



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

32 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-08/32.COM
Paris, 22 June 2009
Original: English/French

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

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

**World Heritage Committee
Thirty-Second Session**

**Quebec City, Canada
2– 10 July 2008**

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD

PROJET DE RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS

**Corrections from States Parties on their own interventions requested for
submission before 31 August 2009**

**Les corrections des Etats parties sur leurs propres interventions doivent être
soumises avant le 31 août 2009**

SECOND DAY – THURSDAY, 3 JULY 2008

FIRST MEETING

09.00 a.m. – 01.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

The **Chairperson**, opening the first meeting, thanked the authorities of Quebec for hosting the Committee's 32nd session on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of Quebec City. She noted that it was being attended by five former Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee: Mr Tumu te Heuheu, Chairperson in 2007, Ms. Ina Marciulionyte, Chairperson in 2006, Mr. Themba Wakashe, Chairperson in 2005, Mr Zhang Xinsheng, Chairperson in 2004 and Mr Tamas Fejerdi, Chairperson in 2002.

ITEM 2 REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/2
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.2

Decision: **32 COM 2**

The **Chairperson** drew attention to the exceptionally high demand for participation at the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee. Out of the 1300 requests received only 900 have been accepted. Given the number of requests, she considered that a clear policy should be laid down to deal with the matter for future sessions of the Committee. She suggested that rules might be drawn up establishing fixed quotas for countries, and also concerning the calendar for the registration of participants.

The Delegation of **Canada** offered assistance to the World Heritage Centre in preparing a proposal along those lines and drew attention to the amended draft decision put forward.

The **Rapporteur** read out the following amendments to Decision **32 COM 2** proposed by the Delegation of Canada, consisting of four additional paragraphs at the end of the text presented in the working document:

- *Noting the ever-increasing interest in the implementation of the Convention by States Parties and observers and the challenges that the resultant growth in demand for participation in the Committee's sessions poses for the host country;*
- *Noting further the need to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the Committee's proceedings;*
- *Requests the World Heritage Centre to develop draft principles, policies and procedures to guide the process of evaluating and confirming requests for participation at meetings of the World Heritage Committee including, in particular, questions associated with:*
 - a) *the appropriate size of State Party delegations*
 - b) *an annual calendar defining timelines for the registration and acceptance of participants for Committee meetings*

- *Further requests the World Heritage Centre to propose any changes to the Rules of Procedure, the Operational Guidelines and the Host Country Agreement that may be warranted to operationalize the principles, policies and procedures described above, for examination at its 33rd session in 2009.*

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

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed disagreement with the proposed amendments, pointing out that the calendar and policy referred to in the text would cause serious difficulties for many countries. It was to be hoped that the Secretariat would be able to come up with another proposal.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, supported by the Delegation of **Jordan**, said that the success of the *World Heritage Convention* was demonstrated by the popularity of the Committee's sessions. Access to those sessions should not, therefore, be restricted and the number of participants artificially reduced. Though a developing country, Kenya had made the effort to participate in the current session with a seven-member delegation and that effort should be welcomed rather than reproved. Therefore, the Delegation of Kenya supported open participation in the sessions of the Committee, provided there was an established calendar and a clear policy in place.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with the views expressed by the Delegation of Kenya, but proposed a change to the amendments just circulated, adding a reference to observers in the third paragraph a), in order to ensure that Observer delegations were of an appropriate size too.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Canada and the intention to enhance participation in the Committee's sessions. However, it was very difficult to take a decision without any precise data on participation.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended draft decision reflecting the change proposed by the Delegation of Israel.

The **Chairperson** asked the delegations proposing amendments whether that latter version was acceptable to them.

The Delegation of **Canada** responded positively.

The Delegation of **Brazil** insisted on not imposing any limitation of calendar or size on delegations participating in the Committee's sessions, and proposed to put a full stop after "the World Heritage Committee" in Paragraph 3 of the amended version.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it would be satisfied with the changes proposed by the Delegation of Brazil.

Following an exchange of views, the **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee wished to adopt the amended draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 2** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** then asked the Arabic- and Spanish-speaking members of the Committee to state in which of the two working languages they wished to see their interventions reflected in the summary records of the session.

The Delegations of **Bahrain, Spain, Cuba** and **Peru** said they wished their interventions to be recorded in English.

