Dodyonga Dam and phosphate mining in the Park) had been definitively abandoned, as previously stated by the State Party's Minister for Water, Environment and Desertification Control in response to concerns about "W" raised by the Committee.

IUCN said that it too had been informed that the planned dam construction had been abandoned by the authorities in Niger. It had also been made aware that the phosphate mining at the site would not take place.

La délégation du **Bénin**, félicitant les autorités du Niger, relève le caractère transfrontalier du parc, situé à cheval entre le Niger, le Bénin et le Burkina Faso. Elle précise que son pays a pris part à la décision d'abandon du projet de barrage, qui témoigne de l'attachement des pays concernés à la conservation du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that it was encouraging news and proposed adoption of the Draft Decision.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.1**

The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)

Decision **28 COM 15B.2** was adopted.

Tai National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195)

Decision **28 COM 15B.3** was adopted.

Mount Kenya National Park / Natural Forest (Kenya) (N 800)

Decision **28 COM 15B.4** was adopted.

Greater Saint Lucia Wetland Park (South Africa) (N 914)

Decision **28 COM 15B.5** as amended was adopted.

Ngorongoro Conservation Zone (Tanzania) (N 39)

After the Secretariat presented the report, the Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania**, speaking at the invitation of the Chairperson, provided additional information on the property. It expressed regret at its Government's delay in the submission of the report of the Ngorongoro study on ungulates and said that was in agreement with the Draft Decision under consideration. It reassured the Committee that it would ensure that the report would be submitted by 1 February 2005.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.6**

Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)

The **Secretariat** noted that a consultant mission was taking place at the time of the Committee session and new information would only be available upon submission of the consultant's report.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.7** without discussion.

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654)

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.8** without discussion.

Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083)

The **Secretariat** said that a letter dated 24 May 2004 had been received from the Secretary-General of the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO, forwarding a letter from the Director of the World Heritage Management Committee of Yunnan Province, dated 21 April 2004, regarding the project to construct dams on the Nujiang River. The letter indicated that a national research project had produced a Report on the Planning of

Hydropower Development on Nujiang (Salween River) Middle/Lower Reaches, and that environmental impact studies were still in progress. The current report showed that none of the proposed dams fell within the boundaries of the World Heritage property. It noted that the State Party would make further assessments and reviews regarding the environmental and technical feasibility of the proposed hydropower construction project. The Yunnan World Heritage Management Committee was alert to any new issues related to conservation and development in the Nujiang River watershed, and would keep the Committee informed, in accordance with paragraph 56 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. The Secretariat had also received a petition from 43 Chinese people, including representatives of NGOs, community members and scientists, expressing concern about the dam. The letter had been transmitted to IUCN.

IUCN said that the impact of dams on World Heritage properties could be direct, via flooding, and indirect, due to the associated construction of infrastructure such as roads, and to the forced migration of displaced people. Dams could also have downstream and transboundary consequences. It noted concerns about the potential impact of the project and said that it was important to clarify the exact nature and status of the proposal before providing a detailed response. It supported the Draft Decision.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.9** without further discussion.

Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)

The **Secretariat** noted the cooperation between the State Party and the Wet Tropics of Queensland property in Australia, and referred to a mission of representatives of the Australian property to Lorentz National Park in June 2004.

IUCN said that the cooperation between Lorentz National Park and the Wet Tropics of Queensland site was a good example of a positive partnership between two States Parties. It noted progress on the strategic management plan for Lorentz National Park, along with the appointment of executive staff in the western part of the park.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.10**

Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal) (N 284)

The **Secretariat** said that it had no new information to present.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.11**.

East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854)

The **Secretariat** said that on 24 June, it had received a mission report from the National Commissioner for Culture, Solomon Islands National Commission for UNESCO. The Commissioner had said that the mission report had been delayed due to unavoidable circumstances. The report noted that the site was well protected and that there was no sign of logging or significant agricultural activity. Some socio-economic problems had arisen due to the suspension of project funding by New Zealand. The chiefs and communities had expressed their willingness to assist and support a UNESCO/IUCN joint mission to the site later that year and recommended that the joint mission should visit the four villages in order to assess different environments around the lake. The report also included a recommendation that the New Zealand Government should reconsider reactivating and providing the funds for the projects that had already been approved during the first phase of the World Heritage project.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.12**

Ha-Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N672 bis)

The **Secretariat** reported that UNESCO had engaged in consultations with the private sector and had agreed on a waste management project in cooperation with the Six Senses Resort Group of South-East Asia.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.13**

The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)

Decision **28 COM 15B.14** was adopted.

**Greater Blue Mountains Area (Australia)
(N 917)**

Decision **28 COM 15B.15** was adopted.

Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)

Decision **28 COM 15B.16** was adopted.

Te Wahipounamu – Southwest zone of New Zealand (New Zealand) (N 551)

Decision **28 COM 15B.17** was adopted.

**Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines)
(N 653)**

The **Secretariat** said that on 15 June it had received a comprehensive State of Conservation report from the State Party. The report: "Impacts of illegal fishing on the Conservation of the Tubbataha Reef National Park", prepared by the Tubbataha Protected Area Management Board contained a great deal of information and had been transmitted to IUCN for consideration.

IUCN applauded the comprehensive report from the State Party. It underlined important issues such as the impact of illegal fishing on marine biodiversity and provided a number of strategies to counter the threat. The revised Draft Decision took into consideration the new information provided by the report.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought clarification regarding the revised Draft Decision.

The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** asked to take the floor.

La délégation du **Bénin** dit qu'en tant qu'observateur, la délégation des Philippines n'est admise à prendre la parole que si un membre du Comité souhaite obtenir d'elle des renseignements précis.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that the regulation did not apply to discussions on State of Conservation reports. However, Observer Delegations were not permitted to propose amendments to draft decisions.

La délégation du **Bénin** remarque que l'alinéa

trois, demandant l'organisation d'un forum sous-régional sur la question des pêcheries illicites, ne figure plus dans le nouveau texte et demande qu'il soit rétabli dans le cas où le forum n'aurait toujours pas eu lieu.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that the subregional forum had not yet taken place and that a reference to it could be included in the revised Draft Decision.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.18**, as amended.

The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** welcomed the re-insertion of the regional forum in the decision and said that it could not over-emphasize the importance of such a forum, as the illegal fishing issue involved foreign fishing vessels. It would seek International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to help organize the forum.

Phong Nha Ke Bang (Viet Nam) (N 951 rev)

The **Secretariat** said that it had no new information to present.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.19**.

Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland) (N 33-627)

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the mission referred to in the working document had looked at all the issues raised over a number of years and had produced a comprehensive report, including the issue of the border fence (now the European Union border), upon which the Draft Decision was based.

The Committee adopted decision **28 COM 15B.20**.

Conformément à la décision du Comité, La délégation de la **Pologne** (Observateur) précise avoir accueilli les résultats de la mission UNESCO/IUCN favorablement. Elle observe cependant, s'agissant de la première recommandation du rapport sur les mesures de coopération entre les deux gestionnaires du site, que la Pologne et le Bélarus ont récemment signé un accord prévoyant la création d'un conseil de

gestion du site transfrontalier. Un représentant de la Pologne participera à une rencontre au Bélarus pour travailler sur un projet d'accord plus spécifique. S'agissant de la deuxième recommandation d'élargir le site, la délégation souligne qu'elle y est également favorable et rappelle que cette proposition semblait désormais recueillir le soutien de l'IUCN, ce qui n'était pas le cas il y a 7 ans, quand ce projet d'extension avait initialement proposé. La délégation note par ailleurs qu'à la question de la clôture séparant les frontières de la Pologne et du Bélarus qui se trouve à l'intérieur du site, que cette clôture relève de la responsabilité du Bélarus. Elle souligne également que la présence de cette clôture empêche la libre circulation des animaux et demande aux autorités du Bélarus de veiller à ce que ce type de structure ne soit réalisé qu'avec l'accord de la Pologne et de l'Union européenne. Elle précise que la coopération avec le Bélarus est prioritaire dans la gestion et la protection de ce site.

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received a letter from Bulgaria on 2 June 2004 stating that the Pirin National Park Management Plan had been considered and approved at a meeting of the High Ecological Expert Council of the Ministry of Environment and Water. The Ministry intended to submit the document in July 2004 for final approval to the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, the last step in the procedure for the adoption of management plans as defined by the Bulgarian legislation (Protected Areas Act and management plan regulation). Concerning the question of the boundaries, the letter stated that it should be the task of the experts in the context of preparatory assistance for the possible extension of the property.

The Committee adopted decision **28 COM 15B.21**.

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a high-level meeting had taken place and, although late, a comprehensive report had been received from the State Party. Recent information indicated that a new routing proposal for a pipeline was under consideration. It needed further clarification from the State Party, but had not received any new information.

IUCN stated that the issue of the previous routing of the pipeline had been discussed at several Committee sessions and that further international cooperation and funding were needed to safeguard the site.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested two clarifications on the report. The first concerned the meaning of "not substantially changed", as stated in paragraph (d) of the report, the second concerned the oil pipeline and whether it was actually proposed, and if so, how the threats could be mitigated.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether the outstanding universal value of the property was threatened.

The Delegation of **Norway** asked the State Party to clarify the issue of the proposed oil pipeline.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** had no information on the subject.

Replying to the Delegation of Saint Lucia, the **Secretariat** said that the water body of Lake Baikal is the cleanest on earth, and that the issue of Danger Listing at the previous session had mainly concerned the proposed construction of the oil pipeline and environmental pollution. The result of the earlier Environmental Impact Assessment for the pipeline had been negative, which had delayed the project, but since then NGOs had reported on a new project for a pipeline, for which no confirmation had been received from the State Party.

IUCN explained that the high-level mission had addressed Danger Listing, but that there was no need for it at this stage, although significant threats existed in addition to the oil pipeline, notably in relation to the effluent of the pulp and paper mill.

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre said that he had been asked by the Director-General to participate in the high-level mission to Moscow. He reported on the long discussions with the Minister of Environment looking at all issues including the pulp and paper mill. He had been informed by the State Party, information confirmed by the World Bank, that measures to limit pollution from the mill were underway. However, concern had been raised over the pipeline, for which there was no clear plan at the time, and the Government informed that a decision would be taken by

February-March 2004, but the Centre had not received a formal report.

He further explained that NGO's had reported of two pipeline projects under development, one to the north of the lake, and one to the south. These plans are within a framework of a large industrial cooperation scheme, one with Japan and the other with China. The Director concluded by saying this was difficult for the Committee and the Centre, as there was no way of responding to this threat because of absence of information.

The Delegation of **the Netherlands** stated it was in confusion as regards the status for in Danger Listing and requested an answer to the question raised by the Delegation of Saint Lucia. It further proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision to be passed on to the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed frustration and asked clarification on the situation and how to get information from the State Party. This, it stated, should be reflected in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **the Netherlands** proposed to amend paragraph 6 in "to provide in cooperation with IUCN an updated report".

The **Chairperson** remarked on the uncertainty with regard to feasibility.

IUCN stated it was happy to cooperate, but it would need advice and information of the State Party in order for the Advisory Body to make an assessment concerning the in danger listing.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** responded it had no information on the proposed pipeline.

The **Chairperson** concluded there was consensus to ask the State Party for information on the issue and declared **Decision 28 COM 15B.22** adopted as amended.

Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria) (N 219)

Decision **28 COM 15B.23** was adopted.

Yellowstone (United States of America) (N 28)

The **Secretariat** informed that it had nothing to add to the Draft Decision as proposed in Document **28 COM 15B Add**.

The Observer of the **United States of America** remarked that for the sake of consistency it would like to see reflected in the Draft Decision the State Party's efforts in addressing the conservation issues and it further requested to remove "snow-mobile phase-out and other", as this would be inconsistent with a recent court ruling in the US, allowing the Draft Decision to be in line with this recent ruling.

La délégation du **Bénin** s'inquiète de ne pas suivre la bonne procédure. Elle ne pense pas qu'il est possible pour un observateur de présenter un amendement à un projet de décision du Comité. Elle précise qu'il faut que cet amendement soit présenté par un membre du Comité.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked upon section (f) of the report, paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision and stated that the State Party no doubt did their best, but that the legal system in the United States was very difficult.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.122 Add** adopted.

Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) N 765 bis)

The **Secretariat** stated that the mission was completed and a detailed report provided, after which **Decision 28 COM 15B.27 Add** was adopted.

The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Nahanni National Park (Canada) (N 24)

Decision **28 COM 15B.24** was adopted.

Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada) (N 256)

Decision **28 COM 15B.25** was adopted.

Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908)

Decision **28 COM 15B.26** was adopted.

Skocjan Caves (Slovenia) (N 390)

Decision **28 COM 15B.28** was adopted.

Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685)

Decision **28 COM 15B.29** was adopted.

Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487)

Decision **28 COM 15B.30** was adopted.

Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1 bis)

The **Secretariat** reported that in the past months challenges had arisen to the Special Law for Galapagos, as the Government had negotiated with fisherman outside the framework established for this law. As a result of the crisis, a new Minister has taken office and finally the Government is maintaining the framework of the law, while strong pressure of the fishing sector remains, which has to be monitored closely.

IUCN reported that it had received a report on 24 June 2004 updating the situation in Galapagos, which noted that the Environmental Ministry had appealed a Galapagos Island court ruling delivered last week that struck down the limits for the lucrative sea-cucumbers catch activity. Nine conservation groups are backing the appeal, made to Ecuador's top constitutional court. The Advisory Body concluded that the implementation of the Special Law will remain a challenge and it supported Draft Decision 28 COM 15B.31, in particular paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported IUCN's statement and explained that this property was considered of great importance to the region, where three countries were cooperating in conservation and the fishing industry was putting strong pressure on governments. It stated that the whole of the marine corridor needed to be addressed and that IUCN had to stay involved in maintaining fishing quota.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** seconded the statement of Colombia.

The **Chairperson** declared **Decision 28COM 15B.31** adopted.

The Committee adopted the following decision without discussion:

Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)

Decision **28 COM 15B.32** was adopted.

Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 202-552)

The **Secretariat** reported that since the production of the document, there had been a new government, which decided not to proceed with the road through the Volcan Baru National Park. It stated that this was reflected in the revised Draft Decision **28 COM 15B.33** was adopted.

The Committee adopted the following decision without discussion:

Sian Ka'an (Mexico) (N 410)

Decision **28 COM 15B.34** was adopted.

Kakadu National Park (Australia) (N 147 bis)

The **Secretariat** reported that, following an agreement between the mining company (ERA) and the Mirrar Aboriginal Traditional Owners, the mine at Jabiluka will not be further developed and the mine shaft had been backfilled. It stated that the decision for the mine not to be developed, except with the approval of the Mirrar, must now be approved by the Indigenous Affairs Minister before it comes into force, and that no information had been received from the State Party, upon which Decision **28 COM 15B.35** was adopted.

The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Pyrénées - Mont Perdu (France /Spain) (N 773 bis)

Decision **28 COM 15B.36** was adopted.

Mount Athos (Greece) (N 454)

Decision **28 COM 15B.37** was adopted.

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (N 274)

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre presented the state of conservation report and explained that four issues were of importance: 1) the conservation of the archaeological site; 2) the development of tourism; 3) the control of the slopes to prevent landslides; and 4) the uncontrolled development of the town of Aguas Calientes. He recalled that the Committee had expressed its concerns already several times before and that this time a lengthy report was received at the Secretariat, but that after study it appeared that many issues had remained unsolved, most importantly with regard to item four. He continued by saying that the landslide in last April killed several people, all of them in the town of Aguas Calientes, and left several hundreds of tourists stranded. He further elaborated on the Vilcanota Valley Project of the World Bank, aiming at capacity building, solid waste management and tourism development, in which the World Heritage Centre was cooperating, and that the Government of Peru recently had established a special Commission for the protection of the property.

The Delegation of **Chile** stated that Machu Picchu was of significance, not only to the State Party of Peru, but also to the other Andean countries, and indeed the whole world. As such, it continued, the Andean countries feel close to it, also when disaster strikes and it remembered the loss of life in the recent landslide of April. The Delegation stated that the issues surrounding the conservation of the site could no longer be ignored, which was apparent also in the fact that a large delegation from Cuzco was present at this Committee session. It asked if the State Party could explain what measures have been undertaken for protection of the site.

The Delegation of **Argentina** seconded Chile and stated that Machu Picchu was the representation of the Inca culture, which had covered a large part of Latin America, and it recalled the important project to nominate the Camino Inca. It further requested the State Party to clarify issues.

La délégation du **Bénin** remercie le directeur pour la qualité de la présentation de son rapport nécessaire à la meilleure compréhension de l'état de conservation de ce bien. Elle souhaite savoir si la commission péruvienne créée pour assurer la protection des biens du patrimoine du Pérou a été effectivement établie et demande à l'Etat partie d'informer le Comité de l'avancement des travaux de cette commission pour que le Comité soit assuré de l'état de conservation de ce bien et des dangers qui pourraient le menacer.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stressed the importance of supporting the State Party in its conservation efforts.

The Observer Delegation of **Peru** expressed its gratitude on behalf of the Government of Peru for the opportunity to explain that Machu Picchu was a symbol for country and continent, and that both Delegation and Government fully agreed with the assessments made in the report. It explained that with regard to the actions and solutions for implementation previously proposed by the State Party, it had been too enthusiastic, and that the additional documents handed to the Secretariat proposed updated measures. It elaborated on a resolution that was passed on 24 June 2004 for new regulations and establishment of a multi-sectorial commission, which will start its work immediately after this Committee session to preserve the property's integrity through planning and conservation activities in core and buffer zones.

The Observer Delegation further stated that the current scepticism towards Peru's intentions was justified, but that now for the first time all relevant players were brought together, which would make effective management possible. It continued that transport studies were not yet available, while a detailed examination of numbers of tourists in relation to the carrying capacity of the property would be arranged through the World Bank Vilcanota Valley project, as well as solid waste management and awareness raising campaigns. He explained that the disaster at Aguas Calientes, which is 2 kilometers away, pointed to the neglected development of the town, that the Government of Peru was fully aware of the issues and that the special commission would assess them, including the removal of citizens, and redefinition of the urban area. The documents that were handed to the Secretariat provided information on all the actions taken after the disaster.

It continued by explaining that a Canadian mission had visited the site last May and done geological surveys of the roads, the data of which will be processed and archived in Ottawa. Furthermore, it requested UNESCO's assistance in conducting a feasibility study for setting up a team of international experts for the safeguarding of Machu Picchu. It concluded by saying that previously there had been no significant progress, but that a change had taken place in the last few months, a sort of awakening in light of the disaster. A detailed progress report on the management plan would be provided in December 2004; UNESCO's support was important.

ICOMOS stated that there was no imminent danger to the World Heritage property.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.38** adopted.

Then the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Greenpeace concerning the State of conservation of Lake Baikal.

The Representative of **Greenpeace** provided additional information on the plan to proceed to build the pipeline at Lake Baikal in the Russian Federation which, according to him had been approved by the Government in March 2004. He further stated that the World Heritage Committee should send a stronger message to the State Party concerning the potential dangers facing the property if the construction plan went ahead as planned and in doing so referred to Article 8 of the *Convention*.

Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)

The **Secretariat** introduced the report on the state of conservation of the property as included in the working document.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.39** without discussion.

Robben Island (South Africa (C 916)

The **Secretariat** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property as included in the working document.

The Delegation of **South Africa** welcomed the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its

27th session to send a reactive monitoring mission to Robben Island. It stressed the open and constructive spirit of cooperation and communication with the members of the mission. It informed the Committee that certain recommendations had already been implemented and that the others would be addressed soonest. A progress report would be submitted to the Committee at its 29th session.

La délégation du **Bénin** rappelle le symbole de résistance à l'Apartheid que le site de Robben Island représente pour la communauté internationale en général, et pour l'Afrique en particulier. Elle félicite l'Afrique du Sud pour son engagement à protéger les valeurs de ce site, en commençant d'appliquer les recommandations de la mission ICOMOS-ICCROM-UICN.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.40** adopted.

Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 144)

The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report as included in the working document and pointed out that some of the figures on International Assistance were too low. The mission to the site had been requested by the State Party in view of its possible inscription in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of **Norway**, was of the opinion that paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, concerning a revision of the inscription criteria, was unrealistic and that it was not a priority at a time when conservation should be the priority.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that there was ascertained danger to the outstanding universal value of the property and that it should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger to save the site for humanity.

La délégation du **Bénin** appuie le projet de décision relatif à l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, présenté par le Secrétariat. Elle estime, comme la délégation de Grande-Bretagne, qu'il faut fournir à l'Etat partie une liste de recommandations destinées à sortir le site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elle propose également que le Centre du patrimoine mondial aide l'Etat partie à formuler la stratégie

qui devrait être mise en place à cet effet. Suite aux observations des délégations du Royaume-Uni et de la Norvège, elle propose de supprimer le paragraphe 4 du projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** also agreed with the comments on paragraph 4 and said that its country would be willing to provide support to the property, which was also of importance for the history of Portugal.

The Delegation of **South Africa** appealed for the challenge of the conservation of heritage in the developing world to be addressed, in order to avoid sites deteriorating. Capacity-building should be provided to assist the State Party in developing comprehensive conservation and management plans.

The **Chairperson** concluded that there was consensus on inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the deletion of paragraph 4 from the Draft Decision.

He declared Decision **28 COM 15B.41** adopted, as amended.

The Delegation of **Portugal** requested assurance that the State Party agreed with the inscription.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** expressed its appreciation to ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for the mission to the site and confirmed the State Party's agreement with the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It thanked the Governments of Japan and France for the support provided thus far and the Government of Portugal for its offer of assistance. It outlined several measures taken by the State Party and said that a standing committee had been created for the supervision and monitoring of the site. As to paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, the State Party would look into the implications at a later stage. Having informed the Committee that a management plan was under preparation with the support of the World Heritage Fund, it appealed to States Parties, UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre and the international community to support the safeguarding of the site.

Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)

The **Secretariat** introduced the report on the state of conservation of the property, in particular in reference to the copy of the memorial project constructed on the island.

Le **Représentant du Directeur général de l'UNESCO** informe le Comité qu'au cours d'une mission qu'il a effectuée en juin 2004 au Sénégal, en compagnie du Président de la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO et du délégué permanent du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO, il a eu l'occasion de visiter les deux sites du patrimoine mondial, l'île de Gorée et l'île de Saint-Louis, et a pu discuter du cas particulier de l'île de Gorée avec les autorités sénégalaises, notamment la Ministre de la Culture du Sénégal et le Maire de Gorée. En ce qui concerne la réplique, celles-ci ont pleinement conscience de l'impact négatif de ce monument, dont la destruction exigerait une dépense de plusieurs millions de dollars. Elles souhaiteraient donc obtenir le concours technique et financier de la communauté internationale pour trouver une solution définitive à cette situation.

La délégation du **Bénin**, associée à cette mission par le biais du délégué permanent auprès de l'UNESCO, remercie le Représentant du Directeur général pour les informations complémentaires apportées, utiles pour une meilleure compréhension de l'état de conservation du bien.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that the site had been inscribed some considerable time before and that one could expect the responsible agency to be aware of the rules governing the *Convention*. It was surprised that nobody had noted the matter before, and wondered how that was possible.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** pointed out that there was a contradiction. The original project had been approved by UNESCO in 1991 and now the World Heritage Centre said that the memorial should be demolished.

The **Representative of the Director General of UNESCO** pointed out that the Executive Board, following an international competition, had approved the memorial to be placed on the mainland at a cost US\$100 million and that the Government of Senegal had asked UNESCO to assist in generating the necessary funds. A replica of over ten metres high had been constructed on the island. The replica was not in harmony with the visual integrity of the site, both in materials and in scale.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** agreed that a mistake had been made but a balance should be found with political concerns. It proposed that the Committee should express its concerns in the Draft Decision

and that the State Party should provide, at the 29th session, a technical report on the strategies it envisaged to limit the effects of the replica on the property. No "danger listing" should be considered, however.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.42** adopted, with the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Nigeria.

Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)

The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979. It highlighted for the Committee's attention the issue of the construction of a commercial complex within the buffer zone of the property. New information had been received from the UNESCO Teheran Office on 26 June 2004, informing the Committee that the National Technical Committee had studied the issue of the commercial complex and had proposed two possible alternatives: one reducing the height of the new building to 32.64 metres; the second reducing its height to 24.48 metres. The Secretariat observed, however, that both alternatives would still have an adverse impact on the property.

ICOMOS added that the difficulty was that the new commercial complex was under construction in a high location overlooking the Meidan, so that its construction impacted visually on the inscribed property in a very intrusive and negative way.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked the State Party to inform the Committee of its view of the situation and possible mitigating measures that had been envisaged.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** informed the Committee that the National Technical Committee had recommended to the Iranian Government that the construction should be limited to 24.48 metres.

The **Chairperson** declared revised Decision **28 COM 15B.63** adopted.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** commended the State Party and the National Technical Committee for its technical analysis.

Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report and indicated that new information had been received regarding the intention of the Government of Algeria to work with the Centre on the preparation of the requested conservation plan, but that there was no reason to revise the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM15B.43** adopted.

M'Zab Valley (Algeria) (C 188)

The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report as included in the working document.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it had no problem with the Draft Decision but suggested the inclusion of a deadline for the completion of the actions.

The **Secretariat** proposed that the deadline should be that for the 30th session of the Committee, that was, 1 February 2006.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM.15B.44** adopted, as amended.

Medina of Essaouira (Ancient Mogador) (Marocco) (C753rev)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report included in the working document.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM15B.45** adopted.

Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco) C 444)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report as included in the working document.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that urgent threats were outlined in the report and asked how they were to be addressed. Danger listing might be considered the following year, but it wanted to know what would be done in the meantime.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether danger listing would be necessary, considering the assistance being provided by Italy.

The Delegation of **Oman** pointed out that the fact that the Government of Morocco had undertaken to develop the appropriate legal framework was not reflected in the Draft Decision. As to possible danger listing, it would have liked to know the opinion of the State Party thereon.

The **Secretariat** said that in one year good progress could be made in the preparation of a master plan. The reference to eventual danger listing had been included in the document because the Committee had referred to it at its previous session. It suggested revising paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision to integrate the observations made by the Delegation of Oman.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed, but repeated its question as to whether danger listing should be considered.

The **Secretariat** reiterated that threats did exist but that there was a new attitude to the management of the site.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** observed that there were many positive developments but that there was still little impact on the site. It agreed with the revised Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.46** adopted, as amended.

Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report included in the working document.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.47** adopted.

Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report included in the working document.

La délégation du **Liban** apporte des clarifications concernant les paragraphes 2, 3, et 4 du projet de décision **28 COM 15B.48**. Pour le paragraphe 2, elle informe le Comité que le bâtiment auquel il est fait référence ne se trouve pas dans le site, mais plutôt en limite de celui-ci, et suggère de remanier ce paragraphe en conséquence. Pour le paragraphe 3, elle assure le Comité que la création de la réserve archéologique marine est en bonne voie,

ainsi que la finalisation de la carte archéologique qui est d'ailleurs intégrée dans le projet de la Banque mondiale. Pour le paragraphe 4, elle suggère au Comité d'ajouter que celui-ci appuie la proposition de transformation du port commercial en port touristique. Elle suggère enfin de remplacer, toujours au paragraphe 4, "port de Sidon" par "port actuel".

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Delegation of Lebanon for its information. It asked for clarification as to what was meant when the documents referred to UNESCO (World Heritage Centre, Advisory Body, other divisions of UNESCO). As to the building, it said that the Committee was unable to stop it but asked whether an impact study had been undertaken.

In response to the observation of the Delegation of Lebanon as to the location of the building, the **Secretariat** clarified that there were two archaeological zones, the strictly protected and fenced area, and the zone indicated in the master plan as having potential archaeological significance. On the reference to UNESCO, it informed the Committee that an International Scientific Committee had been set up by the Executive Board in the context of the International Campaign to Safeguard the Site of Tyre and its Surrounding. At the same time, the Centre carried out some activities and had developed cooperation with the World Bank in the framework of an overall World Bank project for Lebanon.

La délégation du **Bénin** souhaite savoir, d'une part, si l'Etat partie a accepté la proposition de protection du patrimoine subaquatique autour de Tyr et, d'autre part, si les autorités libanaises ont pris des mesures afin que la construction illégale dont il est fait mention n'affecte pas l'intégrité de la zone archéologique du site.

En réponse à la question de la délégation du Bénin, la délégation du **Liban** informe le Comité que les dernières décisions ne sont pas encore prises. Pour ce qui concerne le bâtiment illégal, elle porte à l'attention du Comité qu'une interdiction de construire, inscrite dans le schéma directeur, a toujours existé dans cette zone.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether the construction had been the subject of an impact assessment, and how all the different initiatives in Tyre were coordinated.

The **Secretariat** responded that due to unrest in the country for some time, developments could take place that were not under the control of the Government. That had led in the preceding years to numerous new constructions which had had a negative impact on the environmental value of the property. The new building under discussion was only the last in a series of new structures, and in that sense it had not dramatically changed the overall state of conservation of the property. A reference to the need to integrate Environmental Impact Assessment procedures into the planning system could be incorporated in paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision. Frequent coordination was undertaken between the International Campaign and the World Heritage Centre and with the World Bank project.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.48** adopted, as amended to reflect observations expressed during the discussion, in particular regarding the impact study.

Archaeological site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)

The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report as included in the working document.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that many of the problems identified in the report could be found in many other sites and that in view of the lack of conservation and the presence of many foreign archaeological missions, there was a strong need for a management plan and strategic direction for the site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the United Kingdom. It suggested that in paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision a date be included and in paragraph 4, the word 'reduce' deleted.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** suggested that archaeological excavations should be temporarily halted but that restoration work should be reduced.

ICOMOS referred to the ICOMOS and UNESCO charters on archaeological sites, which stated that not everything should be excavated, and added that non-destructive research methods did exist.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that most archaeological missions were foreign and that once they were stopped at a certain site it would be

difficult to get them back. For that reason, it found the recommendation to halt the excavations too strong.

The **Secretariat** emphasized that conservation was required but that restoration should not be a priority.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed that a sentence be inserted in paragraph 2 regarding the need to coordinate archaeological interventions on the site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM15B.49** adopted, as amended.

The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dashur (Egypt) (C 86)

Decision **28 COM 15B.50** was adopted.

Saint Catherine Area (Egypt) (C 954)

Decision **28 COM 15B.51** was adopted.

Medina of Fez (Morocco) (C 170)

The **Secretariat** pointed out that there had been a mistake in the translation from French into English in paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, where 'surroundings' should replace 'boundaries'.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15.B.52** adopted, as amended.

Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report for the property.

It said that of the two International Assistance requests submitted by the State Party, the request for Training Assistance could not be accommodated due to lack of resources in the World Heritage Fund, while the second request, for Technical Co-operation, would be reviewed under Agenda Item 10A.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.53**.

Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (China) (C 439 bis)

The **Secretariat** drew the Committee's attention to the outstanding issue of the lack of an adequately defined buffer zone, which had been addressed by Decision **27 COM 14B 30** and at the present session when examining the extension of the property to include the Imperial Palace of the Qing Dynasty in Shenyang.

It had received from the State Party on 16 January 2004 a progress report on work to define and establish the property's buffer zone. A partnership project had been initiated between UNESCO and Tsinghua University of China to implement a new urban renewal project in the Xicheng District of Beijing. Meanwhile, UNESCO had been also invited to act as technical adviser for the European Union's project in Beijing within the framework of the *Asia-Urbs* Programme (twinning Beijing with Rome and Paris). A conference on the preservation of historic cities in China would be organized jointly by the World Bank, the World Heritage Centre and the Government of China and held in early 2005.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested incorporating the substance of the Committee's Decision **28 COM 14B.30** regarding the extension of the property and the particular paragraph requesting definition of its buffer zone into the Draft Decision on the state of conservation of the property.

The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15B.54** adopted as amended.

Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707 ter)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994, extended in 2000 and 2001. It informed the Committee that new information had been received from the State Party on 27 June 2004, but that neither it nor ICOMOS had yet had time to study the report.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** observed that Draft Decision **28 COM 15B.55** appeared to be a repeat of a similar decision adopted by the Committee at its 27th session, and wondered whether it was necessary to repeat the Decision. It asked whether the updating of the conservation management plan for the property had or had not been completed, and if not, why not.

The **Secretariat** explained that a reiteration of the Committee's previous recommendations would reinforce the importance and the urgency of the work recommended.

The Delegation of **Benin** noted that the Draft Decision did acknowledge receipt of a report. It asked the State Party whether non-skilled workers were being employed to undertake conservation work on the property.

The Delegation of **China** described the Chinese system of local administration and management of heritage sites. All conservation work on the property had been undertaken within a framework of "minimum intervention". Skilled traditional artisans had been employed, working under the supervision of experts. All conservation work on the property had been planned and monitored by experts from the State Administration of Culture Heritage, assisted by experts from Tsinghua University. Progress reports on the work had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 12 January 2004 and 27 June 2004, specifying that the Chinese Government had announced the scope of the protection and buffer zone at the Potala Palace, Jokhang Monastery and Norbulingka. Further regulations and technical requirements had been identified to ensure protection of the buffer zone.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that ICOMOS had reviewed the report of 12 January 2004.

ICOMOS noted that restoration of vernacular ("humble") buildings had proven problematic in the historic core of Lhasa and that it would be necessary to find a balance between replacement and retention of authentic historic fabric.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** observed that neither the Secretariat nor the Advisory Body (ICOMOS) seemed to be up-to-date with the current state of conservation of the property, and suggested that a short mission should be undertaken to the site in the immediate future.

The Delegation of **Portugal** asked for paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision to be reworded to specify the information provided by the State Party.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that the words “World Heritage conservation guidelines” in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision should be replaced by the term “international standards” or a similar phrase.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that, for the sake of completeness and clarity, paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision should be amended to include and reiterate all of the recommendations contained in Decision **27 COM 7B.45**.

The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15B.55** adopted, as amended.

Classical Gardens of Suzhou (China) (C 813 bis)

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report for the property, Classical Gardens of Suzhou, China (C 813 bis), inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1997 and extended in 2000. He highlighted for the Committee’s attention the issue of the proposed construction of a new museum within the buffer zone, near the Garden of the Humble Administrator.

He said that ICOMOS had conducted a desk review of the architectural plans and that UNESCO and ICOMOS had undertaken monitoring missions to the site, the conclusion of which had been that the proposed museum, designed by Chinese-American architect IM Pei, would not adversely affect the property. Indeed, the UNESCO-ICOMOS evaluation had found that the proposed construction would be an improvement to the current condition of that lot in the buffer zone, which was occupied by a derelict high-rise hospital building of relatively recent construction.

He also underscored for the Committee’s attention the need to ensure the protection of the historic urban fabric of Suzhou, which was under threat from redevelopment pressures, and suggested that the State Party might eventually wish to consider nominating an extension to the property to include the historic core of Suzhou and the related canal towns situated within the same geo-cultural area.

The Delegation of **Norway** asked about the intended fate of the protected historic structures

(those marked in red on the conservation master plan) that fell within the footprint of the proposed museum building.

ICOMOS said that the structures in question would be moved elsewhere.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision to be redrafted, noting that it was not the State Party, but the Committee which was empowered to inscribe properties on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** declared revised decision **28 COM 15B.56** adopted, as amended.

Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India) (C 1056 rev)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2002. It informed the Committee that it had received new information on the site management plan on 18 May 2004 and that it had been evaluated by ICOMOS and ICCROM. It highlighted the issue of the property’s management plan, a revision of which had been submitted to the Secretariat and to the Advisory Bodies.

ICCROM reported that ICCROM and ICOMOS had jointly reviewed the revised management plan submitted by the State Party, and observed that, in fact, the “management plan” submitted was not so much a plan guiding site management, as a set of intentions as to how the site should ideally be managed. ICCROM commended the State Party for its accurate identification of the major conservation issues at the property and for having initiated studies that addressed them directly.

It also drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that, although the property had been inscribed on the World Heritage List, it had not been included in the Indian Government’s official list of nationally protected sites. That anomaly had made it difficult for the Archaeological Survey of India to extend its technical assistance to the site.

The Delegation of **India** welcomed the recommendations contained in the Draft Decision and informed the Committee that national listing of the property as a protected site was under review by the Indian Government. It also informed the Committee that the Government was considering nominating an extension of the site, at an

appropriate future date, to include the Bodhgaya cultural landscape.

The **Chairperson** declared revised Decision **28 COM 15B.57** adopted.

Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 252)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report for the property and highlighted for the Committee's attention the issue of the proposed "Taj Corridor Project" and informed the Committee that the project had reportedly been discontinued by the Government of India. It suggested to the Committee an amendment to the Draft Decision requesting the State Party to provide to the Secretariat a report on the status of the "Taj Corridor Project" and progress made on other issues and recommendations contained in the Draft Decision for consideration by the Committee at its 29th Session in 2005.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that the recommendations in the Draft Decision were an ambitious list of actions, and that the Government of the United Kingdom was ready to provide technical assistance to the Government of India in their implementation, if so requested.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** welcomed the news that the Taj Corridor Project had been abandoned. It noted that paragraph 4(a) of the Draft Decision had not been properly drafted - it was not for the Committee to instruct a State Party as to which ministry or department should be designated to head the recommended steering committee. It therefore requested the Secretariat to re-draft the paragraph.

The **Chairperson** declared revised decision **28 COM 15B.58** adopted as amended.

Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 592)

The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property and highlighted for the Committee's attention the still problematic issue of the commercialization of the entry area to the property in Zone 2 and, in particular, plans to build a shopping complex (sometimes referred to in documents as "Jagad Jawa") within Zone 3 of the property, in spite of

the Committee's strong recommendation to the contrary.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.59** adopted.

Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 479 rev)

The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property and highlighted for the Committee's attention the issue of the projects financed by the Asian Development Bank to rip-rap the river bank and widen roads within the core protected zone of the property, with negative impact on the property's heritage values. The problem had been brought under control through the establishment of a project review committee on which representatives of the Luang Prabang Heritage House and UNESCO sat. The committee monitored all development projects with a potential impact on the inscribed property and its buffer zone.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.60** adopted.