Following a request by the Delegation of **Egypt** for its interventions to be recorded in English and in Arabic, the **Chairperson** recalled that the working languages of the World Heritage Committee were English and French, unlike the General Assembly of States Parties in which six languages were used, including Arabic.

The Delegation of **Egypt** chose the English option.

La Délégation du **Maroc** remercie à son tour la Présidente ainsi que les autorités canadiennes pour leur accueil chaleureux. Elle remercie également l'Arabie saoudite de leur permettre de s'exprimer en arabe. La Délégation interviendra en arabe et souhaite que ses observations soient retranscrites en français dans le résumé des interventions.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** transmet à la Présidente et aux autorités canadiennes ses meilleurs vœux et remerciements pour l'organisation de ce Comité, et souhaite que ses propos soient également retranscrits en français.

ITEM 3 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND THE TIMETABLE

ITEM 3A ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/3A.Rev3

Decision: **32 COM 3A**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced three amendments to the agenda proposed by the Bureau.

The Delegation of **Australia** raised the question of late receipt of documentation. While it acknowledged the difficulties of producing and circulating such a large volume of documents in time and did not wish to lay blame on the World Heritage Centre, the Delegation requested a thorough discussion on the full cycle of preparation of the documentation and asked the World Heritage Centre to draw up a clear timeline for the preparation of documents at least 6 weeks in advance of the meeting, in conformity with Rule 45 of the Rules of Procedure.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that a document had been prepared for the Bureau and proposed to circulate it to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Australia** welcomed that initiative, but insisted on having a discussion on the timeline for the preparation of documentation, in order to ascertain where the weak points lay and where to focus more attention.

The **Chairperson** suggested that a discussion on the matter be included in Item 18, "Other business".

The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** expressed agreement with the agenda in general, but requested postponement of the Argentinean nomination of the Cultural Landscape of Buenos Aires (Argentina) under item 8B as it had not been formally notified of a change in the status of the nomination and preferred to leave the Committee's consideration of this nomination in abeyance until the 33rd session as had originally been projected, noting that, according to the *Operational Guidelines*, the World Heritage Committee could decide at any time to suspend an item, even if the agenda had already been adopted. Further it noted that

the outcomes of the debate on historic urban landscapes being held during the current session, might have important consequences which it would prefer to be able to take into account. It hoped that the Committee would take Argentina's request into account.

The **Chairperson** said that the matter had been raised at the Bureau meeting. She believed that the discussion should be held under item 8 on nominations, but sought the opinion of the Legal Adviser.

The **Legal Adviser** said that in the case under discussion there were two questions to be put to the Committee, the first concerning the appropriate item under which to discuss the matter, and the second having more to do with looking into the consequences of postponement. Therefore, the first decision for the Committee to take was whether to deal with the issue under the current item or elsewhere.

In response to a question by the Delegation of **Kenya**, the **Chairperson** reassured that Delegation that the postponement did not concern the whole of item 8 on nominations, and said she was in favour of discussing the request for postponement under item 8, one reason being that that would give the Committee more time to think about the question.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the Chairperson.

There being no other comments, the agenda was adopted as amended.

ITEM 3B ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/3B.Rev

Decision: **32 COM 3B**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, introducing the provisional timetable, drew attention to the changes to the timetable as set out in document *WHC-08/32.COM/3B.Rev.*, and presented the side events that were to be held during the Committee's session.

The timetable was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** drew attention to the time-limit to be observed by speakers in view of the Committee's workload, and recalled the deadline for submission of requests for a discussion of properties included in document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B*. She noted that so far there were 30 items for discussion and 56 properties already on the State of Conservation discussion list.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** read out the list of the four withdrawals of nominations received (nominations from Bolivia, Bulgaria, Italy and Hungary/Slovakia), which brought down to 43 the nominations to be examined at the current session. He added that the nominations of Buenos Aires (Argentina) and Majuli Island (India) have therefore been brought back into the nominations to be examined by the Committee.

IUCN drew the Committee's attention to the implications of the withdrawal of the approved extension of the National Park of Pirin, Bulgaria. In the Advisory Body's view, this withdrawal would call for a discussion, under the State of Conservation item, of some recommendations included in the draft decision, which was withdrawn.

ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEURS

ITEM 4A REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 31ST SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (CHRISTCHURCH, 2007)

Documents: WHC-07/31.COM/24
 WHC-07/31.COM/INF.24

Decision: No decision required

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Mr. John Pinkerton, Rapporteur of the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session.

Le **Rapporteur de la 31e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial** souhaite remercier le Président de la session, M. Tumu te Heuheu, le Vice-président, M. Ole Briseid et le pays hôte, la Nouvelle-Zélande. Soulignant à quel point il a été fier d'avoir servi le Comité et souhaitant tout le succès possible à son successeur, il présente un résumé des décisions les plus importantes prises pendant cette session, qui s'est tenue à Christchurch, Nouvelle Zélande, du 23 juin au 2 juillet 2007 :

Le Comité a adopté 271 décisions, dont 32 portaient sur l'état de conservation de biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, 130 Rapports sur l'Etat de Conservation et 74 sur les propositions d'inscription de nouveaux biens et des modifications de biens déjà inscrits.

Gabon and Namibia had their first sites inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Proceeding in English, he indicated that the Committee had added 22 properties to the World Heritage List and implemented for the first time the provisions of Paragraph 155 of the *Operational Guidelines*, which required it to adopt a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for newly-inscribed World Heritage properties. The Committee had added three properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger, while removing four properties from that List. There were currently 31 properties on this List, a fact that must be a cause for concern of all Committee members and States Parties.

Furthermore, the Committee had taken the unprecedented step of removing a property from the World Heritage List, the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman), at the request of the State Party.

Le Comité a adopté un mécanisme de suivi renforcé, devant faire l'objet d'une période d'essai de deux ans avant son intégration complète dans les *Orientations*.

Further, the Committee had noted the initiative to establish a Pacific World Heritage Fund and encouraged States Parties and international donors to contribute to the Fund when it was established.

Based on the recommendations of the Benchmarking workshop held in 2007, the Committee's decision move the process further along toward adopting an integrated monitoring framework for World Heritage properties, in which Outstanding Universal Value,

authenticity and/or integrity become the clear basis for the Committee's decision-making in all processes related to the State of Conservation of World Heritage Sites

The Committee had amended the draft decision presented to it on results of the audit of the Centre in such a way that it reflected a consensus response to the audit that would restore World Heritage as a flagship UNESCO programme.

No decision was required for adoption on this Agenda item.

ITEM 4B REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 16TH SESSION OF THE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION (UNESCO, 2007)

Document: WHC-07/16.GA/13

Decision: No decision required

The **Chairperson**, in the absence of the Rapporteur of the 16th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention*, requested Ms Benanni of the Moroccan Delegation, Chairperson of that session, to give a brief overview of the main resolutions taken and discussions held during the session, which had taken place in October 2007 at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris.

Mme Bennani, Ambassadeur et Déléguée permanente du Royaume du Maroc auprès de l'UNESCO, Présidente de la 16e session de l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties à la *Convention*, après avoir félicité la Présidente de la 32e session du Comité pour son élection et la Ville de Québec pour la célébration de son 400e anniversaire, indique qu'outre les débats importants sur les points relatifs au patrimoine mondial, l'Assemblée générale a élu de nouveaux membres du Comité. Elle regrette cependant le déséquilibre géographique du Comité actuel. Un groupe de travail, présidé par le Délégué permanent du Japon auprès de l'UNESCO, M. Kondo, a de fait été établi. Le rapport de ce groupe de travail devra être présenté l'année suivante avec des recommandations visant à améliorer la représentativité du Comité et, à terme, sa crédibilité. Elle remercie également l'Arabie saoudite, qui fournit l'interprétation des débats en arabe, contribuant ainsi à la diversité culturelle du Comité.

No decision was required for adoption on this Agenda item.

The **Chairperson** concluded item 4 by outlining her numerous activities during the past months in her capacity as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. She added that such report from the Chairperson on his/her activities should be part of the Agenda for the future sessions of the Committee.

ITEM 5 REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/5
 WHC-08/32.COM/INF.5A
 WHC-08/32.COM/INF.5B
 WHC-08/32.COM/INF.5C
 WHC-08/32.COM/INF.5D

Decision: **32 COM 5**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the Report of the World Heritage Centre, recalling that at its previous session the Committee had asked for the format of the report to be changed and for it to be based more on results. He would not go into the details of the report, but drew attention to the new layout, with three different matrices and the 5 Cs as a common cross-reference. The first matrix was based on regions, the second on programmes and the third on activities in the field of communication, education and partnerships.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** commended the World Heritage Centre on its activities, welcomed the new format of the report and proposed an amendment to Paragraph 4 of the related draft decision, with the view to identifying more extrabudgetary funding for the implementation of key issues such as conservation and management.