Complex of Hué Monuments (Viet Nam) (C 678)

The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property, Complex of Hue Monuments (C 678), inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1993. It highlighted the issue of the ongoing and proposed projects to construct and/or widen roads within the Citadel and through the buffer zones of various monument zones. Those road construction projects had posed particularly difficult conservation issues for the State Party to manage, considering its intention to envisage nomination of an extension to the inscribed property linking the now individually-isolated monument zones into one contiguous cultural landscape along the Perfume River.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked about the status of the road projects affecting the property.

ICOMOS said that it did not have current information on the subject.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the issue of roads would be on the agenda of the next meeting of the Viet Nam-UNESCO Hue Working Group, scheduled for October 2004.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.61** adopted.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested that the following State of Conservation reports from part II be moved to Part I for discussion of the Committee: Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) and Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal).

Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)

The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1998, and informed the Committee that paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision had been revised at the suggestion of the State Party.

The Delegation of **Oman** supported the revised Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared revised Decision **28 COM 15B.64** adopted.

Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666)

The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1997. It highlighted the issue of the newly-constructed Maha Devi Temple which had negatively impacted on the conservation and the understanding of the site. A joint UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission had taken place on 8 May 2004 and had found that the new building was totally inappropriate, negatively affecting the conservation of the excavated archaeological remains, and obscuring the World Heritage value of the Lumbini sacred grove. Limited interpretation and presentation was available at the site. A site management plan was required, focusing on the identification and priorities of future cultural resources of the property. The Secretariat drew to the Committee's attention the mission findings and recommendations for examination.

The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** explained that the structure was the result of an attempt to please everyone, and that the design of the structure had

been approved by UNESCO. It informed the Committee that it was prepared to make changes to modify or replace the structure and asked UNESCO and the Committee to supervise that work.

La délégation du **Liban**, notant que le site a déjà fait l'objet d'un examen à Budapest, demande au Secrétariat et à l'ICOMOS si le plan du nouveau temple leur a effectivement été soumis avant construction. Elle observe que la "reconstruction" du temple a consisté en la création d'une enveloppe autour du site, sous la forme d'un bâtiment totalement kitch, sans aucune qualité architecturale, qui ôte toute visibilité au bien protégé. Devant cet acte irrémédiable, qui aurait dû susciter une réaction plus tôt, il n'est d'autre solution que de détruire le tout et de reconstruire. La délégation demande à l'ICOMOS si l'atteinte portée au bien n'affecte pas directement sa valeur universelle, remettant en cause son maintien sur la Liste.

The **Secretariat** said that the plan for the newly-constructed Maha Devi Temple had not been submitted to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and had therefore not forwarded to the Committee.

ICOMOS said that it very much regretted the construction of the new Maha Devi Temple structure.

The Delegation of **South Africa** observed that there was an obvious and regrettable disconnect between the World Heritage values of the property and the management of the property which did not safeguard those values. It was, however, of the opinion that it was not too late to take corrective action. It suggested that strong action should be recommended by the Committee and paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision redrafted accordingly.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed the opinion that the "outstanding universal value" of the property was still intact, in spite of the inappropriate construction of the new temple building. It stressed the need for the authorities to develop a new management plan for the property which would include conservation protocols for the safeguarding of its heritage value, authenticity and integrity.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether the design for the new temple had been submitted to UNESCO or not.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed the opinion that the property still retained its “outstanding universal value” and said that the case suggested the need for new criteria to deal with places of spiritual significance.

La délégation du **Liban** pense que la décision prise devra refléter clairement à la fois l’inquiétude et la déception du Comité face à la dégradation du site et au non respect par l’Etat partie des dispositions de la Convention concernant la nécessité de soumettre les plans de tout projet de construction à l’intérieur du site. Rappelant que le site en question est inscrit au titre des critères (iii) et (vi), à la fois comme témoignage unique et site associé à des événements et croyances, elle estime qu’il ne remplit plus les conditions requises dans le premier cas, car il ne reste plus du bâtiment que des ruines, mais propose, compte tenu de ses valeurs spirituelles indéniables, et au vu de la situation exceptionnelle, de maintenir le critère (vi), même si celui-ci ne doit pas s’appliquer seul à un bien.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** responded to the proposal by Lebanon, saying that there was no urgency in deciding about the deletion of criterion (iii) and that the Committee might wish to consider the question at its next regular session. It seconded the request by Saint Lucia for UNESCO to review the process by which such a structure could be built without the Committee’s approval, and to ascertain whether any UNESCO unit had, in fact, reviewed and approved the structure’s design.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** spoke in favour of retaining criterion (iii) in respect of the property, pointing out that even seemingly insignificant archaeological remains retained symbolic significance.

The Delegations of **Saint Lucia, Norway, Nigeria** and **China** agreed that the property had retained its “outstanding universal value” under criterion (vi) and seconded the proposal that the Committee should wait until its next session to review the question of removing criterion (iii).

The **Chairperson** repeated the request for clarification from UNESCO as to whether the Secretariat had received the design plans for the new Maha Devi Temple before it had been built.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** inquired whether the design for the new temple had been submitted to UNESCO and asked the Secretariat to report

back to the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that the failings in the case might point to the need to revise the *Operational Guidelines* with regard to the respective roles of the different units within the UNESCO Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed the opinion that the definition of the respective roles of UNESCO operational units was the internal concern of UNESCO and not a matter for the Committee to dictate.

The Committee decided to examine the state of conservation of the property at its 29th session in 2005 and the **Chairperson** declared revised decision **28 COM 15B.66** adopted, as amended. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China) (C 705)

Decision **28 COM 15B.62** was adopted.

Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People’s Democratic Republic) (C 481)

Decision **28 COM 15B.65** was adopted.

State Historical and Cultural Park “Ancient Merv” (Turkmenistan) (C 886)

Decision **28 COM 15B.67** was adopted.

Historic Centre of Shakhrysbz (Uzbekistan) (C 885)

Decision **28 COM 15B.68** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** asked whether any Delegations wished to open discussion on cultural World Heritage properties in Europe and North America listed under Part II of the working document.

La délégation du **Liban** demande que les biens suivants fassent l’objet d’un débat: Salzbourg (Autriche), Bagrati (Georgie), Vicence (Italie) et Avila (Espagne).

City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.69**.

Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (C 292 rev)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that ICOMOS strongly recommended against a high-rise construction project and recalled that the State Party had not followed the recommendation made by ICOMOS at the time of the inscription to define a buffer zone.

ICOMOS said that the Cathedral could be seen from a far distance and that the visual integrity of the property was important. Recalling its recommendation to the State Party at the time of inscription regarding the definition of a buffer zone, it pointed out that a cluster of skyscrapers was located on the opposite side of the River Rhine and that one of the buildings nearest to the Cathedral had already been constructed. ICOMOS deeply regretted the situation but also pointed out that not all the planned skyscrapers would necessarily be completed.

The **Director of the Centre** informed the Committee of the consultations the Centre had carried out with the State Party in order to discuss the responsibility of States Parties under the *World Heritage Convention*. Furthermore, representatives of the Centre had attended the expert conference on the high-rise building project in Cologne in November 2003.

La délégation du **Liban** juge ce cas d'une importance décisive. La Cathédrale est le monument principal du site; elle entretient un rapport très particulier avec celui-ci, et c'est précisément ce qui lui donne une valeur universelle. Le bâtiment est construit directement dans le site du patrimoine mondial, portant atteinte à sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Le Comité doit être cohérent et faire preuve de fermeté. Il doit faire de ce cas un exemple, d'autant que celui-ci concerne l'Allemagne, pays riche et fort d'une longue expérience. Face à une situation aussi

dramatique et exceptionnelle, invoquant le paragraphe 80 des *Orientations*, la délégation recommande l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the proposition made by the Delegation of Lebanon and strongly regretted the fact that a buffer zone had not been established since the inscription of the site. Any new development projects should respect the visual integrity of the property.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the proposals made by the Delegation of Lebanon and remarked that the Committee needed to show to the wider public its commitment to safeguarding the World Heritage property.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the proposition made by the Delegations of Lebanon and Norway. It also referred to the economic interest that the State Party had in the town. It considered that if no development took place on the opposite side of the River Rhine, the property could be retained on the World Heritage List. If that was not possible, the Committee should consider the possibility of removing it from the List, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4 of the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the suggestions made by the Delegations of Lebanon and Norway, and added that the Committee might even have to consider delisting..

The Delegations of **Chile** and **Colombia** endorsed the proposal made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked the State Party to explain its views on the high-rise project.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** stated that the planned high-rise construction would have no material impact on the Cathedral of Cologne and that the Municipality of Cologne was in the process of establishing a buffer zone which did not include the location of the construction project. It stressed that the project had been extensively discussed in public and among the relevant national authorities over the previous year. It called upon the Committee to develop guidelines concerning the visual impact that urban development could have on monuments.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recalled that the Draft Decision should specify what the State Party would need to do in order to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recalled the decision taken by the Committee at its 27th session to organize a conference on high-rise building and visual integrity, and requested more information from the Secretariat thereon.

La délégation du **Liban** souscrit aux propos du Royaume-Uni, notamment en ce qui concerne l'organisation d'une réunion. Répondant à la délégation des Pays-Bas, elle précise qu'il est important de faire réaliser, par les organisations consultatives une étude d'impact visuel et une étude détaillée de l'état de conservation du site qui permettront au Comité de se prononcer sur cette question lors de la session à venir. La délégation remarque que l'Etat partie n'a pas informé le Centre et les organisations consultatives des plans déjà approuvés de ces constructions lors des discussions tenues dans le cadre de l'évaluation du site. Elle suggère que le Comité modifie le paragraphe 1 du projet de décision pour manifester qu'il regrette le fait.

The **Director of the Centre** explained that the Vienna Conference “World Heritage and contemporary architecture – Managing the historic urban landscape” would take place from 16 to 17 May 2005 in Vienna, Austria, to discuss the contemporary interventions on World Heritage sites.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the Secretariat for that information and undertook to do its utmost to assist in the preparation of the Conference, particularly in providing a range of appropriate experts as the problem of high-rise construction was pertinent to the United Kingdom.

The **Chairperson** asked the World Heritage Centre to follow up on the offer made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, while acknowledging the importance of the Vienna Conference, underlined the urgency of the situation and supported the suggestion made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Committee adopted decision **28 COM 15B.70**, as amended.

Acropolis, Athens (Greece) (C 404)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the letter from the State Party dated 22 June 2004 confirmed that the construction of the building would be one floor lower, following the instructions from the Greek Central Archaeological Council. Furthermore, the letter stated that the Ministry of Culture had commissioned the required visual impact study and upon completion it would be submitted to the Council to evaluate whether the construction of the building with the reduced height would have any visual impact on the property.

La délégation du **Liban** précise qu'il est important d'attendre les résultats de l'étude d'impact visuel et recommande que l'Etat partie ne prenne aucune décision qui pourrait être irréversible pour l'intégrité du site.

The Observer Delegation of **Greece** confirmed that no construction would take place in the vicinity of the property without the approval of the Greek Central Archaeological Council.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.71**.

Archaeological Ensemble of the Bend of the Boyne (Ireland) (C 659)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to the site in February 2004 had concluded that the municipal waste incinerator would not have any major impact on it. As a result of the mission, communication between the Centre and the State Party had greatly improved. It had received submissions by the State Party on 18 June 2004 concerning the Slane Bypass and South North Pipeline as a follow-up to the recommendations of the mission.

Referring to a number of subsidiary issues that the mission had considered, as mentioned in the working document, **ICOMOS** suggested that the State Party should undertake a review of development impact on the property

The Observer Delegation of **Ireland** thanked the Chinese authorities for hosting the Committee. It noted the conclusions of the mission with

satisfaction and promised to be vigilant over the conservation of the property.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked that the subsidiary issues that the mission considered should have been included in the working document.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.72**.

Rock Drawings in Valcamonica (Italy) (C 94)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

La délégation du **Liban** relève deux problèmes: la construction d'une route ayant un impact sur le site et l'existence d'une ligne à haute tension sur ce même site. Depuis l'inscription sur la Liste en 1979, l'Etat partie n'a pas établi les limites du site, n'a mis en oeuvre aucun plan de gestion, et ne donne aucune information sur son état de conservation. Notant une contradiction entre la demande d'inscription de nouveaux sites et la négligence de ceux qui sont déjà inscrits, la délégation recommande que l'Etat partie soit prié dans le projet de décision de définir les limites du site et d'établir un plan de gestion le plus rapidement possible.

La délégation du **Bénin**, souscrivant aux propos de la délégation du Liban, évoque la nécessité de consulter l'ICOMOS sur l'état de conservation du site. Elle demande que l'Etat partie réponde aux questions posées, notamment en ce qui concerne le plan de gestion et la délimitation du site.

The Delegation of **Argentina** regretted the fact that the site did not have defined boundaries or a management plan.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** warmly welcomed a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to the property in order to evaluate the state of conservation of the property. It confirmed that the relevant national authorities were in the process of establishing the boundaries of the property within the framework of the forthcoming Periodic Reporting exercise. It also remarked that a management plan was being prepared and would be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2005, while an adequate management system was in force with some specific laws and

structures dedicated to the conservation of cultural heritage. Furthermore, the Ministry of Cultural Heritage had evaluated the power-line project and had changed the route to be further away from the World Heritage property. Construction of the road which had been originally planned near the property had been halted.

La délégation du **Liban** précise que les *Orientations* requièrent, au paragraphe 24, des mécanismes de gestion adéquats et que l'Etat partie doit fournir des preuves de l'existence de ces mécanismes.

The Committee adopted the decision **28 COM 15B.73**, as amended.

Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

The Delegation of **Norway** referred to the rapid economic growth in Riga and proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision to ensure that any new building would fully respect the visual integrity of the property and that the historical watercourses would be preserved as an open public space without any new buildings.

La délégation du **Liban** soutient la proposition de la Norvège et considère que le projet de décision devrait exprimer les regrets du Comité. Elle souhaite connaître l'avis de l'ICOMOS sur cette question.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the comment by the Delegation of Lebanon and regretted that the State Party had not taken into account the decision of the Committee at its 27th session. Paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision should specify the time frame for finalizing and implementing the preservation and development plan for the property. Furthermore, the Delegation of Colombia questioned whether the law of June 2003 had any specific reference to the height restriction for construction of buildings within the property.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the opinions of Lebanon and Norway and asked to see the photograph of the construction project under consideration.

The Observer Delegation of **Latvia** stated that it had taken a number of conservation measures such as the preparation of a management plan, the establishment of the Council and the finalization of the conservation and development plan. It thanked Norway for proposing the amendment and supported the organization of the Vienna Conference on World Heritage and contemporary architecture in May 2005.

The Committee adopted decision **28 COM 15B.74**, as amended.

Curonian Spit (Lithuania and Russian Federation) (C 994)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that according to the report from Lithuania dated 1 July 2004 and the letter of 29 June 2004 from the authorities of the Russian Federation, the intergovernmental meeting on 16 April 2004 in Vilnius had not reached any bilateral agreement as regarded the coordination of a joint Environmental Impact Assessment. The World Heritage Centre had also received information during the session from the Lithuanian authorities that D-6 oil exploitation had commenced while the Russian Federation had provided no information. The Ministry of Natural Resources was undergoing a structural change, which might be one of the factors hindering bilateral cooperation. Following the request from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania by letter of 22 July 2004 to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Centre had held extensive consultations with the States Parties, Advisory Bodies and members of the mission, which had led to the preparation of the revised Draft Decision.

La délégation du **Liban** note qu'il est prévu dans le projet de décision d'inscrire le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en 2005 si de nouvelles informations ne sont pas reçues de la part de l'Etat partie concerné. Elle suggère que la délégation présente donne de nouvelles informations.

La délégation du **Bénin** remarque qu'en ce qui concerne ce site, l'ICOMOS recommande que les valeurs culturelles soient mieux prises en compte et qu'il importe d'attirer l'attention des Etats parties sur cette question.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** considered that it was important to receive the assurance from the

States Parties that they both supported the Draft Decision, as it was an unusual procedure which rendered possible the automatic inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger after 1 February 2005. The joint work plan for monitoring, prevention/mitigation measures mentioned in paragraph 6 should also include compensation measures, and the details of the work plan should be repeated in paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the revised Draft Decision and remarked that bilateral cooperation was a guiding principal for the conservation of transboundary properties.

The Delegation of **China** expressed its support for the revised Draft Decision, provided that it had been prepared in consultation with both States Parties.

The **Chairperson** assured the Committee that the revised Draft Decision had indeed been prepared in full consultation with both States Parties.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the comment made by the Delegation of Benin and suggested that the States Parties should acknowledge the cultural attributes more clearly in their management process and consider the threat of oil spills to relevant cultural aspects of the property.

The Delegation of **Chile** requested both the States Parties to assure the Committee that they both agreed with the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** appreciated the interest shown by the Committee members in the issue and said that it agreed with the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** also agreed with the revised Draft Decision as a compromise reached after a series of consultations.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.75**, as amended.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked whether it could read out a statement.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Lithuania to submit the statement to the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Lithuania**, in a written statement, thanked the Committee for adopting the revised Draft Decision and raised the alarm over the D-6 oil exploitation, which had already commenced. It informed the Committee that the decision taken at its 27th session had not been implemented and that bilateral cooperation with the Russian Federation had been unsatisfactory. Recalling Article 6.3 of the *World Heritage Convention*, the Lithuanian authorities hoped that the situation would improve so that it would not be necessary to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Concerning the revised Draft Decision, the Lithuanian authorities stressed that written agreement by the States Parties to carry out a joint Environmental Impact Assessment should be implemented within a reasonable time frame, as should the preparation of a joint work plan.

Route of Santiago de Compostela (Spain) (C 347)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that, according to the detailed presentation given to the World Heritage Centre on 21 June 2004, the part of the route to be flooded by the enlargement of the barrage of Yesa would be reduced, and that that information had been confirmed by the Ministry for the Environment to the Ministry of Culture of Spain in a letter dated 25 June 2004. The Draft Decision had been revised to take into account the reduction, although the flood would still affect minor parts of the route.

La délégation du **Liban** note que la situation est moins grave que prévue puisque, selon les organisations consultatives, les parties de route inondées n'affecteront pas la valeur universelle du site.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** was concerned that the flood would still affect minor parts of the route. It nonetheless supported the revised Draft Decision.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.79**.

Old Town of Avila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348 rev)

The **Secretariat** said that the World Heritage Centre had received the final report from ICOMOS

Spain on the construction projects of Plaza de Santa Teresa in Avila.

The **Director of the Centre** explained that the planned construction had reduced its volume but its architectural style still posed a problem of impact on the World Heritage property.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.97**.

The Megalithic Temple of Malta (Malta) (C 132 bis)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the Ambassador of Malta had informed the World Heritage Centre on 10 June 2004 that the Government of Malta had decided not to construct a landfill for domestic refuse near the property but had located an alternative site. According to the authorities of Malta, progress had also been made on the development of a conservation and preservation plan. The Draft Decision had been revised to take into account the changed situation, although there still remained a number of conservation issues.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its concern over the archaeological project and suggested that the Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out before the construction.