The Delegation of **Barbados** congratulated the World Heritage Centre on the Small Islands Developing States programme. It however expressed concern about the apparent lack of focus within all the World Heritage programmes due to the historical context. It also requested the Director of the World Heritage Centre to better integrate the Small Island Developing States throughout these programmes with a programmatic approach rather than merely thematic.

The Delegation of **Israel** commended the World Heritage Centre on its activities, but asked what the Centre was doing to make the *Convention* more universal, in terms of ratification by new States Parties. It also welcomed the format of the report which presented activities and results achieved, but wondered where there had been shortcomings and how they could be prioritized. It indicated for example that there is no reference to the Universities and Heritage programme in the document. The Delegation also wondered what were the key issues the World Heritage Centre had in implementing the Committee's decisions. It sought more than a simply descriptive report to have a clear picture of what still remains to be done.

The Delegation of **Australia** echoed Barbados' concerns about SIDS and particularly how it related to the Pacific Islands. It also said that it was hard to tell in reality who was achieving the various results presented, and therefore asked for a clearer indication of results and clearer indication of the way the programmes are going. It added that it would be willing to work closely with the World Heritage Centre in the future to improve the preparation of the report. Then, it recalled the speech at the opening ceremony of the Director General and his concerns about a number of key issues (number of sites, workload of the system, funding, oversight of the whole process etc.).

The Delegation of **Canada**, speaking on the basis of experience gained as Rapporteur at the Committee's previous session, acknowledged how critical the activity of the World Heritage Centre was for the *Convention*. It added it was very useful to have organized the document according to the 5Cs, but that the document still needed to have better articulation between the core functions and who does what, particularly with respect to the evaluation of nominations.

The Delegation of **Kenya** raised the issue of representativity of the staff. It also noted that not all the activities presented in the report of the Secretariat had actually been achieved by the World Heritage Centre. For example he had attended the meeting in Abuja which had been organized by the Africa World Heritage Fund. Furthermore, it noted that the term "community benefit" was being used too loosely. It congratulated the former Rapporteur for his excellent work and report which clearly illustrated how the Committee confronted salient issues.

The Delegation of **Australia** announced that it had submitted an amendment to the draft decision.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, thanking the Committee for the constructive comments, recognized the limits of the report and the overlapping of some activities under the 5 C's. He recognized that the report would need to be better structured and harmonized, and said that the Centre would try to improve it. There were nine Member States of UNESCO that were not States Parties to the *Convention*, but the World Heritage Centre was moving slowly towards achieving global membership. In the previous year, Guinea Bissau and Djibouti had ratified the *Convention* and the World Heritage Centre looked forward to ratification by the remaining nine Member States.

Concerning Israel's question on the Universities and Heritage programme, the World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that activities under that programme were integrated in several parts of the World Heritage Centre's report.

On Small Island Developing States, the following year, the World Heritage Centre would have a more detailed report showing what had been done, highlighting the results achieved in the Pacific. More activities are foreseen by next year in the Caribbean. As a general observation, the World Heritage Centre would in future focus on the way ahead, showing the Committee the strategic orientation and ensuring greater coherence. In response to comments about lack of clarity in the tables, he explained that some activities fell under more than one of the 5 Cs.

Referring to the report of the World Heritage Centre, the **Rapporteur** informed the Committee about various amendments proposed by the Delegations of Korea, Australia, Canada and Israel, indicating that several amendments were referring to Paragraph 4, while some others were additional paragraphs. She read all the amendments proposed:

- Proposal by the Delegation of Canada: Revision to Paragraph 1 to include all documents presented; Paragraphs 2 and 3 remaining as they were; Additional paragraph to be inserted between Paragraphs 3 and 4 to take note with appreciation of the results of the Advisory Bodies' activities;
- Proposal by the Delegation of Israel: Additional 5th paragraph requesting the World Heritage Centre to present at the 33rd session a summary statement of issues addressed during the year and recommendations for improving the work of the World Heritage Centre.