ICOMOS gave the details of the archaeological park project which included the construction of shelters over two of the temples. It raised questions as to whether the project was in line with the conservation needs of the property, and if the construction of the shelters would have significant visual impact on the World Heritage property. ICOMOS suggested revising the Draft Decision to request the State Party to provide the details of the project by the end of September 2004.

La délégation du **Liban** approuve le changement que l'ICOMOS propose d'apporter au projet de décision et suggère d'ajouter que l'Etat partie ne doit en aucun cas commencer les travaux avant d'avoir obtenu l'accord du Comité sur le projet.

The Observer Delegation of **Malta** contested the date proposed by ICOMOS concerning the submission of the detailed archaeological part project and suggested an alternative wording namely “in due course”

The **Chairperson** said that “in due course” was too vague.

The Observer Delegation of **Malta** suggested “as soon as possible”.

La délégation du **Liban** insiste sur le fait qu'aucun des travaux envisagés ne doit commencer sans consultation préalable du Comité.

The Observer Delegation of **Malta** emphasized that its Government was fully committed to protecting the World Heritage site and underlined the need of the authorities to work according to their domestic calendar. It could not cede sovereignty over such an issue.

The **Chairperson** said that it was important to specify a date.

The Observer Delegation of **Malta** suggested 1 February 2005.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** joined the Delegation of Lebanon in urging the State Party not to commence any construction before consideration by the Committee.

La délégation du **Liban** s'étonne que la délégation de Malte (observateur) puisse évoquer l'idée d'un abandon de souveraineté de la part des Etats parties. Elle tient à rappeler que Malte a signé la *Convention* qui demande que tout projet concernant un site du patrimoine mondial et ses environs soit soumis au Comité pour approbation préalable. A défaut de quoi, l'Etat partie s'expose à voir son site inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, voire retiré de la Liste. Le Comité est quant à lui souverain dans les demandes qu'il fait aux Etats parties de se conformer à la *Convention* et aux *Orientations*. Il lui est en effet impossible de trouver des solutions une fois les travaux commencés.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** disagreed with the Delegation of Lebanon on its interpretation of the *Convention* and stated that neither the Committee nor the Advisory Bodies had the right of veto for construction projects. It wondered whether the misunderstanding might have arisen from the different language versions of certain phrases in paragraph 56 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that sovereignty of States Parties is not questioned.

States Parties are free to implement or not the decisions of the Committee but then the Committee is also free to take the necessary actions including removing sites from the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Malta** thanked the Committee for its good will in assisting the State Party but once again expressed its dissatisfaction concerning the submission date of the details of the project.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.76**, as amended.

Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that it had received an update report on Actions in Progress prepared by the local authorities of Sintra on 24 June 2004. While the report reflected some positive efforts made by the authorities of Portugal, the critical issue remained the lack of an overall management plan.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that there existed a management structure in place although there was no formal management plan. It informed the Committee that the budget available for the management of the property was around 23 million euro. ICOMOS had commented in the state of conservation reports that the conservation challenges facing the site were considerable and would require large amounts of resources. In that regard, it suggested deleting paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision concerning a possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. As to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Draft Decision, the Delegation of the Netherlands expressed its intention to submit alternative wording in writing.

The Delegation of **Argentina** endorsed the proposals made by the Netherlands.

The Delegation of **Oman** suggested amending paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision as the State Party had submitted phase 1 of the management plan.

La délégation du **Liban** rappelle que le paysage culturel de Sintra est dans un état de détérioration avancé, que l'Etat partie n'a pas pris de décisions pendant des années et que le site aurait dû depuis longtemps être placé sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril. Une évolution est cependant amorcée et un

nouveau dynamisme se manifeste dans le cadre des efforts de conservation du site, qu'il ne sera sans doute pas nécessaire d'inscrire sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril. Il n'y a donc pas lieu de modifier le projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** mentioned that phase I of the management plan included revised legislation on the buffer zone as well as the study on the past conservation effort, while many of the recommendations of the mission in 2000 had been followed. The budget for managing the property was 10 million euro for 2004 and an increase of up to 23 million euro was expected for 2005. Concerning the Draft Decision, the authorities would respect the decision if the Committee wished to retain paragraph 6, although the meaning of "financial, administrative and technical measures" was unclear. It would welcome a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission in 2005 or 2006 in order to evaluate the state of conservation and the progress made in safeguarding the property.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.77**, as amended.

Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Serbia and Montenegro) (C 125)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that a round table was being held in November 2004 in order to involve all stakeholders in the preparation of a management plan for the property.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.78**.

Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that a number of missions had been undertaken by the UNESCO Division of Cultural Heritage and that a conference would be organized in September 2004 to discuss urban conservation and development issues, including transportation.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.80**.

Historic Centre of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784)

City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria)

(C 931)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no information since the finalization of the working document.

Concernant la ville de Graz, la délégation du **Liban** remarque que le Centre a été informé de la construction d'un bâtiment et de la destruction d'un autre dans le Centre historique de la ville. Elle note qu'il n'y a aucune réponse de l'Etat partie et remarque que le Comité se trouve une fois de plus devant le même problème que pour le site de Vienne. La délégation du Liban souhaite obtenir des informations de l'ICOMOS et du Secrétariat sur cette question.

ICOMOS said that certain high-rise construction projects had been revised in Graz, while the festival hall had partly been damaged in the Historic Centre of Salzburg. It suggested that the Committee should examine the state of conservation of the City of Graz at its 29th session.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked the State Party to express its position.

The Observer Delegation of **Austria** explained that the delay in preparing a state of conservation report had been due to a complex administrative system within the country. It nonetheless renewed its commitment to safeguarding the property.

La délégation du **Liban** souligne que le projet de décision devrait demander aux organisations consultatives et au Secrétariat de faire un rapport sur l'état de conservation de la ville pour la session à venir du Comité.

The **Director of the Centre** said that the mission to Graz was necessary to assess the impact of the construction project of the Thalia Centre as well as the demolition of the "Kommod-Haus" building within the property.

The Committee adopted both Decisions **28 COM 15B.81** and **28 COM 15B.82**

The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)

Decision **28 COM 15B.83** was adopted.

Fertő/Neusiedlersee Cultural Landscape (Austria/Hungary) (C 772 rev)

Decision **28 COM 15B.84** was adopted.

Historic District of Quebec (C 300)

Decision **28 COM 15B.85** was adopted.

Paphos (Cyprus) (C 79)

Decision **28 COM 15B.86** was adopted.

Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no information since the finalization of the working document.

La délégation du **Liban** note, d'après le rapport sur l'état de conservation que les autorités géorgiennes ont l'intention de reconstruire une partie de l'ouvrage, soit avec des pierres artificielles pour recréer la forme originale de l'édifice soit en utilisant de l'acier vernissé pour obtenir un dôme transparent qui pourra être illuminé. Si ces informations sont confirmées, il serait urgent que le Comité examine très sérieusement l'état de conservation de ce site, qui pourrait être très endommagé. La délégation demande que le Comité ne se contente pas de prendre note de cette question.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the reconstruction project was being proposed and supported by the Orthodox Church, which owned ecclesiastic buildings in Georgia, while the national authorities took a cautious approach to the reconstruction project. The Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports in Georgia had recently created a special section responsible for World Heritage issues, after which communication with the Centre had improved greatly.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the comment made by the Delegation of Lebanon and asked why a property with issues as serious as that had been placed in Part II, which is the "For noting" part.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed amending the Draft Decision to request the State Party not to start the reconstruction project without consideration by the Committee.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.87**, as amended.

The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Hanseatic City of Lübeck (Germany) (C272 rev)

Decision **28 COM 15B.88** was adopted.

Parks and Palaces of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany) (C 532 ter)

Decision **28 COM 15B.89** was adopted.

Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz (Germany) (C534 rev)

Decision **28 COM 15B.90** was adopted.

City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712 bis)

The **Secretariat** said that it had received no information since the finalization of the working document.

La délégation du **Liban** remarque que le problème en l'occurrence concerne notamment le projet de construction d'une autoroute à proximité du site, qui n'avait pas été mentionné dans le dossier d'inscription comme facteur pouvant avoir un effet négatif. Ce projet a été approuvé en 2002 et devrait se terminer fin 2004. L'État partie n'a pas donné d'explication sur cette décision d'autant plus incompréhensible que le site est magnifique.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the comment made by the Delegation of Lebanon in accordance with paragraph 22 of the *Operational Guidelines*. It proposed dispatching a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to evaluate the impact of the highway construction on the property.

ICOMOS regretted the seriousness of the situation and agreed to the need for such a mission.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether paragraph 22 of the *Operational Guidelines* had been in force at the time of the inscription of the property.

The **Secretariat** said that paragraph 22 had most likely been in operation as the site had been inscribed in 1996, but it would prefer to refer to the record.

La délégation de **l'Italie** (observateur), tout en partageant les préoccupations du Comité concernant ce projet, précise que le calendrier des opérations a été complètement modifié: les travaux prévus au début de 2002 n'ont pas encore commencé; les études devant les précéder n'ont pas encore débuté en raison de l'intervention du Centre ainsi que d'associations de citoyens opposées au projet. Le ministère de la Culture a été saisi. En outre, le 1er juin 2004, le ministère des Transports a été informé que l'autorisation de construire serait assortie de conditions importantes, notamment de l'obligation d'une attention particulière au site et à la zone tampon. Ces mesures vont débloquent la mise en oeuvre des études que l'Etat partie transmettra pour examen aux organisations consultatives ainsi qu'au Centre qui vérifieront si les conditions posées ont été respectées. La délégation estime donc que la situation est moins grave que prévu, même si la vigilance demeure de rigueur.

La délégation du **Liban** remercie la délégation de l'Italie pour avoir transmis des informations rassurantes concernant ce projet et demande que le projet de décision prenne en compte ces informations et indique qu'il est demandé à l'Etat partie de fournir l'ensemble des informations avant les travaux. Le projet de décision devra également mentionner que l'envoi d'une mission est recommandé.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported sending a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to the site.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B 91**, as amended.

Rock Drawing of Alta (Norway) (C 352)

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked why the Draft Decision had been revised.

The **Secretariat** explained that it had been revised to take into account the measures that the State

Party had taken to protect the site from further damage and to enhance legal protection of the property, as indicated in the state of conservation report of 10 June 2004.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.92**, as amended.

Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland) (C 31)

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that an expert meeting had been held from 13 to 15 May 2004 in order to prepare a management plan and to clarify the boundaries of the property.

S'exprimant sur l'état de conservation du site d'Auschwitz, la délégation de **Pologne** (observateur) déclare que l'Etat partie prend très au sérieux les décisions du Comité. Elle regrette que les conclusions de la réunion d'experts internationaux tenue dernièrement à Cracovie n'aient pas été intégrées dans le rapport sur l'état de conservation du site. Elle ne pense pas cependant être en mesure de fournir avant février 2005, comme il lui est demandé dans le projet de décision, un plan de gestion complet du site et demande que le Comité accepte de recevoir début février un rapport sur l'état d'avancement de ce document.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.93**, as amended.

The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania) (C 902)

Decision **28 COM 15B.94** was adopted.

Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

Decision **28 COM 15B.95** was adopted.

Spissky Hrad and its Associated Cultural Monuments (Slovakia) (C 620 rev)

Decision **28 COM 15B.96** was adopted.

Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)

Decision **28 COM 15B.98** was adopted.

Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastery Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527)

Decision **28 COM 15B.99** was adopted.

L'viv – the ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C865)

Decision **28 COM 15B.100** was adopted.

Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728)

Decision **28 COM 15B.101** was adopted.

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373)

Decision **28 COM 15B.102** was adopted.

Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)

Decision **28 COM 15B.103** was adopted.

Archaeological Site of Chavin (Peru) (C 366)

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed concern as to the kind of damage to the site caused by road construction and requested information from the Secretariat on the irreparable nature of the damage.

The **Secretariat** explained that the site covered a very extensive archeological area and road construction had affected the archeological remains. It did not have sufficient information as to whether the damage affected the core zone or the buffer zone of the area inscribed on the List. All the archeological remains found were being documented.

ICOMOS regretted the fact that, due to the lack of a survey, emergency measures would have to be taken.

The Delegation of **Lithuania**, with reference to the ICOMOS statement, recommended sending a mission to the site.

ICOMOS considered that it would more pertinent to wait until the plans and studies had been completed.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested amending the Draft Decision to include a reference to paragraph 56 of the *Operation Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that the Secretariat should request the State Party to provide information on the state of progress and results of ongoing studies, and on measures taken to avoid similar damage in the future.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.104**

Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747)

ICOMOS introduced additional information on its latest mission. It was satisfied to see that the recommendations and priority actions were being respected, and that there was collaboration between the municipality and the national authorities. The management plan and the impact assessment were being developed. Archeological research was required before any intervention and construction.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.105**.

Coro and its Port (Venezuela) (C 658)

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its concern at the special treatment requested for the site due to political problems, as the Committee had requested urgent measures or urgent actions from countries in equally difficult political situations. The priority for the Committee was the conservation of the site.

The **Secretariat** displayed a picture of La Vela, and stressed the lack of authenticity and fragility of the site, affected by serious degradation. In spite of the lack of relations between the Mayors of La Vela and Coro, some studies had been undertaken, and the UNESCO Office in Montevideo was

willing to set up a group of experts and elaborate a plan for immediate action.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, supported by the delegation of **Chile**, suggested sending a mission to verify whether the site met the criteria for inclusion on the World Heritage List in Danger.

The **Chairperson** concluded that the Committee wished to send a mission to verify the state of progress in formulating the management plan, and whether the site met the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.106**.

The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis: San Ignacio Mini, Santa Ana, Nuestra Senora de Loreto and Santa Maria la Mayor (Argentina), Ruins of Sao Miguel das Missões (Brazil)
(C 275-291)

Decision **28 COM15B.107** was adopted.

Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445)

Decision **28 COM15B.108** was adopted.

Historic Centre of the Town of Goias (Brazil)
(C 993)

Decision **28 COM15B.109** was adopted.

Historic Town of Ouro Preto (Brazil) (C 124)

Decision **28 COM15B.110** was adopted.

Churches of Chiloé (Chile) (C 971)

Decision **28 COM15B.111** was adopted.

Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285)

Decision **28 COM15B.112** was adopted.

Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)

Decision **28 COM15B.113** was adopted.

Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala) (C 65)

Decision **28 COM15B.114** was adopted.

Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129)

Decision **28 COM15B.115** was adopted.

Historic Centre of Puebla (Mexico) (C 416)

Decision **28 COM15B.116** was adopted.

Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)

Decision **28 COM15B.117** was adopted.

Fortifications on the Caribbean side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)

Decision **28 COM15B.118** was adopted.

City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)

Decision **28 COM15B.119** was adopted.

Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500 bis)

Decision **28 COM15B.120** was adopted.

Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru)
(C 1016)

Decision **28 COM15B.121** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** made a general remark concerning the organization of the next session of the Committee. It might be worth first discussing the state of conservation of sites and then proceeding with the inscriptions, so as to

refresh the memory of the members of the Committee, to include conditions in spite of recommendations to the States Parties, and to avoid including new inscriptions without management plans.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Saint Lucia for its statement, which would be most useful for the future work of the Committee.

9. REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

RAPPORT DU CENTRE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL SUR SES ACTIVITES ET SUR LA MISE EN ŒUVRE DES DECISIONS DU COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Documents:

WHC-04/28 COM 9Rev

WHC-04/28 COM/11

WHC-04/28 COM/12

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre recalled that the Committee had agreed to establish an informal consultative group to look at agenda items 9, 11 and 12 and to report back to the full Committee. The three Draft Decisions circulated in the room reflected the group's deliberations.

Referring to the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* (page 2 of the working document for item 9), he said that the World Heritage Committee and Advisory Bodies had completed the work remitted to them by Decisions **6 EXT COM 5.1** and **27 COM 10** but that in so doing, substantive changes in terms of language had been introduced which had led the Chairperson of the 27th Session of the Committee to consider that more time than originally envisaged was necessary to properly consider them with the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies prior to approval. That work would take place over the coming weeks with the firm target of having the revised *Operational Guidelines* ready by the end of October 2004.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** highlighted the need to remove the square brackets around the date in paragraph 8 of the relevant Draft Decision. In

relation to paragraph 6 on staffing, it considered that one of the key posts for the World Heritage Centre, after that of the Director, was that of Deputy Director. The post should in future be firmly based in Paris and devoted to the management of the Centre, thus freeing the Director to fulfill the important diplomatic and site inspection roles required of him or her.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** hoped that the *Operational Guidelines* would be ready in print form before 17 October, so that the meeting to launch the Pacific 2009 programme could work with them.

The Delegation of **China** supported the views of the Netherlands and expressed its appreciation for the work of the Centre. It supported the Draft Decision, noting that, in the context of the Executive Board, China had expressed the vital importance of the Centre as one of the three pillars of the *World Heritage Convention*, together with the Committee and the States Parties, and the consequent need to strengthen its human and financial resources in order to reinforce implementation of the *Convention*.

Referring to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** looked forward to the finalization of the *Operational Guidelines* but considered that transitional arrangements would be necessary with clear indications to all parties as to the dates by which particular paragraphs came into force. That would be particularly important in relation to nominations to be presented in the cycle beginning on 1 February 2005, which would need to be considered under the existing arrangements.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the statements of the Delegations of China and the Netherlands. Speaking in her capacity as Chairperson of the 27th session, Ms Vera Lacoëuilhe said that she wished to fulfill the mandate entrusted to her by the Committee at that session and explained the complexity of the task and the reasons for which it had not been possible to approve the *Operational Guidelines* in advance of the present session. In that context, it would be helpful to know whether the relevant decisions of the 28th session could be taken into account in reviewing the text with the Centre and Advisory Bodies over the coming weeks.

Turning to paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision, there appeared to be a number of interesting initiatives or

programmes being developed by the Centre but she flagged her concern that such initiatives should be presented to the Committee before being fully elaborated. It was important that full attention be paid to the Committee's previous decisions on thematic and regional programmes.

Se référant au paragraphe 5, la délégation du **Bénin** note que si les nouvelles *Orientations* parviennent aux Etats parties le 15 octobre 2004, il n'est pas raisonnable d'envisager qu'elles puissent entrer en vigueur deux semaines plus tard. Une période transitoire lui paraît nécessaire pour ne pas pénaliser les Etats; elle demande l'avis du Centre sur cette question.

The Delegation of **Japan** looked forward to the approval and entering into force of the revised *Operational Guidelines*. While it did not object to the proposal in paragraph 6 to strengthen the human resources of the Centre, it stressed the need to take full account of UNESCO's other activities and programmes. It also wished to express its concern about the severe delays in the distribution of documents for the present session. A more timely distribution of the working documents could have contributed to a more effective meeting, in that delegations would have had sufficient time to consider the documents with their expert advisers.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the remarks made by China and considered that there was a clear need for more permanent staff dedicated to the core tasks of the Committee's work. It agreed with the concerns of Saint Lucia about new initiatives and also supported strengthening collaboration with other UNESCO sectors.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the remarks of the United Kingdom in relation to the need for transitional arrangements covering the coming into force of the revised *Operational Guidelines*. It welcomed the proposals for strengthening human resources, particularly in the Latin America and Caribbean Unit, and also asked for greater emphasis to be placed on staffing to deal with environmental themes and natural heritage in particular in the Latin America and Caribbean Unit.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed support for the transitional arrangements proposed by the United Kingdom in terms of the *Operational Guidelines*, the comments made by Japan in relation to the timely distribution of documents, and those of Portugal on the need to enhance inter-

sectoral collaboration within UNESCO. It also sought the Committee's views on whether the Chairperson of the 27th session would be mandated to give consideration to decisions adopted at the 28th session in finalizing the *Operational Guidelines*.

IUCN, speaking on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies, noted the considerable amount of intellectual energy that had been invested in the review of the *Operational Guidelines* and hoped that they could soon be approved and put into force. Referring to paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision, it noted that the resource constraints applied also to the Advisory Bodies and hoped that the Committee was taking that into consideration.

Responding to issues raised in the discussion, the **Director** of the World Heritage Centre explained that the particularly critical situation faced by the Centre at present, whereby four senior posts were simultaneously vacant, was a result of natural turnover for professional and personal reasons. The post of Deputy Director was currently under recruitment and the process for filling the vacancies in the Latin America and Caribbean, Asia, and Policy and Statutory Implementation Units was in hand, as were plans to equip each regional desk to deal with both natural and cultural heritage. He agreed on the need to put in place transitional arrangements to cover the coming into force of the revised *Operational Guidelines* and was confident that the work would be finished within the revised deadlines.

Turning to the issue of the various initiatives under development, he explained that the term "initiatives" had been quite deliberately chosen to distinguish them from the thematic and regional programmes approved by the Committee, which were central to the work of the World Heritage Centre. The initiatives were experiments arising from opportunities and ideas. Not all of them would develop into programmes approved by the Committee but would be helpful to retain some flexibility to try out new ideas.

Document preparation and distribution was a problem and the Centre would try harder to respect the prescribed six-week deadline. However, for some issues the Centre was merely the last in a chain of players. For example, the production of the State of Conservation (SOC) documents was based on information provided by States Parties, which in many cases was not provided by the 1 February deadline. If the documents were prepared

too far in advance, much would be missing.

World Heritage was perhaps the quintessential inter-sectoral programme. Since arriving at the World Heritage Centre, he had actively promoted cooperation with other sectors, as witnessed by the initiatives underway with the Division of Ecological Science in the Democratic Republic of Congo, with the Sector for Social and Human Sciences on the Vienna conference, and with the Education Sector for the World Heritage in Young Hands Programme. He would be making proposals to increase that further in the preparations for the forthcoming document 33 C/5.

The Observer Delegation of **Greece** informed the Committee that Greece had previously made a no-strings-attached voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Centre and was currently seconding an expert there. It commended that approach to other States Parties.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the Director for his detailed explanation and reiterated its question about taking into account the decisions of the 28th session of the Committee in the process of finalizing the *Operational Guidelines*. On the question of document production, it suggested preparing the SOC document in two phases, so that information received on time could be sent out in a first document with that received later incorporated into a second edition.

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre considered that to be a practical proposal.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that there were two deadlines on 1 February – for nominations and for SOC. With the former, it was vital that the documents were available as early as possible and within the prescribed guidelines.

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre confirmed that 1 February was both the deadline for receipt of nominations for inscription and for SOC reports from States Parties. It was an unfortunate result of the change in the nominations cycle.

The Delegation of **Norway**, supported by the Delegation of **New Zealand**, noted that States Parties tended to adhere to the 1 February deadline for receipt of nominations but not for SOC. It suggested that if reports were not received on time, they should not be discussed.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, considered that it would be counter-productive not to consider late reports on SOC, suggesting that a different date should be set instead.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed, adding that a different mechanism for SOC could be envisaged.

La délégation du **Liban** pense qu'il faudrait maintenir le 1er février comme date limite pour la réception des rapports sur l'état de conservation. Cependant, la sauvegarde des sites demeurant le souci premier du Comité, il convient, comme le suggère Directeur du Centre, d'adopter une approche plus souple. En particulier, l'envoi du rapport sur l'état de conservation des sites aux membres du Comité peut être fait en plusieurs fois.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed, emphasizing that having a single deadline for both nominations and SOC was actually helpful to States Parties in terms of coordinating activities.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested that the Committee should consider moving the deadline for nominations back to 1 December.

The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed that acceptance of nominations should be conditional on States Parties demonstrating proper care for properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List, including through the timely submission of SOC reports.

Responding to those points, the **Director** of the World Heritage Centre said that it would be difficult to amend deadlines at that point, given the introduction the previous year of the 30 September deadline for submitting draft nominations for review, which had proved to be a beneficial measure in preparing nominations.

He emphasized that conservation was at the core of the work of the World Heritage Centre, perhaps its single most important activity. The SOC documents presented at the present session included 157 reports, representing a considerable amount of discussion, review and missions.

The **Committee** adopted Decision **28 COM 9**, subject to the following amendments:

The deadline of 15 October should be removed

from paragraph 5, but that of 1 November retained. The suggested text of the United Kingdom covering the need for transitional arrangements should be added and the paragraph should also include approval for the Chairperson of the 27th session of the Committee to take into consideration the relevant decisions of its 28th session in finalizing the *Operational Guidelines*.

The square brackets around the deadline in paragraph 8 should be removed.

11. PRESENTATION OF ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND IN 2002-2003 AND SITUATION OF THE BUDGET 2004-2005

PRESENTATION DES COMPTES DU FONDS DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL POUR 2002-2003 ET ETAT DU BUDGET 2004 - 2005

Documents: WHC-04/28.COM/11

The revised Draft Decision, which had been distributed in the room to the members of the Committee, included all the new recommendations made by the working group that had been meeting in previous days to discuss the matter.

The **Director of the Centre** introduced the item and said that the accounts of the World Heritage Fund, like all other accounts within the framework of UNESCO, had to be established by the Comptroller of the Organization. They referred to specific information on the arrears of each State Party, the rate of execution of the Programme and Budget, as well as all the extrabudgetary activities pertaining to World Heritage. That information, which had been already provided in the past, although in a combined form, would in the future be more detailed. Concerning the list of all the activities related to World Heritage, whose inclusion the working group had requested in future presentations of the budget, he drew the attention of the Committee to the possible difficulty in collecting information from other Sectors of UNESCO on every activity affecting a World Heritage property, and, especially in determining their relevance to the scope of the *World Heritage Convention*. Efforts would be made, at any rate, to improve the clarity of the presentation concerning those items, so as to enable the Committee to evaluate progress made with respect to the recommendations made by the

External Auditor following the external audit of 1997, the report of which had been distributed in the room.

La délégation du **Bénin** demande que soit clarifié le sens des points (a) et (b) du paragraphe 7 du projet de décision **28 COM 11**. Notant que le rapport d'audit de 1998 (*WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.5*) concernait non seulement les activités financières, mais aussi les activités administratives du Centre, elle propose d'ajouter au point (b) "relatives à la gestion administrative et financière". Elle souhaite en outre que le Centre du patrimoine mondial présente deux rapports distincts, l'un sur l'audit et l'autre sur la totalité du budget du Centre. Elle demande enfin que soit précisée l'expression "toute autre recommandation dont l'application n'aurait pas été finalisée" à laquelle il est fait référence au point (b), de manière à en faciliter la compréhension.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the suggestion made by the previous speaker that two distinct reports should be prepared, rather than one, and that the words "concerning financial and administrative issues" should be added to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision. In response to the request for clarification by the Delegation of Benin, it noted that since the entire system of UNESCO was subject to periodical auditing, it was appropriate to take into account other recommendations made at the general UNESCO level when they had a bearing on World Heritage issues.

The Delegation of **Japan**, agreeing that the capacity of the World Heritage Centre needed to be strengthened, suggested, however, that that should go hand-in-hand with the enhancement of budget transparency, pursuit of cost-efficiency and improvement of overall management, in line with the efforts currently undertaken within UNESCO. It stressed the need for an improved presentation of the budget so as to make it more understandable for States Parties with reference, for example, to the impact of extrabudgetary resources on statutory tasks and other activities. An order of priority should be given to individual programmes, with clear goals set. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision, particularly on the need for a list of all projects financed through sources other than the World Heritage Fund, and asked the Secretariat to integrate in its future budget presentations the income received in accounts certified by the Comptroller. It further supported the request made in the Draft Decision for a report on the entire

budget as well as on the following-up of the recommendations made by the External Auditor. The Centre should identify the elements of the Programme and Budget yet to be implemented, and the Committee's decisions on the strengthening of the Centre's capacity should be based on careful analysis of that data.

The **Director of the Centre** thanked the members of the Committee for their support regarding the reinforcement of the staff and budget of the Centre. With respect to the points raised by the Delegations of the Netherlands, Benin and Japan, there were two main issues to be addressed: accountability and effectiveness. Concerning accountability, the Centre had completely revised the presentation of the budget in past years. An improved presentation would be prepared for the next year, including the list of all projects funded through resources other than the World Heritage Fund. That would also be beneficial to the image of the *Convention* as it would demonstrate its capacity to attract funding and promote its ideals.

On the subject of effectiveness, he assured the Committee of his personal commitment to identifying additional human and financial resources, as was also shown by the increase in the staff in the preceding years. He also informed the Committee that, thanks to an agreement reached between the Centre and the United Nations Foundation, the staff of the Centre would undergo a capacity-building programme based on the results-based management approach. It would imply more work at the initial stage, but it was hoped that in the future it might improve the performance of the Secretariat in better serving the Committee, taking into account, however, the fact that the Centre, as part of UNESCO, would nevertheless be subject to overall administrative constraints.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, recalling that the introduction of the results-based management approach had been already agreed by the Executive Board of UNESCO, acknowledged that the Centre had made great progress in the presentation of the budget, and looked forward to examining a new and further improved budget the following year (2005) at the 29th session of the Committee in South Africa.

The Chairperson declared Decision **28 COM 11** adopted with the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Benin.

12. PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET 2006-2007 (DRAFT 33C/5)

PROPOSITIONS CONCERNANT LA PRÉPARATION DU PROJET DE PROGRAMME ET BUDGET 2006-2007 (PROJET 33C/5)

Document: WHC-24/28.COM/12

The revised Draft Decision, which had been distributed in the room to the members of the Committee, included all the new recommendations made by the working group that had been meeting in previous days to discuss the matter.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that document *WHC-04.28 COM/12: Proposals concerning the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget 2006-2007 (Draft 33C/5)* and Draft Decision **28 COM 12** had been drafted in response to previous requests by the Committee to be involved in the preparation of the World Heritage content of future Programme and Budget (C/5) and Medium-Term Strategy (C/4) documents. It presented the existing situation in terms of programme priorities and finance and staffing, including the dual role of the World Heritage Centre as both Secretariat to the Committee and part of UNESCO, in order that the Committee might develop proposals on the future orientation of the work.

La délégation du **Liban** propose un amendement au paragraphe 6 du projet de décision.

La délégation de **Sainte-Lucie** remarque que le paragraphe 9 du projet de décision n'est pas vraiment "représentatif" des opinions du groupe de travail.

The Delegation of **Argentina** agreed with the structure of the Draft Decision, and supported the comments of Lebanon and Saint Lucia. Paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision highlighted a pressing problem on which the Committee must intervene: that of co-ordination between the *World Heritage Convention* and other UNESCO Conventions and Recommendations, in particular the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. It needed to be discussed in detail and could be an item for the extraordinary session of the Committee proposed for later in

2004 or for its 29th session in South Africa in 2005. Paragraph 10 of the Draft Decision also required urgent consideration in relation to the objectives for the Centre and should also be discussed either at an extraordinary session of the Committee or at its 29th session.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the previous speakers. The working document was very helpful, in particular the emphasis in paragraph 12 on the functions of the World Heritage Centre in relation to Article 14 of the *Convention*. It was important that more resources from the regular budget be allocated to those functions, so that in future there could be a clearly-defined group of people working exclusively on them and funded through the regular programme. Referring to paragraph 16 of the document, there was a compelling need to take a long-term view of the issues to be addressed. Paragraph 22 included the following important statement on which the Committee might wish to reflect: “Members of the Committee may wish to note that in addition to the human resources allocated to the World Heritage Centre by the Director-General, other parts of UNESCO, including the Division of Cultural Heritage, Science and Education Sectors and the UNESCO Field Offices carry out activities in relation to World Heritage properties.”

Paragraph 23 referred to decision **27 COM 11.3** which called, *inter alia*, for the “reinforcement of the staff of the World Heritage Centre”. That much was clear, but the time had come to be more specific in terms of what it meant in terms of numbers. On the basis of informal talks with some staff from the Centre, it seemed that one member of staff could reasonably be expected to cope with 40 sites. Given the fact that approximately that number of sites were added to the List each year, it suggested the need for one additional member of staff funded on the regular budget each year in order to avoid any negative impact on the *Convention*. That was an important message to convey to the Director-General. Continuing with the theme of staffing, it considered that there was a need for a clearly-defined organizational structure, which might require some re-shuffling of the existing arrangements.

Referring to paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision, it commented that Committee members should be aware that the current financial situation had in part arisen because the reserves of the Fund had been depleted. There would be no reserve after the present biennium.

It wished to see an explicit reference in paragraph 8(a) of the Draft Decision to the need to strengthen the human resources allocated to the Centre, while paragraph 9 should emphasize the need for collaboration as well as cooperation.

The Delegation of **Japan** recalled that World Heritage had to be considered in the context of UNESCO as a whole and that the special situations that had arisen around the world since the present Medium-Term Strategy had been set in train must be borne in mind, together with their impact on the Programme as a whole. It would be important to consider how the Committee’s strategy could be implemented through the forthcoming Medium-Term Strategy.

Referring to paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision, it agreed, supported by the Delegations of the **United Kingdom** and **Oman**, that there was a need for close coordination between the 1972 and 2003 Conventions, but reminded the Committee that the two instruments were based on different notions.

La délégation du **Bénin** souscrit aux observations des délégations des Pays-Bas, du Japon et du Royaume-Uni. Elle propose que le paragraphe 9 de la décision 28 COM 12, à son avis trop général et peut-être insuffisant, inclue une recommandation qui porte expressément sur le Comité. Rappelant que la *Convention* de 1972 est beaucoup plus ancienne que celle de 2003, elle pense que cette recommandation spécifique permettrait d’éviter d’éventuels conflits entre les deux conventions.

La délégation de la **Belgique** (Observateur) se dit préoccupée par les questions relatives au personnel du Centre. Elle propose des amendements au paragraphe 5, concernant la dotation en personnel, et au paragraphe 8 (b), concernant le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Elle propose en outre de supprimer les alinéas (iii) et (v) du paragraphe 8(c), et de les remplacer par des propositions qui seront soumises par le groupe de travail sur la Décision de Cairns, afin d’éviter des conflits entre les domaines prioritaires.

Responding, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** asked for clarification in the form of a written amendment. He noted that, with the exception of the proposal for a risk preparedness strategy, the priorities set out in the Draft Decision were long-standing priorities of the Committee. The recruitment exercise currently underway for the post of Deputy Director included a requirement

that applicants should be natural heritage experts. He asked the Committee to permit some management flexibility in terms of the background of staff.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the proposal by the Observer Delegation of Belgium on paragraph 8(c). The requirement for an expert in natural heritage was relevant, particularly in light of the earlier discussion about the need for the new Deputy Director to have an essentially managerial function. It therefore supported the proposed amendment to paragraph 5.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 12** as amended after consultation.

16. PRESENTATION OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN AND FOLLOW-UP REGIONAL PROGRAMME

PRESENTATION DU RAPPORT PERIODIQUE POUR L'AMERIQUE LATINE ET LES CARAIBES ET SUIVIDU PROGRAMME REGIONAL

Document: WHC-04/28.COM/16

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat to introduce the results of the fourth periodical reporting exercise for examination and decision by the Committee. The report had already been presented in detail a few days previously to facilitate the discussion and decision-taking process. He also introduced Mr Elias Mujica and Ms Alissandra Cummins, well-known experts in the region.

The **Secretariat** thanked the Chairperson and the Committee for allocating sufficient time for the presentation of the Latin America and the Caribbean Periodic Report, in a shorter version. The presentation would focus on the main characteristics of the preparation of the report, on key results of the analysis of the periodic reports and, finally, on the proposed action plan for the region. The periodic reporting process had been organized according to three subregions: South America, Central America and Mexico, and the Caribbean. States Parties and the Advisory Bodies had participated through specifically designated focal points for periodic reporting (one for the natural and one for the cultural heritage). Reports

were due on the overall application of the *World Heritage Convention* from 31 States Parties as were reports on the state of conservation of 62 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

As at July 2003, there were 107 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List (out of the 754 worldwide) from Latin American and Caribbean States Parties. The region continued to preserve a high level of biological and cultural diversity. As a general framework, the World Heritage sites showed a very high proportion of archaeological sites and colonial historic towns/urban ensembles. The results also illustrated the near absence of heritage from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as well as cultural landscapes.

Mr Mujica was given the floor and said that he would concentrate on selected key issues based upon a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the Periodic Reports submitted by the States Parties, and on a critical analysis of the reports by the Regional Group of Experts.

He stressed the evidence of lack of institutional memory and lack of adequate World Heritage documentation within national institutions. A lack of integration among different institutional levels, as well as between thematic and chronological inventories was also noted.

He said that around 70% of the States Parties reported that they had valid Tentative Lists. In general, Tentative Lists were mostly cumulative and not the outcome of in-depth and systematic reflection on the diversity of the heritage, and the way the State Party could contribute to the representativity of the World Heritage List. Furthermore, there was a lack of coordination and harmonization of Tentative Lists on the subregional level.

The set of questions related to the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage, and the integration of heritage issues into broader planning and development schemes appeared very limited. In general, there was very limited coordination and integration of natural and cultural heritage preservation.

Concerning identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation, nearly three-quarters of the reports suggested a need for the reform of policy and/or legal frameworks, which might suggest that legislation did not correspond to

present-day concepts and requirements and/or that national policies for the heritage needed to be reviewed. In relation to training, the great majority of respondents identified training needs and opportunities, although only 29.8% of the States Parties had developed their own training modules or programmes for World Heritage.

The challenge was to strengthen training facilities and ensure that the technical and managerial capacities of the human resources of the institutions responsible for the cultural and natural heritage, particularly in the management of heritage and cultural projects, were linked with job opportunities.

The potential for international cooperation and fund-raising was not fully utilized in the region - the fact that there were only very few twinned World Heritage Sites suggested missed opportunities to share experiences and lessons learned.

As for education, information and awareness-raising, particular attention should be called to the 57% participation in the World Heritage in Young Hands project.

Concerning the statement of authenticity/integrity, the reports demonstrated a limited understanding of those concepts and a remarkable lack of knowledge of the evaluation reports of the Advisory Bodies, and, more specifically, of their assessment of authenticity and integrity at the time of the inscription of the property.