She then read all the different amendments referring to Paragraph 4 of the draft decision:

- Proposal by the Delegation of Australia: Deletion of the Paragraph 4 proposed in the draft decision and replacement with another text referring to the range of emerging issues related to workload, resourcing, governance and future challenges for the operation of the Committee and the *World Heritage Convention*.
- Proposals by the Delegation of Korea and Israel: slight adjustment of the existing text to add a reference to key issues regarding conservation, management and sustainable use of World Heritage properties
- Proposals by the Delegation of Israel: slight adjustment to add "...including issues of sustainable tourism" at the end of the existing Paragraph 4.

To summarize, the **Chairperson** declared paragraph 1 adopted as amended by Canada; paragraphs 2 and 3 adopted without any changes. A new Paragraph 4 proposed by Canada and then adopted.

She then asked Committee members their views about the amendment proposed by Australia to Paragraph 4 of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** called for a time-frame to be established for the amended texts.

In support of the Delegations of Australia and Kenya, the Delegation of **China** endorsed the proposed amendments, including the deletion of the Paragraph 4 of the draft decision, and referred to them as challenges that would have an impact on developing countries. It further supported the request by the Delegation of Kenya to have a time bound decision. The Delegation considered that staff funded by extra budgetary resources should not be included in the current discussions as that question would be addressed under another item.

Seeking clarification, the Delegation of **Brazil** asked whether there was not a potential conflict seen in Paragraph 4 regarding the issue of extra budgetary funding which was to addressed under another item; it supported the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Australia, which it considered positive.

The Delegation of **Israel** said, in support of the observations of the Delegations of Kenya and Australia, that it would support the proposal put forward by Australia with some indication of a time frame.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with the Delegation of Brazil that the issue of the funding did not belong to the agenda item under consideration and said that the matter should be discussed specifically at the appropriate place.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the proposal made by Australia.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** commended the World Heritage Centre on the great efforts it had made in accomplishing a wide range of activities and complying with the wishes of the Committee in preparing a clear, results-based report for the current session. The Delegation stated that, while the heart of the *Convention* lay in the protection of valuable heritage, all the elements of the 5Cs contributed to achieving that goal. It proposed to change the wording of the latter part of paragraph 4 of the draft decision to read: “and requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to identify extra budgetary funding and ensure adequate staffing for its continued development on key issues regarding the conservation, management and sustainable use of World Heritage properties”.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Australia.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed the establishment of an expert working group on the issue under discussion, to report back to the Committee session.

The Rapporteur read the different amendments to the decision as follows: paragraph 1 was adopted as amended by Canada, paragraph 2 and paragraph 3 were adopted without change, a new paragraph 4, proposed by Canada, was adopted whereas the former paragraph 4 was deleted at the request of Australia, and a new paragraph 5, proposed by Australia, was adopted as amended by Israel.

The **Chairperson** having no further interventions the decision was adopted as amended. Among other recommendations, it was proposed to set up a working group, but this proposal was not retained.

ITEM 16 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE 2006-2007 BUDGET AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2008-2009 BUDGET

ITEM 16A PRESENTATION OF ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2006 – 2007, PROVISIONAL STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2008 – 2009 BUDGET AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE BUDGET PROPOSED TO THE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/16A

Decision: **32 COM 16.1** and **32 COM 16.2**

and

ITEM 16B REPORT ON THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/16B

Decision: **32 COM 16B**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the Report on the Accounts of the World Heritage Fund for 2006 – 2007 and a provisional rate of implementation of the 2008-2009 budget, insisting on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund and on the necessary adjustments to the budget proposed to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the Committee was informed and was aware of the work of the Advisory Bodies and regretted that the funds were not being transferred to the Advisory Bodies in a timely fashion for services contracted.

The Delegation of **Barbados** said that the Committee needed to consider how the cash flow situation affected the Centre and how it would affect the integrity of the work that had to be done. The Delegation was concerned about the cash flow situation, particularly because late payment might compromise the work of the World Heritage Centre. It would like to have more information on all World Heritage Centre subcontracts and the schedule of payments.

The Delegation of **Australia**, while expressing sympathy with the Centre in its efforts to cope with a reduced budgetary situation, said that the World Heritage Fund should not be used to support the Centre's personnel costs. Such use would be unacceptable to Australia. It was also much concerned with the issue of outstanding payments due to ICOMOS. The Delegation would be happy to participate in the proposed working group on the issue.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether the funds provided by UNESCO to support UNESCO activities were subject to exchange rate fluctuations. The Delegation would likewise be willing to participate in the working group.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that the Committee had a serious issue with the budget and in support of the Delegation of Australia said that the United States of America could not condone the use of the World Heritage Fund for such purposes.