In relation to the management of World Heritage properties, only 52.6% of the sites had a "public use" plan, indicating that the notion of a management plan was at times confused and, in most cases, did not involve an integrated approach to management. Only 41% of the properties had formal monitoring systems in place and there was also clearly a very limited understanding of the importance and relevance of monitoring the state of conservation and the effectiveness of management. Such issues should receive the highest attention of the Committee.

In short, the main gaps were to be found: between the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies on the one hand, and those responsible for the management of cultural and natural heritage properties on the other; within the States Parties, between the national institutions in charge of heritage and managers of World Heritage

sites, and, finally, between culture and nature. The linking of nature and culture needed to be fully developed, as did the reevaluation of concepts such as universal value vis-à-vis regional value, authenticity and integrity.

It was equally necessary to strengthen the harmonization of legal instruments of different sectors and to establish a framework for the full participation of and cooperation among national governments, decision-makers, site managers, experts, interest groups and the public at large. The establishment of National World Heritage Committees might be an appropriate response at the national level, whereas at the level of the properties, the establishment of site commissions should be promoted. Participatory processes in the preparation and implementation of management plans would have to ensure broad support and participation.

Ms Cummins then took the floor and introduced the action plan for the Caribbean. The Caribbean was defined as the Insular Caribbean and Belize, Guyana and Suriname: 14 of the 31 States Parties of the region were located in the Caribbean. Between them, the Caribbean States Parties had 14 World Heritage sites. Previous meetings had been important in generating critical technical, institutional and political support for World Heritage. One of the most critical issues to emerge from those fora had been on the issue of identity and the definition of authenticity within the Caribbean context.

Activities designed to promote the development of effective capacity-building within the Caribbean complemented the actions proposed for the conservation of heritage sites. It must be stressed that while training was an important component of the programme which had been elaborated, effective capacity-building must take cognizance of the needs and aspirations of all sectors, including communities and civil society as a whole and technicians. At the same time, an efficient coordinating mechanism was critical to achieving success. Priority would be given particularly to ensuring continual communication amongst all stakeholders, and the adaptation and dissemination of the World Heritage in Young Hands kit and associated resources.

The **Chairperson** thanked the presenters and opened the floor for discussion by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Argentina** thanked the Secretariat and the experts for the preparation of the excellent report for Latin America and the Caribbean. It was clear, complete and well-structured. The action plan was a useful initiative, taking into account the four objectives of the Global Strategy: credibility, conservation, capacity-building and communication.

It further thanked the UNESCO staff, Mr Mujica and Ms Cummins for the side event and informal discussion held on previous days. Obviously it would be crucial to distribute the report in a friendly version, both in English and in Spanish, throughout the region. Further actions, namely a subregional meeting, should be organized in order to address an action plan as was indicated for the Caribbean region.

The Delegation of Argentina further considered it pertinent to remind the meeting of some other regional and subregional meetings - besides the specific meetings mentioned in the introduction - closely related to issues that could be considered for the action plan: first of all, the meeting of Querétaro, on the representativity of the World Heritage List in America, held in Mexico in December 2003. The Observer Delegation of Mexico had kindly distributed the conclusions and papers compiled in an excellent publication. Additional subregional meetings included Estancias Jesuíticas (Córdoba, 2002), and the workshop organized by UNESCO/IUCN in Iguazú (September 2002), on capacity-building for World Heritage. The site managers' regional seminar on remote sensing applied to the conservation of national and cultural heritage held in Córdoba had been a result of the partnership between the Argentinian Space Agency, UNESCO and the European Space Agency.

Considering further developments for the region, the Qhapaq Ñan (Main Andean Road) project should be considered as a flagship project for the subregion due to its close relation with the Global Strategy exercise.

The Delegation had seen at first-hand that there was some difficulty in understanding certain questions, since Argentina had participated in the first part of the elaboration of the report with different sectors in its country. Nevertheless, the level of participation had been most satisfactory for the whole region. Argentina had held a national seminar devoted to its eight sites and the results reflected the difficulties and trends in the region:

lack of consistency of concepts of the *Convention* - for instance, outstanding universal value; lack of human and financial resources; different jurisdictions acting in a conflicting manner on the same site; lack of institutional memory; lack of continuity, clear imbalance in matters of management areas and risk preparedness for natural sites; insufficient participation of local communities in the overall process of nominations, and disproportionate expectations derived from inscription in the World Heritage List. Not enough serious consideration had been devoted politically to the way in which heritage conservation could contribute to the quality of life of people. There was much to be done in the field of awareness and of communications not only amongst young people, but also in the media.

Concerning Chapter 5 of the Report, and after more than 30 years of World Heritage in Latin America, some points should be stressed:

- for the credibility of the List, an in-depth analysis of under-represented categories was needed in order to identify World Heritage Sites by potential categories such as cultural landscapes, industrial heritage and modern urban heritage of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries;

- better understanding of the *Convention* and the obligations deriving from its ratification was needed. That would be in order not to wait for UNESCO actions and initiatives that should be undertaken by the State Party itself.

- UNESCO should improve coordination between its different sectors and field offices to avoid overlapping and, of course, increase human and financial resources, taking into account the real needs of the region. It should organize the translation into Spanish of the Report.

- as experts had pointed out in the Report, further resources should be allocated to UNESCO National Commissions. There was also a need, however, to strengthen the international approach in order to deal in a specific way with World Heritage issues even if that would not be an easy task: more participation meant more transparency from the point of view of the Advisory Bodies; in-depth analysis in a regional perspective of under-represented categories, but also a self-assessment of what had been done or not done in the previous 30 years in the region.

For the future, the Delegation of Argentina felt that further efforts were required to overcome the fragmentary vision of natural and cultural that reflected a similar attitude from public bodies.

With reference to ICCROM, its presence in the region was not as strong as it could be. It would like to encourage reflection on how that situation could be changed considering the urgent needs. In that connection, the Delegation considered it pertinent to refer to concerns expressed by ICOMOS on the need to establish a "Lista del Patrimonio de las Américas", to be managed by ICOMOS, in connection with Tentative Lists and the representativity of the Americas, as reflected in the conclusions of the Querétaro meeting. Those concerns should be shared with the Committee because they were closely related to the Global Strategy.

It stressed the importance of working on the concept of "interpretation", which had a crucial role in education and the conservation of natural and cultural resources and was not sufficiently developed in Latin America.

It was necessary to work in qualitative programmes because the underlying values of exceptional natural and cultural resources went beyond aesthetics and could not be properly understood without adequate information.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments on Draft Decision **28 COM 16**.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** commended those responsible for the Periodic Report on the high quality of the result, it being the first time that the "four-C" scenario had been achieved. In that regard, immediate concrete action should be taken. The Delegation shared all the concerns raised by the Report, and took particular notice of its findings since it had territories in the Caribbean.

The Delegation of **Colombia** fully agreed with the Delegation of Argentina and underlined some key needs: the translation of the periodic report into the Spanish language, an action plan for Latin America, not only for the Caribbean, and a meeting to define guidelines for it. It stressed its support for the Main Andean Road Project, a very important technical and financial initiative involving six of the region's countries in the nomination process.

The Delegation of **Portugal** confirmed the importance of the periodic reporting exercise as a crucial instrument for guiding the establishment of priorities. The Report under discussion should provide inspiration for the elaboration of the corresponding Europe and North America Periodic Report, and, in that respect, the Delegation recalled the interesting conclusions of the Spain and Portugal meeting held in Lisbon two months previously as part of the periodic reporting exercise. It would be useful to translate the Report into the Portuguese language, as it could be of interest not only to Brazilian professionals but also to a wider forum. It expressed interest in the idea of the List of World Heritage in the Americas and asked for more information about the role of universities in the elaboration of the Periodic Report.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** congratulated the Latin America and the Caribbean team on its effort and underscored the importance of the exercise for the Europe periodic report. It expressed concern as to the difficulty of selecting priorities based on the findings of the periodic reports.

The Delegation of **Oman** congratulated the Secretariat team on the work done, which showed that a more comprehensive exercise had taken place than for previous reports. It asked for clarification concerning paragraphs 3 and 11 of the Draft Decision concerning the actions plans, notably the number of those planned.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that any initiative to develop an action plan for Latin America would have to be provided for in the next budget, and said that paragraph 11 of the Draft Decision should be amended.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** complimented colleagues on a very lucid and concise exercise. It stressed the lack of awareness of the *Convention* at regional and national levels in the Caribbean and stated that the periodic reporting exercise had great potential to enable the sharing of experiences between Latin America and the Caribbean. It drew the attention of the Secretariat to the implementation of the action plan and suggested that support from UNESCO field offices should be envisaged, as should support for building up a solid partnership mechanism in the Caribbean, and developing one in other geographical regions (Belize, Mexico).

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the States Parties and, concerning paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision on the decentralization of funds, requested clarification on the proper measures to be taken to ensure coordination with the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **China** commended the States Parties on producing the report in cooperation with experts and the Advisory Bodies, and agreed with the Delegation of Portugal as to the interest of the exercise for comparative analysis and exchanges of best practice, which should be encouraged.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the States Parties and the Secretariat on its effort and reminded the Committee of similarities with the conclusions of previous periodic reports. It would be interesting to summarize the results of the present exercise and previous exercises and for those results to be published as a global view which would enhance cooperation.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** congratulated the States Parties and the Secretariat on its effort and underlined the importance of the exercise for the Europe and North America Periodic Report. The Delegation considered it important that that point should be taken into consideration at the next extraordinary session of the Committee, which would have to approve the follow-up to the conclusions of the Report. It suggested publishing a synthesis of the six periodic reports when the cycle was completed, as a very valuable initiative that was also in line with the Global Strategy policy.

The Delegation of **Chile** commended those who had participated in the exercise and emphasized that the region should be concerned as to the state of conservation of World Heritage sites. It thanked the Netherlands, Spain and Japan for extrabudgetary funds for the region and agreed with Lithuania regarding the interest of selecting actions for the future as well as of improving relations with the Advisory Bodies.

ICCROM joined the congratulations voiced by the State Parties and underlined three points concerning the report: the role of the Advisory Bodies as a very positive element to take into account in the future; the action plan, developed in parallel to the elaboration of the report, and the usefulness of compiling a synthesis of all the periodical reports finalized during the first cycle.

The **Secretariat** thanked the Committee for the positive feedback. The ambitious action plan responded to the Committee's ambition. It agreed that there was a need to establish clear priorities for future work. Concerning the question posed by Portugal on the role of universities, it said that those very promising partners had yet to be fully involved. In conclusion, States Parties must bear in mind that the future depended on the interest and spirit of cooperation they themselves could provide.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that after intense negotiation amongst the States Parties of the region, they were ready to approve Draft Decision **28 COM 16**.

The **Chairperson** declared Draft Decision **28 COM 16** adopted.

The Delegation of **Argentina** reminded the Committee about the remaining issue concerning Draft Decision **28 COM 15.13** on the Main Andean Road project. It thanked the Government of Peru for its interest in the initiative, and proposed minor changes, in writing, to paragraph 6, agreed on following discussion among the Committee Members. The paragraph should be divided into two different paragraphs. It should include after *nomination* "taking into account the Regional Action Plan which is being prepared by the six State Parties with the financial support of the Inter-American Development Bank" and paragraph 7 should begin " Congratulates the World Heritage Centre.....". The Delegation of Argentina proposed including *to develop* instead of *to elaborate*.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, while recognizing the interest of the promising initiative, remarked that the project received support from extrabudgetary funds. It proposed deleting paragraph 8 of the Draft Decision.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the project was a flagship project for the Secretariat. Should it receive unexpected extrabudgetary funds in the following year, the Centre would not mobilize financial resources for it.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** reiterated concern about approving a budgetary item in a draft decision.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the written proposal and hoped that paragraph 8 of the Draft Decision would be maintained. It expressed its gratitude for the indispensable help and support received by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Norway** agreed with the concern expressed by the Delegation of the Netherlands and requested clarification as to the singularity of the project.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the project had been discussed during the 27th session of the Committee and that it was indeed a flagship project for all units at the Centre.

The Delegation of **Argentina** thanked the Delegation of Colombia for its statement and agreed on the need to provide a seed budget to increase international cooperation. It drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 10 of the Draft Decision concerning the need to keep the Committee informed at its 29th session in 2005.

The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15.13** adopted, as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Peru** thanked the Committee and the Secretariat for its interest and help in the implementation of the project.

13. GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

STRATEGIE GLOBALE POUR UNE LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL REPRESENTATIVE, EQUILIBREE ET CREDIBLE (suite)

Report of the Working Group on the Cairns Decision

Rapport du Groupe de travail sur la décision de Cairns

Document: Draft Decision 28 COM 13.1

The **Chairperson** invited Mr Jade Tabet (Lebanon), in his capacity as Chairperson of the Cairns Decision working group, to report on the group's results and conclusion.

Le **Président du groupe de travail** sur la Décision de Cairns rappelle au Comité le mandat que celui-ci avait confié au groupe. Il indique que le groupe était composé des Délégations du Liban et de l'Égypte pour le groupe Arabe, de Sainte Lucie et de l'Argentine pour le groupe Amérique latine et Caraïbes, du Bénin et de l'Afrique du Sud pour le groupe Africain, des Pays Bas et de la Norvège pour le groupe Europe, de l'Inde et la Nouvelle Zélande pour le groupe Asie et Pacifique, par la Lituanie et la Fédération de Russie pour le groupe Europe de l'est, des organisations consultatives et de nombreux observateurs.

Il présente au Comité les résultats du groupe de travail et le projet de décision qui les reflètent.

Il rappelle en outre que ce projet est le fruit d'un accord entre tous les membres du groupe de travail.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Cairns Decision working group for their hard work.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** congratulated the working group. It proposed the following amendments to the Draft Decision: to insert "primarily" in the second line of paragraph 5; to include a reference to the State Party in paragraph 12; paragraph 13, item (ii) was rather prescriptive in assigning work for the Committee which was really the concern of the State Party and should be amended accordingly, and to include the words "order of priorities" in paragraph 16, subparagraph (c).

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed its gratitude to the working group and said, with reference to paragraph 13, that its Government would like to contribute by hosting the expert meeting, the dates of which were to be considered in consultation with the World Heritage Centre, and covering all costs for around 30 international experts.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the working group and welcomed the Draft Decision. It requested clarification as to the significance of "natural property" in paragraph 16 (a).

Le **Président du groupe de travail** précise que le groupe a considéré comme prioritaire la réduction du déséquilibre entre les différentes catégories de biens inscrits dans la Liste et a décidé, à ce fin, d'établir une limitation à la proposition d'inscription de bien culturels.

The Delegation of **Oman** thanked the Chairperson of the working group and asked whether the 30% mentioned in paragraph 13 (ii) was a goal, or just a figure for encouragement, an incentive, and whether the assessment of the mechanism in 2007, referred to in paragraph 17, was correct.

The Delegation of **Colombia** extended her congratulations to the working group. With reference to paragraph 13 (ii), it asked about the criterion for determining what constituted under-represented regions and, with regard to paragraph 16 (a), whether it also concerned mixed properties.

The Delegation of **China** thanked the Chairperson of the working group and its members, in particular Argentina, which had helped build the consensus after many consultations, both during meetings and outside them.

La Délégation du **Bénin** rappelle sa participation au groupe de travail et, tout en exprimant sa satisfaction pour le compromis trouvé, souligne l'importance de la formation de personnel qui puisse travailler sur l'identification des biens de valeur universelle potentielle. Elle suggère, à ce fin, de rajouter le terme « plus » devant les termes « conformes à l'article 11 de la Convention » dans l'avant dernière ligne du paragraphe i de l'article 13 du projet de décision.

Elle rappelle en outre que l'activité d'homogénéisation des listes indicatives est un procès en cours et que certains Etats parties ont besoin d'une certaine gradualité pour améliorer leurs listes.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that its country had lost the European soccer championship, but that the Draft Decision before the Committee saved the day. It was delighted to note that all the issues put forward in the statement made by Portugal before the working group started work had been addressed. It requested clarification as to the issue of identification raised by Benin, and asked whether Colombia's question as to what constituted an under-represented country would be addressed at the special meeting in Russia.

Furthermore, it proposed adding a subparagraph (c) to paragraph 16, and said that paragraph 12 should include "States Parties". Clear goals had to be achieved in 2007, but perhaps insertion of "at least" before 30% was needed. It was a huge goal and great ambition, which warranted support, but something less categorical might be better.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the suggestion made by Portugal and proposed inserting "strategic" before "comprehensive" in paragraph 10 related to capacity-building, and inserting "further decides to examine the mechanism" in paragraph 16.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated the working group on a job well done and seconded Benin, while for paragraph 16 (a) it proposed changing "concerns" into "includes".

The Delegation of **Chile** thanked the group for its excellent and comprehensive work, and remarked that, with regard to the imbalance between Nature and Culture, nature would always be under-represented as there were many countries with no or few natural properties, for which extra assistance should be considered.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the timetable in paragraph 17 was unrealistic, as nominations for that year were already, or at least should already be, in preparation, which would be unfair to the countries concerned. On the issue of the Nature-Culture imbalance, it concerned workload as well, in particular for ICOMOS. There had been some discussion about the need for an expert group on the issue of Outstanding Universal Value in plenary, an expert group on the Cairns Decision, but no decision had been taken on an extraordinary Committee session in Paris.

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre said he could not propose such a session, but that if the Committee decided to convene one, he could find a date for it.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed convening an extraordinary session.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that there was a consensus on the idea contained in the Draft Decision and that there was a need to distinguish between editorial and substantive proposals.

The Delegation of **Argentina** thanked the Delegation of Russia for the generous offer to host the expert meeting. As to paragraph 13 of the draft decision point (i), it proposed that the last sentence should read: '... substantially consistent with Article 11 of the *Convention* and its *Operational Guidelines*'. It proposed changing the word 'could' to 'should' in paragraph 13 (ii). For paragraph 16, it emphasized that it clearly stated that the proposal

was on a transitory basis. Furthermore, it proposed maintaining subparagraph (a) as drafted by consensus and splitting subparagraph (b) in two after '... emergency basis'.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** expressed its gratitude to the Chairperson of the working group for its constructive proposals. It had had two concerns. First, sufficient assistance had to be provided to States Parties for the preparation of nominations, and second, the Cairns Decision was too rigid. Those concerns were almost entirely met by the Draft Decision. However, reference should be made in paragraph 16 (a) to mixed properties instead of to natural properties alone, as for a number of States Parties the interaction between cultural and natural values was extremely important.

En remerciant les participants du groupe de travail et son Président pour lui avoir donné la parole pendant les travaux du groupe, elle exprime sa perplexité à propos de la formulation de l'article 16 du projet de décision.

Elle suggère de rajouter les termes « ou mixte » après les termes « un site nature » au paragraphe a) et, en rappelant à cet égard que nombreux Etats parties possèdent plus de sites culturels que naturels, précise que cette formulation ne constitue un obstacle à l'augmentation des sites naturels.

Le **Président du groupe de travail** clarifie que la formulation proposée au Comité dans le projet de décision a été longuement débattue et que, à cause du profond déséquilibre entre biens naturels et culturels en faveur de ces derniers, il a été décidé d'établir une limitation aux propositions d'inscription des biens culturels.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that there were 23 mixed (cultural-natural) properties.

The Delegation of **Colombia** thanked Argentina for its involvement and asked for clarification of the meaning of 'less represented' in paragraph 16 concerning the prioritization of nominations to be examined. In its opinion, it was a subjective notion.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that 'less represented' was a relative expression and that it provided some flexibility that should be examined at the expert meeting in Russia.

The Delegation of **Chile** disagreed with the proposal of the Observer Delegation of Italy, as it called into question the validity of the Cairns Decision. It would prefer to maintain the text as proposed.

La Délégation du **Bénin** exprime des doutes sur la définition de Etats parties « peu représentés ».

The Delegation of **Oman** said that the definition of "less represented" was clear.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) rappelle les inquiétudes qu'elle avait exprimé quelques jours auparavant lors du débat sur la décision de Cairns, quand elle avait soutenu que une révision de celle-ci était prématurée. Elle estime toutefois que le compromis trouvé par le groupe de travail est satisfaisant et qu'il ne faudrait pas le remettre en cause.

Elle décide donc d'appuyer la solution transitoire envisagée par le projet de décision.

The Observer Delegation of **Greece** congratulated the working group and agreed that there was consensus on the definition of 'less represented'. It was of the opinion that paragraph 16 (a) could be more open to States Parties which wished to nominate mixed properties. It also stated that an international funding campaign for World Heritage was needed.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed concern about the discussion that was taking place. It agreed that in principle all States Parties should be represented on the List but that the List should be representative and credible. It also expressed concern about the eventual additional workload for the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat.

The **Director of the Centre**, commenting on paragraph 13, said that the 30% in item (ii) seemed to be a very high target. As to item (iii) of the same paragraph, he recommended that the reference to 20% should be rephrased, as the World Heritage Committee both inscribed and deleted properties from the List of World of Heritage in Danger. Furthermore, on paragraph 16 (b), he asked who would set the priorities.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that the 30% in paragraph 13 (ii) was set deliberately high and that the thinking of paragraph 13 (iii) was to remove 20% of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger. As to the priorities, it referred to the

Cairns Decision, which clearly defined how that should be dealt with.

The **Director of the Centre** again asked who would assess the priorities.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether the Committee could be informed at its 29th session of the numbers of nominations received and the primary assessment by the Centre.

The Delegation of **Oman** recommended that existing procedures should be maintained for a certain period of time.

La Délégation du **Bénin** rappelle que les critères pour établir de telles priorités sont clairement définies dans la décision de Cairns, qui confie au Centre le mandat d'utiliser « la date de réception des propositions d'inscription dûment complétées » comme système de priorité.

The **Director of the Centre** suggested that a practical solution would be to ask the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to submit the assessment of the nominations received to the following Committee session.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 13.1** adopted, as amended.

10A EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

EXAMEN DES DEMANDES D'ASSISTANCE INTERNATIONALE

*Documents: WHC-04/28.COM/10ARev2
WHC-04/28.COM/10B*

The **Chairperson** noted that all the recommendations of the Bureau had been reflected in the revised Draft Decision presented to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the Bureau had met four times to examine the requests and suggested that, if there were no objections, the Committee adopt the Draft Decision.

Decision **28.COM/10A rev2** was adopted.

23. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR

ELECTION DU PRÉSIDENT, DES VICE-PRÉSIDENTS ET DU RAPPORTEUR

Documents: WHC-04/28.COM/23

The **Chairperson** recalled that Rule 13.1 of the *Rules of Procedure* stipulated that the Committee, at the end of each ordinary session, should elect its Bureau.

La délégation du **Bénin** propose M. Themba Wakashe (Afrique du Sud) comme Président de la 29e session.

The **Committee** expressed its unanimous support by acclamation.

The **Chairperson** declared Mr Themba Wakashe (South Africa) elected as Chairperson of the 29th session of the Committee. He expressed his wholehearted congratulations on behalf of the Committee.

He asked for nominations for the post of Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** nominated Mr Ariel Gonzales (Argentina) as Rapporteur.

The **Committee** expressed its unanimous support by acclamation.

The **Chairperson** announced the election of Mr Ariel Gonzales (Argentina) as Rapporteur.

La délégation du **Bénin**, au nom du groupe Afrique, propose que le Nigéria continue d'assurer la vice-présidence, en rappelant que ce groupe élit traditionnellement son représentant pour deux ans.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed Portugal as Vice-Chairperson.

The delegation of **Chile** proposed Colombia as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Oman** proposed Lebanon as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Japan** proposed New Zealand as Vice-Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** declared Colombia, Lebanon, New Zealand, Nigeria, and Portugal elected as Vice-Chairpersons.

The newly-elected **Chairperson** of the 29th session thanked the People's Republic of China for hosting such a successful and hospitable session. The earlier presence of the Director-General had indicated the importance of the forum in international efforts to preserve the World Heritage. The work of the Centre seemed at times undervalued, yet brought the nations of the world together to preserve and ensure a future legacy for humanity. He thanked the Committee and the State Parties for adhering to the values of protecting human history and biological diversity for future generations. He paid tribute to the world's decision to hold for the first time a World Heritage Committee session in sub-saharan Africa in July 2005. He highlighted the spiritual, social and material dimensions of heritage contributing to the wellbeing of people and the alleviation of poverty.

He hoped that the Committee would address some important issues in July, including the implementation of the Global Strategy and its impact on developing countries; the restoration, protection and conservation of cultural and natural heritage in post-conflict situations; peace and security as they impacted on heritage; the value of heritage in complementing regional integration through transboundary protection and joint presentations of nomination dossiers; and, heritage education in promoting national identities, peace and prosperity.

He thanked the Committee for its confidence and the Chinese hosts for their hospitality.

The **Chairperson** thanked the incoming Chairperson for his kind words and agreed to the proposal to show an introductory film about South Africa.

The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 23**.

14B. Nominations of properties to the World Heritage List (continued)

Inscriptions de biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial (suite)

The **Chairperson** opened the floor to discuss a Draft Decision submitted by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and revised by the drafting group established by the Committee concerning the methods of work of the States Parties, Centre and Advisory Bodies in the process of the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegations of the **Netherlands** and **Argentina** recommended postponing discussion of the Draft Decision until the following day in view of the lack of time.

The Delegation of **Japan**, supported by the Delegation of **Oman**, said that even the following day would not provide enough time to discuss all the issues involved, and suggested postponing the discussion until the 7th extraordinary session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Lebanon**, supported by the Delegation of **Colombia**, said that the subject was too important to postpone to a future date and should be discussed at the present session, on the following day.

The **Rapporteur** said that if the item was to be discussed in the morning, certain time constraints must be borne in mind. A lengthy debate might mean that the record of the Decisions of the Committee, in the process of finalization, would not be available for the Committee's approval in the afternoon.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** reminded the Committee that a Draft Decision was already before the Committee. A drafting group had worked hard on it, and at least part of it should be discussed at the current session. Elements on which there was disagreement could be postponed until a future session. If there were technical reasons preventing the discussion from taking place in the morning, it should take place immediately.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it had no problem with the text as it stood. If there were disagreements about certain points, their consideration could be postponed.

La délégation du **Liban** souligne l'importance de ce point dans la mesure où il est lié à la discussion du Groupe de travail sur la décision de Cairns.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon, and proposed replacing the

existing bracketed paragraph 1 with a new paragraph that would remind Committee members that State Parties and Advisory Bodies must do their work with the utmost diligence. The replacement paragraph would read as followed: "*Considering that the quality of the Decisions of the Committee depends upon the quality, completeness and timeliness of the documentation and information provided by the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies*".

The Delegation of **Japan** said that it was very much opposed to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision. It had no intention of refraining from proposing nominations during its term on the Committee, and asked for the Legal Adviser's opinion on the legality of such a decision.

The **Legal Adviser** said that the text of paragraph 7(ii) as it stood carried no legal implications, as it only proposed that the Committee should consider at its next session whether to adopt such a rule. If the Delegation of Japan so wished, the Legal Adviser would be happy to undertake an in-depth study of the legal implications of the proposal itself.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that it was not satisfied with the answer given by the Legal Adviser. The submission of nominations was a right under the *World Heritage Convention*, and to be required to refrain from submitting nominations was a violation of that right. It asked the Legal Adviser to study the question.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that the point made in paragraph 3 was raised in paragraph 9 and that the former could therefore be deleted. Concerning paragraph 4 (iii), the text in brackets should be deleted. Concerning paragraph 4 (vi), the date of 31 March was too tight for many less developed countries and should be extended to 30 April. Concerning paragraph 6(i), it agreed with Lebanon: it was a repetition of a decision already included elsewhere. Concerning paragraph 6(iii), the Delegation asked what "technically complete" meant. Concerning paragraph 6(vi), it noted that it was up to Committee members to ensure that their questions were answered; the statement was not necessary in the decision. Concerning paragraph 7(ii), the Delegation commended the Legal Adviser on a clear response to the questions raised.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that the Draft Decision under discussion was the outcome of a collective process involving other

Committee members, States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. It agreed that the draft text proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands should replace existing paragraph 1. Paragraph 4(iv) and other sub-paragraphs should be redrafted to include references to the relevant paragraphs of the *Operational Guidelines*. The issues raised in paragraph 5 should be re-examined at the Committee's 7th Extraordinary Session. In paragraph 6(ii), "14 days" should be in square brackets. The reference should match the schedule given in the *Operational Guidelines*. It added that, pursuant to the Committee's decision **26 COM 14** adopted at its 26th session (2002), the Secretariat should provide to the Committee at each ordinary session a list of nominations received by the deadline of 1 February with an indication of their status as "complete" or "incomplete".

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed with Japan regarding the opinion of the Legal Adviser. The Delegation did not accept that Committee members could be prevented from submitting nominations during their mandates.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported Lebanon concerning paragraph 6(i). Concerning paragraph 6(ii), it believed that 14 days was not enough time for the World Heritage Centre to analyze nominations and report back to the State Party. Paragraph 7(ii) was very restrictive. Colombia had relatively few sites on the World Heritage List and the rule would not be acceptable to it.

Concerning paragraph 7(ii), the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that it only referred to the need for a discussion of the issue. It agreed, however, that it could be removed from the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Chile** said that it agreed with the entire Draft Decision, but also supported the points made by Argentina. Concerning paragraph 4(vi), if the Committee wished to retain the spirit of the proposal, the text could read "nominations not in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* should not be on the agenda of the Committee." Concerning the request to put the question to the Legal Adviser, that question was whether the Committee could modify the *Convention*. Could the Committee restrict the right of members to nominate properties to the List?

Responding to the Delegation of Chile as to whether the Committee could amend the *Convention*, the **Legal Adviser** said that its Article 37 stipulated that it could be revised by the General

Conference of UNESCO. The Committee itself was not so empowered. Furthermore, nothing in the *Convention* prevented Committee members from presenting nominations.

La délégation du **Bénin** invite le Comité à réfléchir de façon approfondie à la question du « lobbying » qu'un membre du Comité peut exercer ou non dans le cadre de son mandat. Concernant le projet de décision, la délégation ne trouve pas justifié de dire au paragraphe 1 que le Comité a rencontré des difficultés pendant la présente session alors que celles-ci existent depuis des années. Elle partage l'avis des autres orateurs qui souhaitent voir supprimer le paragraphe 3. En ce qui concerne le paragraphe 6(ii), elle estime qu'en raison du manque de personnel au Centre, le délai de 14 jours n'est pas suffisant. Elle se demande, par ailleurs, s'il appartient au Centre de revoir les propositions d'inscription. Le paragraphe 6 (vi), jugé insultant à l'égard du Comité, devrait selon elle être supprimé. Quant au paragraphe 7, le Comité doit « décider » et non « proposer » la création d'un mécanisme, lequel reste cependant à définir. Elle relève enfin que la majorité des orateurs se sont prononcés en faveur d'une suppression du paragraphe 7(ii), considéré comme contraire aux droits fondamentaux des Etats parties.

The **Secretariat** explained that the reference to "14 days" in paragraph 6(ii) was not realistic. Between 50 and 60 nominations were received by 1 February, and reviewing them took at least one month. Furthermore, the timetable for the processing of nominations included in the *Operational Guidelines* provided that the Centre would transmit complete nominations to the Advisory Bodies in March, following their receipt by 1 February.

The Delegation of **Oman** agreed with previous speakers that paragraph 3 could be deleted as it covered the same issues as paragraph 9. Concerning paragraph 4(iv), it agreed that the *Operational Guidelines* reference should be included. The definition of "technically complete" in paragraph 6(iii) should be provided. Concerning 7(ii), the Delegation agreed with the Delegations of Japan and Egypt and recommended adding the phrase "subject to the opinion of the Legal Adviser." Concerning paragraph 8, it thought that any reference to the credibility of the List would reflect badly on the credibility of the Committee and that, consequently, the paragraph should be deleted.

The **Secretariat** explained that "technically complete" meant "complete according to the *Operational Guidelines*."

The Delegation of **Norway** was of the opinion that the Draft Decision was a very good document and agreed with its direction. He thanked the drafting group and the United Kingdom for their work in its preparation. Many of the points raised would be relevant in the revised *Operational Guidelines*, and it suggested that they should be considered when the new *Guidelines* were approved. Concerning paragraph 4(vi), it agreed that a date was necessary. The Secretariat should consult ICOMOS and IUCN in order to arrive at the latest date possible so that documents could be sent out in time. It agreed that paragraph 6(vi) should be deleted and on the need for 7(ii), although its consideration should be pushed back to the next ordinary session of the Committee so that sufficient time would be available to prepare a sound legal document. Finally, it agreed with the Netherlands that paragraphs 3 and 9 had both been covered in the budget discussions and could be deleted.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted that consensus had been reached that paragraph 1 should be replaced with the text proposed by the Netherlands. It agreed with previous speakers that the bracketed phrase in 4(iii) should be deleted. Concerning paragraph 4(vi), while it agreed in principle, the Committee should be careful not to amend the *Operational Guidelines* in its decision, and asked whether that was a new procedure. It also agreed with paragraph 6(iii). Concerning 7(ii), the Delegation suggested new wording to the effect that the Committee would examine the "principle" of Committee members voluntarily refraining from presenting nominations. If the Committee could not agree to examine the principle, then the point should be deleted.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee members to focus on the amendments.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** stated that it appreciated the "rigour" with which the drafting group had produced the document, but it questioned the use of the phrase "intellectual rigour" in paragraph 4(ii), as the Delegation felt that it implied suffering and stress. The word "professionalism" would be preferable. Furthermore, paragraphs 7(ii) and 8 appeared to be a self-indictment of the Committee's performance. Had the Committee really been so bad? Those two points should be scrapped.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** had no difficulty with paragraph 7(ii), but thought that such a measure was only one means of dealing with conflict of interest situations. It proposed that a small working group should be established to explore other sources of conflict of interest and ethical questions in general, together with solutions that might be applied.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether the point raised by paragraph 7(ii) was really so problematic, as it was similar to the measure introduced four years previously when the Committee had been asked to consider reducing its mandate voluntarily to four years. Such a measure could become a voluntary decision taken at the time of a State Party's standing for election at the General Assembly. It need not be a rule.

La délégation du **Liban** souligne que la moitié des membres du Comité ayant présenté des propositions d'inscription, il leur est difficile de prendre part au débat en cours. Elle suggère que le paragraphe 7(ii) soit supprimé et représenté à la session suivante du Comité, assorti de l'avis du Conseiller juridique.

The Delegation of **China** supported the amendment of the Netherlands to replace paragraph 1. It also asked for the phrase "official languages" to be replaced by the correct phrase, "working languages." Finally, concerning paragraph 7(ii), it supported the position of the Delegation of Portugal.

IUCN was appreciative of the open discussion of the issues. It agreed with the deletion of the text in brackets in paragraphs 4(iii) and 6. Concerning the date of 31 March in paragraph 4(vi), a date earlier than 31 March would facilitate the IUCN evaluation process, but a date after 31 March would make it difficult for the Advisory Body to comply with the Committee's desire to receive documents six weeks in advance of the Committee session. It urged the Committee not to select a date later than that provided in the text. Concerning paragraph 9 and the provision of adequate resources for the World Heritage Centre, it should also reflect the needs of the Advisory Bodies.

ICOMOS agreed with IUCN. Concerning paragraph 6(vi), the point had already been addressed, but it was self-evident that the Advisory Bodies were there to respond to questions from the

Committee members. The paragraph was unnecessary.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** said that the Draft Decision needed further elaboration. Concerning paragraph 7(ii), there was no need to discuss the point. It had full confidence in the probity of Committee members. It was happy in the knowledge that Committee members did not exercise any influence beyond what was proper. Furthermore, under such a rule, how would transboundary nominations be handled? It agreed with the Delegation of Japan that it was an artificial limit. To prevent Committee members from presenting nominations would require a change to the Committee's Rules of Procedure. Paragraphs 4(vi) and 6(ii) were unnecessarily bureaucratic, and reminiscent of a schoolteacher's prohibitions to children. To sum up, more time for reflection was needed, and paragraph 7(ii) should be deleted altogether in the meantime.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the implications of paragraph 7(ii) -- that Committee members influenced votes on certain nominations - were unjustified. The Committee should not be guided by innuendo. The evidence of sites which had not been inscribed at the 28th session proved that the provision was unnecessary.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it felt embarrassed vis-à-vis the Observers because the debate gives the impression that the Committee members were busy inscribing their own sites and did not even want to discuss the issue of conflict of interest. It reminded them of the article in the Economist, which already gave a negative image of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 14B.57** adopted, as amended.

Returning to Item 14A; the **Chairperson** said that the Secretariat had prepared a revised paragraph 2 for Decision **28 COM 14A** concerning Tentative Lists: *Noting also that the recently completed study of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists prepared by ICOMOS and IUCN would contribute significantly to the discussion concerning the improved use of tentative lists as requested by the Committee in its Decision 27 COM 8A*". Seeing no objection, he declared decision **28 COM 14A** adopted as amended.

24. **PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 29TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (June-July 2005)**

ORDRE DU JOUR PROVISOIRE DE LA 29e SESSION DU COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL (juin - juillet 2005)

Document: WHC-04/28.COM/24

The **Secretariat** introduced the provisional agenda, mentioning that the available dates proposed by South Africa for the session were the first two weeks of July 2005. The agenda was structured according to tradition, with the examination of the State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List coming before new nominations to it. It drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that, due to an oversight, item 12 should have included a sub-item (12 C) concerning the report on progress in the implementation of activities for the protection of the Palestinian cultural and natural heritage. The Secretariat asked the Committee whether, as suggested by the Delegation of Nigeria, a specific item should be included to discuss the state of conservation of the African World Heritage.

The Delegation of **South Africa** confirmed the availability of the above-mentioned dates.

The Delegation of **Norway** asked the Secretariat to prepare a paper for the Committee's extraordinary session in December 2004 on alternative ways of organizing the work of the Committee and the content of its agenda.

The **Secretariat** agreed to do so, and suggested that the paper might be discussed under Item 4 bis of the agenda for that session.