The Delegation of **Spain** stressed the importance of item 16B since it dealt with the sustainability of the Convention and gave an overall vision of the situation. Noting the negative effect of the currency exchange rate on the implementation of World Heritage programmes, Spain wished to be involved in the working group in order to help resolve the issues related to the financial situation of the World Heritage Fund.

IUCN, speaking on behalf of the Advisory Bodies, brought to the Committee's attention three major issues:

- a) the 20% loss in the budget allocated to them as a result of the depreciation in the United States dollar;
- b) In most instances the contracts only partially covered some of the additional work envisaged and not all relating to SOCs, evaluation of Statements of OUV, assessment of minor modifications etc
- c) The late receipt of both signed contracts and of the allocated funds was causing the Advisory Bodies to have to undertake missions and other support tasks in haste or late.

All of these circumstances created significant setbacks to the timely and adequate completion of the work contracted, and at the same time challenged the credibility of the convention in its execution.

ICOMOS, supporting the statement made by IUCN, added that the funds allotted by the World Heritage Centre needed to be increased not only to address the unfavorable exchange rate, but also for the expanding tasks related to the larger number of properties and unfunded projects.

The **Chairperson**, noting the importance of the item and the time required to discuss it in detail, proposed the establishment of a working group and called for volunteers for the group. She invited the following States Parties which had volunteered to form the working group: **Australia, United States of America, Bahrain, Barbados, Israel, Spain, Sweden and Kenya, the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat**, with **Israel** and **Australia** designated as Rapporteur.

Following points of clarification raised by the Delegations of **Israel** and the **United States of America**, the **Chairperson** specified that a working group on the budget would work on amendments to the draft decision and deal with issues that the Committee members wished to address.

ITEM 6 PROGRESS REPORTS ON FUNDING INITIATIVES

ITEM 6A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE AFRICAN WORLD HERITAGE FUND

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/6A

Decision: **32 COM 6A**

The **Chairperson** introduced item 6A, drawing attention to the Progress Report on the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) (Document *WHC-08/32.COM/6A*) and called upon the Observer Delegation of South Africa to report on the Fund's progress.

As interim chair of the Fund, former Chairperson Mr. Temba Wakashe thanked the Chairperson, the Committee for providing an opportunity to report on the Fund, and the Director-General and the Executive Board of UNESCO for supporting the Fund. Then, Mr. Wakashe introduced Mr. Webber Ngoro, Director of the African World Heritage Fund. Mr. Ngoro informed the Committee of the achievements in establishing the Fund, including the premises at the South African Development Bank, on the expected target for the endowment Fund and on the series of meetings that have taken place financed by the Fund. He noted that while the fund had secured \$5.5 million to date, that it was aiming to raise \$20 million by 2010 in order to ensure the Fund's sustainability.

The Committee was informed about on-going development of promotional tools such as a website, a strategic plan for 2008-2010, and other tools in Arabic, English and French for accessing support for the Fund. As regards priority projects, the Committee was informed that at its second meeting in March 2007, the Fund identified specific activities that will be

supported by the Fund to include updating the tentative list of Mozambique, preparation of a nomination file for Mbanza Kongo in Angola, the nomination of Meroe in Sudan, the preparation of a Tentative List for Lesotho and for assistance to Kenya in the preparation of the Kaya sacred Forests nomination.

Finally the Committee was informed of the Advocacy meeting held in Abuja, Nigeria from 24-25 April 2008, and that the meeting brought together 50 professionals from African State Parties. While the meeting was the first for the stakeholders, it focused on fund-raising strategy, launching of projects and programs and the promotion of the Fund among donors and the public, and follow up activities. Special thanks were extended to those States Parties that had in the past contributed to the Fund, including the Nordic World Heritage Fund, and the Central Bank of South Africa, and those that have recently contributed such as Spain, Egypt and Nigeria.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, thanking the Chairperson of the Fund's Board of Trustees, Mr. Temba Wakashe, acknowledged with gratitude the support provided by Spain and others, and called upon those present to continue to support Africa through the Fund in order to improve the World Heritage List and contribute to the conservation of World Heritage sites in Africa. He urged the appointment of someone to focus on resource mobilization for the funding. The Delegation called upon the Board of Trustees to assist in translating the documents into English, French and Arabic and urged African States Parties to contribute to the Fund.