La délégation du **Bénin** félicite le Secrétariat pour sa présentation très complète de la proposition d'ordre du jour. Elle appuie la proposition du Royaume-Uni d'en différer l'examen et l'adoption à la session extraordinaire du Comité en décembre 2004. Comme le Nigeria, elle souhaite qu'à l'occasion de cette première session du Comité en Afrique subsaharienne, une attention particulière soit accordée à la situation du patrimoine mondial de ce continent et informe le Comité que le groupe Afrique réfléchit à la forme à donner à cet événement spécial. Elle propose enfin que pour la

29e session, le suivi du rapport périodique Afrique fasse l'objet non d'un rapport ordinaire, mais d'un rapport spécial qui bénéficierait d'une plus grande attention..

The **Secretariat** proposed organizing a full-day event devoted specifically to the African World Heritage, possibly involving partners and donors. It could be a side event and it might not, therefore, be necessary to include it as a formal item in the agenda.

The **Chairperson** declared the agenda for the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (June-July 2005) adopted, as amended (**28 COM 24**)

25. **OTHER BUSINESS**

QUESTIONS DIVERSES

The **Chairperson** thanked Lebanon, Oman and the United Kingdom for their original invitations to host the next session of the World Heritage Committee. He then asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present the proposed agenda for the 7th extraordinary Committee session.

The **Director of the Centre** introduced the agenda proposed by the Secretariat for the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee, which was due to take place in December 2004. It included items that had not been discussed during the current session of the Committee due to lack of time, and other policy issues such as the new version of the *Operational Guidelines* and the implementation of the Strategic Objectives set by the Committee. International Assistance requests could also be examined by the Committee, so as not to delay the approval of important activities until June or July 2005. No new working documents would be produced, other than for item 12 (Publications Plans by the World Heritage Centre). He recalled that, in line with Rule 9.3 of the Rules of Procedure, the provisional agenda of an extraordinary session could not be changed once approved by the Committee. He also drew the attention of the Committee to the need to authorize the necessary budgetary adjustments to provide the funding required for the extraordinary session, estimated to be roughly \$110,000.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the Director's listing of agenda items was practically complete and asked firstly whether preparation of

document 34 C/4 (Medium-Term Strategy) should be included alongside document 33 C/5 among the agenda items under the heading Administrative and Financial Matters.

It further asked for reference to be made in Draft Decision **28 COM 12** to intersectoral cooperation and coordination, and asked secondly whether Draft Decision **28 COM 14 (b)**, paragraph 6, referred to the 7th extraordinary session or to the special meeting in the Russian Federation.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed to the first request, and to the second, responded that it was a procedural issue that could be taken up at the next Committee session, which was to be decided by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that a decision was needed for document 33 C/5, as if two Committee sessions were to be held, it would have to be included in the document for the Director-General because the budget for them would come from the Regular Programme budget. Until such time as a decision had been made on that point, however, the Delegation agreed to the readjustment mentioned by the Director of the Centre.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** asked when the new voting mechanism for the election of Committee members would be discussed, as it had been decided in **28 COM 25.1** to defer consideration until the 7th extraordinary session.

The **Director** said that it was proposed to make that subject into a new item 14, replacing “Other Business”.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it had understood that the Bureau had decided that the 7th extraordinary session should last five days, while in fact only three days were being proposed. With regard to provisional agenda item 4, it was too narrowly drafted, as more than a report on the *Revised Operational Guidelines* was needed, covering also other issues that would come up in the debate. With regard to the method of work of the Committee, it proposed a new, more wide-ranging item 2 to cover legal issues such as restrictions on Committee members nominating properties.

The **Director** agreed and proposed rewording item 4 to read: “Report and discussions on the *Revised Operational Guidelines*”, and adding an agenda

item 14 *bis* on “Working methods of the Committee”.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that “Working methods of the Committee” would link closely to the debate on the *Revised Operational Guidelines*, and that therefore it would be more appropriate as provisional agenda item 4 *bis*.

The **Director** said, with regard to the time frame, that a room had been booked for a full week, which, in his opinion, would be needed to discuss the 18 items on the provisional agenda. He recalled that Committee sessions usually started on a Monday and continued until Saturday, when the final report was adopted, with one day without meetings (Friday) for report writing.

The Delegation of **Oman** expressed its support for the United Kingdom's proposal, as well as for a five-day meeting from 6 to 11 December.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the Bureau had recommended five days.

The **Director** replied that a Committee meeting usually took six days: four days of work, one day for report-writing by the Secretariat, and a morning for discussion and adoption of the report.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said, in relation to the Latin America and the Caribbean Periodic Report and the request for an Action Plan for Latin America, that a meeting was going to be held in the first week of October 2004 in Colombia, and asked whether a report or discussion on it could be included as agenda item 5(e).

The **Director** said that the Executive Board would be in session in October, but that the proposal by the Delegation of Colombia was acceptable.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed support for a five-day meeting as proposed by the Centre and, with regard to paragraph 5 “Progress Report on Periodic Reporting for Africa”, suggested that it should not be included in the agenda of the 7th extraordinary session, but in that of the 29th Committee session, which would take place on African soil.

The **Director of the Centre** explained that the item had been postponed from the 28th session and contained an update on activities carried out since 2003. The fact that it was included in the agenda of the 7th extraordinary session would not prevent a

fuller discussion of the subject at the 29th session of the Committee in 2005. Indeed, it could be the subject of a special one-day side event during the Committee's session in South Africa.

In answer to the Delegation of the United Kingdom, he said that the proposed dates for the 7th extraordinary session were 6 to 11 December 2004.

The Delegation of **Argentina** agreed with the dates and requested confirmation on the discussion of Periodic Reporting Progress reports, which included a progress report for Latin America and the Caribbean, to ensure that it covered the Action Plan for Latin America and the Main Andean Road Project.

The **Director** said that an agenda item 5 (f): Main Andean Road Project could be added.

The **Chairperson** declared the agenda for the 7th extraordinary session adopted, as amended. (28 COM 25.2)

26. DRAFT DECISIONS OF THE 28TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (28 JUNE - 7 JULY 2004, SUZHOU, CHINA)

PROJET DE DECISIONS DE LA 28e SESSION DU COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL (28 JUIN - 7 JUILLET 2004, SUZHOU, CHINE)

Document: WHC-04/28.COM/26

The **Rapporteur** introduced the working document. She explained that Part I concerned decisions under agenda items 1 to 14 that had been discussed in plenary, while Part II (items 15 to 25) would be distributed shortly. Three issues had influenced preparation of the document: 1) the 56 nominations and 157 state of conservation reports, of which 35 concerned the World Heritage List in Danger, had led to over 200 decisions in a total of 240 to 250 decisions; 2) the agenda item on state of conservation had been discussed very late in the meeting, which had meant considerable pressure due to lack of time and thus accounting for some missed points or minor differences which needed fine-tuning, and 3) the Secretariat had limited time for report preparation, as a morning and evening meeting had been added to the schedule.

The **Chairperson** proposed proceeding item by item.

La délégation du **Bénin** cherche des renseignements complémentaires concernant les procédures. Certaines dénominations d'états parties – notamment Azerbaïdjan, Érythrée – ne sont pas correctes. La délégation fera ses commentaires par écrit et les donnera au secrétariat.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **28 COM 4**, **28 COM 5** and **28 COM 6** adopted.

La délégation du **Bénin** note un problème de formulation. Elle précise que le mot 'document' apparaît alors qu'il ne devrait pas.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 7** and **28 COM 8** adopted.

With regard to Decision **28 COM 9**, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed the insertion of the words "if finalized" in paragraph 7 concerning the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed to the proposal and recalled that, as previously proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands, any new decisions pertinent to the revised *Operational Guidelines* should also be considered to fall within the mandate entrusted to the Chairperson of the 27th session by the Committee.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed and proposed inserting the words "is also authorized to include".

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 9** adopted, as amended.

La délégation de la **Belgique** (observateur) note que dans la décision 9 on doit mentionner la 27e et la 28e session.

The **Chairperson** accepted the proposal.

He declared decisions **28 COM 10A.1**, **28 COM 10A.2**, **28 COM 10A.3**, **28 COM 11** and **28 COM 12** adopted.

A propos de la décision **28 COM 10A.3**, la délégation du **Bénin** note que la version française du document contient une répétition de mots 'et d'éducation' et demande que l'erreur soit corrigée.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the English version was clear and asked the Delegation of Benin to hand the correction for the French version in writing to the Rapporteur.

A propos de la décision **28 COM 13**, la délégation du **Liban** note qu'il y a une petite omission dans le paragraphe 16b et en suggère la correction dans la version anglaise.

The **Director** confirmed that the omission would be corrected.

The Delegation of **Argentina** congratulated the Rapporteur on her tremendous work, as well as that of the Secretariat, and proposed some small changes to paragraphs 2 and 9, where there was a problem of consistency.

On paragraph 13 concerning the Russian Federation's proposal to host the special meeting, it requested clarification as to how the proposal was incorporated and on the costs for participation of experts, as for Latin America some 10 to 15 experts were expected, supplemented by those from other regions. It supported the proposed amendment to paragraph 13 (i) to make it read "more consistent with Article 11 ...".

It further made a proposal for paragraph 13 (iii), suggesting to add the wording: "to remove from the World Heritage List in Danger".]

The **Director** said that it had all been accepted and proposed adding "presently inscribed".

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that adoption of Decision **28 COM 13.1** depended on it.

Concerning paragraph 13, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked how it related to the issue on Outstanding Universal Value that had been deleted, as it was slightly different.

The **Director** said that there was a correlation and that he saw no contradiction.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it should be deleted, as the conference had already been proposed, and suggested replacing "could" by "should". It was not sure of the meaning of regional context.

La délégation du **Bénin** soutient les propos tenus par la délégation de l'Argentine en ce qui concerne la décision **28 COM 13.1**. En ce qui concerne

spécifiquement le paragraphe 13 et l'invitation de la Russie, la délégation suggère qu'il serait peut-être plus acceptable de l'inclure dans un nouveau paragraphe.

The delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that no formal proposal from Russian Federation was adopted in plenary, and that more details should be given on this generous offer.

The delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of **Lebanon** declared its satisfaction with the proposed amendments.

Faisant référence à la décision **28 COM 14B.14**, la délégation du **Liban** suggère une correction au paragraphe 2, dont le premier mot "Recommande" doit être remplacé par "Demande".

Faisant référence à la décision **28 COM 14B.16**, la délégation du **Liban** suggère que le premier mot du paragraphe 3, "Encourage", soit remplacé par le mot "Demande".

Faisant en suite référence à la décision **28 COM 14B.28**, la délégation du **Liban**, suggère que le paragraphe 5 (continues in English) should be "request" and not "encourage".

Faisant référence à la décision **28 COM 14B.36**, la délégation de l'**Andorre** (Observateur) note un problème de concordance entre les versions anglaise et française. Au paragraphe 4, la version anglaise contient les mots *above measures* et demande que l'équivalent soit reflété dans la version française.

Concerning Decision **28 COM 14B.57**, paragraph 8, the Delegation of **Oman** stated that the word "credibility" was maybe too strong.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of the **Netherlands**, proposed to maintain the above cited word.

Faisant référence au paragraphe 7 de la décision, la délégation du **Bénin** demande que le terme "cabinet du conseiller juridique" soit remplacé par le terme "conseiller juridique".

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed discussing only those decisions that still needed some debate and adopting the other decisions without debate.

La délégation du **Bénin** commente la procédure d'adoption et demande à ce qu'on adopte cette décision et qu'on revienne ensuite sur les autres points à soulever.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it would be good procedure to approve the whole bloc of decisions and to open the floor for discussion only when delegations wished to speak on specific items.

The **Chairperson** agreed to proceed in that way.

Referring to Draft Decision **28 COM 15A.25**, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed deleting paragraph 5 and it submitted a written text which was incorporated.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the proposal of the Netherlands.

Referring to Draft Decision **28 COM 15A.31**, the Delegation of **Egypt** referred to the inconsistencies between the English and the French versions, particularly in paragraph 4, line 2 and paragraph 5, line 1.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether the English version of the Draft Decision should be considered the original version.

The **Director of the Centre** said that it was so.

The **Rapporteur** proposed grouping together the state of conservation reports under item 15B.

Concerning Draft Decision **28 COM 15B.22**, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its concern about the wording of the Draft Decision and said that it did not reflect the Committee's position on the matter.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the United Kingdom and suggested the deletion of the words "with satisfaction". The Delegation of the United Kingdom might like to provide a draft text for an additional paragraph.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it proposed adding to the paragraph 5 the words "Deletes with satisfaction" and adding a paragraph 5bis which would read "Further notes the concerns regarding the potential impact of oil and gas pipelines on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and considers that any such proposal should undergo a comprehensive EIA to

international standards". It also proposed adding to paragraph 7 after the word "route" the words "and the issues noted under paragraph 4 above".

The Delegation of **Colombia**, referring to Decision **28 COM 15B.31**, noted that the Committee's recommendation was missing from the text of the Draft Decision. It therefore proposed adding to paragraph 3 the words "and to ensure that the fishing quotas established by the due processes under the Galapagos Special Law are respected".

The **Chairperson** declared decisions **28 COM 15B.1 to 28 COM 15B.38** adopted, as amended.

The **Rapporteur** suggested that the Committee consider Decisions **28 COM 15B.39 to 28 COM 15B.80** as a first group and Decisions **28 COM 15B.81 to 28 COM 15B.121** as a second group. Decision **28 COM 15B.122** had already been adopted.

Referring to Decision **28 COM 15B.48**, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether the new building referred to in the report affected the outstanding universal value of the property and why that was not reflected in the report.

The **Secretariat** replied that the new construction was not big in dimension and did not affect the outstanding universal value of the property.

The **Chairperson** declared adopted the group of decisions **28 COM 15B.39 to 28 COM 15B.80** and the group of decisions **28 COM 15B.81 to 28 COM 15B.121**.

He then declared decision **28 COM 15C** adopted without debate.

He declared decision **28 COM 16** adopted, as amended during the discussion of the item.

The Delegation of **Argentina** asked for a reference to the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee to be made in the decision concerning the adoption of the provisional agenda of the 29th session of the Committee.

La délégation du **Bénin** intervient sur la décision **28 COM 17C** (Suivi du Rapport périodique en Afrique). Elle demande que lui soit confirmé si cette discussion sera reporté à la 7^e session du Comité.

The **Director of the Centre** said that the item would be postponed for discussion to the 7th extraordinary session.

The **Chairperson** declared decisions **28 COM 17A, 17B.I, 17B.II, 17C and 17D** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the Committee had decided to postpone discussion of items 18, 19 (except the aspect relating to the World Heritage Research and Training Institute in China), 20, 21 and 22 to the 7th extraordinary session of the Committee.

Referring to item 19, **ICCROM** suggesting inserting in Decision **28 COM 19** the words "decides in view of the time constraints to defer the discussion until its 7th extraordinary session".

Referring to item 20, the Delegation of **Argentina** proposed adding the words "noting with satisfaction the day on partnerships that took place on 6 July in the context of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee".

The **Chairperson** declared decisions **28 COM 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22** adopted, as amended.

La délégation du **Bénin** intervient sur la décision **28 COM 23**, c), concernant l'élection des vice-présidents et demande à ce que l'on suive la même procédure que pour les points a) et b) de la décision 23. C'est-à-dire, qu'il faut préciser le début du mandat et la fin du mandat de chacun des élus.

The **Chairperson** agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of Benin and declared Decision **28 COM 23** adopted as amended.

27. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

CLÔTURE DE LA SESSION

The **Rapporteur** offered some observations about ways of working drawn from the past days. There had been similar observations on past occasions but as yet no solution had been found. In future, it would be essential that the Committee deal with reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties before examining nominations for inscription. This would facilitate the Committee's work and the preparation of decisions. It would also be essential to adhere ever more closely to the guidelines on terminology in

relation to Decisions adopted at the 26th and 27th sessions of the Committee: indeed the preceding debate had highlighted the need for this. Work flows would also be more efficient if the Committee were to adopt decisions paragraph by paragraph so that it was clear exactly what was agreed: this was particularly important in sensitive cases. While it was sometimes necessary for the Secretariat to consult the Advisory Bodies after a Decision had been taken, this should be kept to a minimum to maintain the integrity of the Committee's decisions. The **Rapporteur** would, with her successor and immediate predecessors draft some proposals for consideration during the 7th Extraordinary session of the Committee in Paris in December, which would include an item of methods of working. Finally she thanked the Secretariat for its professionalism, loyalty and assistance in undertaking this challenging task.

In closing the session, the **Chairperson** thanked all participants for their hard work but noted that the act of inscribing properties on the List was only the beginning of the international community's collective work to ensure sure that they retained the outstanding universal values for which they had been inscribed. A heavy responsibility weighed on the shoulders of the Committee. One of the most fundamental tasks related to safeguarding World Heritage was that of sensitizing young people to the need to protect it.

Representatives of the Youth Forum that had been taking place in parallel, presented the conclusions of their work to the Committee. Their findings are annexed to this summary record.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** offered his thanks to the Chairperson, **Rapporteur** and Committee for their contributions to what had been a truly memorable session and in particular to all those involved in the preparation and conduct of the session – the Chinese authorities and volunteers, UNESCO staff and the interpreters.

The **Vice Mayor of Suzhou**, Mr Wang Guoxing, expressed the warmest congratulations of the municipality of Suzhou, noting that the conservation of World Heritage was an important driver for peace and development.

The **Delegation of Portugal**, speaking on behalf of the Committee, expressed its heartfelt thanks to the Chairperson, **Rapporteur**, the Chinese authorities, volunteers, World Heritage Centre staff, UNESCO secretariat and interpreters for their efficient and

harmonious work before and during the session. Inspired by the beauty of the World Heritage property, the Humble Administrator's Garden, it hoped that future humble administrators would follow the same path and continue to identify and protect World Heritage.

The newly elected **Chairperson for the 29th session** said that he was acutely conscious of the

responsibility that the post entailed. He thanked the outgoing Chairperson and the Government of China for their extraordinary efforts and looked forward to welcoming the Committee to South Africa in 2005.

The **Chairperson** declared the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

Annexes

- I** Agenda /Ordre du jour
- II** Chronological timetable of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (28 June - 7 July 2004)

Calendrier chronologique de la 28e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (28 juin - 7 juillet 2004)
- III** Index of Decisions of the World Heritage Committee
Index des Décisions du Comité du patrimoine mondial

Note concerning the Annexes to this document

As this draft document is presented for the purpose of obtaining any corrections to the interventions, Annexes referred to herein have not been attached at this time. The final document will contain Annexes I, II, III: with resumes of speeches incorporated in the main part of the text under the relevant point of order. It will be possible in the near future to consult all speeches in their entirety, unedited, on the World Heritage Centre web site.

Note concernant les Annexes de ce document

Ce projet de document étant présenté afin d'obtenir des corrections éventuelles sur les interventions, les Annexes auxquelles il est fait référence ne sont pas jointes pour le moment. Le document final comportera les Annexes I, II, III, et les résumés des discours intégrés dans le corps du texte sous le point de l'ordre du jour approprié. Cependant, tous les discours, dans leur forme complète et non-éditée, pourront être consultés en ligne sur le site Internet du Centre du patrimoine mondial.