The Delegation of **Spain** commended the presentation of the updated report by the Chairperson of the Fund's Board of Trustees and the Director of the African World Heritage Fund. Spain reaffirmed its commitment to the Fund, which had a leading role, and expressed its satisfaction with the reinforcement of capacity-building for the preparation of nomination files and the strengthening of institutional and operational structures. The Delegation hoped that once the funds were in hand they could be used for the preparation of the nomination files and for preservation activities. It stressed the importance of regular follow-up of activities and transparency, with the provision of clear information. The African World Heritage Fund needed assistance as it could be an example of good practice for the preservation of the world's heritage and the preparation of nomination files.

The Delegation of **Canada** thanked the Director of the African World Heritage Fund for the presentation. It congratulated the Fund's Director on the clear progress achieved to date and noted that it was encouraging to see that Africa was contributing to the development of its own fund.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** commended the establishment of the African World Heritage Fund which would greatly assist the African States. It expressed an interest in collaborating in the enhancement of capacity-building, especially in specific areas such as project design, project proposals and others. It also recommended the establishment of a regional database for resource personnel, so that African States Parties could use their expertise. The University of Mauritius and relevant Ministries were in a position to provide human resources. Mauritius would continue to support the African World Heritage Fund, and could also provide assistance through the secondment of officers who would be well-placed to assist in achieving the objectives set for African World Heritage.

La Délégation du **Maroc** remercie le Directeur du Fond pour sa présentation et rappelle l'importance de la réunion d'Abuja, qui s'est tenue en avril 2008 à l'initiative du Nigéria, et aimerait savoir ce qui s'est passé depuis en matière de renforcement des capacités. Le **Maroc** a également rappelé que le Fond a permis de traduire certains documents en arabe, ce qui a été très utile à la région arabe.

The Delegation of **Nigeria**, thanking the members of the Committee present and the Government of Canada for hosting the Committee session, and speaking on behalf of the African continent, stated that, while the ravages of war had taken their toll in many areas of the world, culture remained a factor of stabilization and cohesion among all nations of the world, and that there was a need for a regulatory body such as the present Committee, which, in accordance with its rules and procedure, would objectively take decisions on all matters and issues brought to its attention.

It emphasized the need for an equitable distribution of sites and the enhancement of the status of Africa. Nigeria fully shared that concern and had made itself part of the solution, for example by hosting and organizing the advocacy meeting of the African World Heritage Fund in Nigeria in April 2008, and pledging one million United States dollars to the Fund. It expressed gratitude to those countries outside the continent which had contributed to the Fund. Africa would count on the World Heritage Committee to encourage initiatives in Africa through capacity-building, networking and partnership, and strengthening South-South-North triangular cooperation in the field of cultural heritage promotion and protection.

It expressed gratitude to the States Parties that had supported Nigeria's candidature for election to the present Committee, and pledged its continued full cooperation and assistance in the work of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed satisfaction with the report, noting the priority to be given to the question of the Fund's assistance in preparing Tentative Lists. Regarding UNESCO Category II classification, it wondered what the added value would be for the Fund to be listed in Category II.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked Spain for its financial support to the African World Heritage Fund. For its part Egypt proposed to establish an institute for capacity-building and research in Cairo for the training of African students and experts in the field of archaeology.

Le Directeur général de l'**ICCROM** exprime toutes ses félicitations aux collègues qui ont présenté le document sur le Fond du patrimoine mondial africain ainsi qu'à M. Temba Wakashe et au Directeur du Fond, M. Webber Ngoro. Il exprime sa fierté de voir que c'est un collègue de l'ICCROM qui a été choisi pour être Directeur du Fond du patrimoine mondial africain. Le Directeur général de l'ICCROM se félicite d'une future synergie entre les activités menées par l'ICCROM en Afrique, notamment dans le cadre du programme Afrique 2009 mené en coopération avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et toutes les institutions de conservation en Afrique. Il passe ensuite la parole, à M. Joe King, responsable du projet susmentionné.

Mr Joseph King said that ICCROM was especially happy to note that the activities being planned were based on a strategic planning approach, and felt that that was the right way to move forward so as to be able to show clearly the results obtained.

ICCROM thanked the Director of the African World Heritage Fund for having specifically mentioned ICCROM and noted that the Advisory Body had agreed with the African World Heritage Fund to help in the planning of the upcoming course in Lesotho along with the other Advisory Bodies. ICCROM further pledged to continue its collaboration in the future on activities to build capacity to implement the *Convention*.

Finally, the Advisory Body noted in particular that, as AFRICA 2009 would be coming to an end in 2009, ICCROM was looking forward to working closely with the Fund and other stakeholders to develop a follow-up programme to be based in the region to continue the gains achieved over the past 10 years of the AFRICA 2009 programme.

Referring to the presentation concerning buffer zones, the Advisory Body observed that the distinction drawn did not mean that there could not be restrictions; indeed, there could be very strong restrictions in buffer zones but such restrictions were intended to protect the World Heritage site, not to protect the buffer zone per se; finally, if Outstanding Universal Value was present in the buffer zone, it should be part of the site.

IUCN thanked those who had supported the African World Heritage Fund and advised the Fund to focus on effective management of sites. It reiterated that IUCN was willing to play its part in fund- raising, particularly working within the framework of its Protected Areas Commission. The Advisory Body further informed the Committee about the forthcoming World Conservation Congress to be held in Barcelona, Spain, from 5 to 14 October 2008, and said that information on the Fund could be provided at that meeting.

ICOMOS welcomed the creation of the African World Heritage Fund, and reiterated its desire to cooperate with the Fund for the improvement of African sites.

The **Director of the Fund then responded to a number of the points raised by Committee members. Chairperson** called for comments on draft Decision **32 COM 6A**.

Decision **32 COM 6A** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 6B PROGRESS REPORT ON THE CREATION OF THE PACIFIC WORLD HERITAGE FUND

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/6B

Decision : **32 COM 6B**

The **World Heritage Centre** made a brief presentation, explaining that the Fund, which had been proposed by the States Parties of the Pacific at the 31st session of the Committee, had not yet been established. Discussions were ongoing concerning its possible format and modalities of operation. The World Heritage Centre had set aside USD 40 000 to contribute to a feasibility study. Further discussions on the Fund were to take place at a workshop organized by the Australian authorities in Cairns in October 2008. A thematic study had been prepared with the assistance of ICOMOS and would be distributed to Committee members.

The Delegation of **Australia** confirmed that a meeting was scheduled for the countries in the region in October 2008. The Delegation noted the inspiration drawn from the African World Heritage Fund, an impressive model that Asia was watching closely in the hope that it could build on lessons learned from that Fund.

The Delegation of **Kenya** welcomed the Pacific Region's initiative, noted the comments made by Australia, and said that Africa as the 'cradle of humankind' was ready to contribute as it had done in the past with the AFRICA 2009 programme which was now being replicated in other regions. The Delegation further concurred with the amendment proposed to paragraph 4 to reflect adaptation of the African Fund model to the region's needs.

Decision **32 COM 6B** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

ITEM 7.1 PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXPERT MEETING ON WORLD HERITAGE AND BUFFER ZONES

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7.1

Decision: **32 COM 7.1**

The **Secretariat** gave a brief introduction to document *WHC-08/32.COM/7.1*, related to the International Expert Meeting which had taken place in Davos, Switzerland, from 11 to 14 March 2008.

The **Rapporteur of the Expert Meeting** gave a detailed presentation of the key results of the meeting.

The **Chairperson** said that the discussion would be resumed at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 06.00 p.m.

SECOND DAY – THURSDAY, 3 JULY 2008

SECOND MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Christina Cameron

**ITEM 7.1 PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE EXPERTS MEETING ON
BUFFER ZONES (continued)**

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7.1

Decision: **32 COM 7.1**

The **Chairperson** invited participants to resume their consideration of item 7.1.

The Delegation of **Sweden** stressed the importance of analyzing cultural and natural values, as well as the impact of any activity on Outstanding Universal Value rather than whether it takes place in or outside the buffer zone. It was skeptical about introducing the new concept of “area of influence” as it would lead to confusion. It proposed amending paragraph 5 of the draft decision with the addition of “for revision at the 33rd session in 2009”.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** transmet ses remerciements au Centre du patrimoine mondial et aux experts qui ont travaillé sur le sujet des zones tampons, en soulignant que ces zones contribuent à garantir l'authenticité et l'intégrité du bien. La Délégation attire l'attention des membres du Comité sur la nécessité de porter ce sujet à l'attention de tous les Etats parties. La Délégation souligne qu'il est prématuré de prendre une décision et propose de différer l'adoption du projet de la décision afin de prendre le temps nécessaire à son étude sous différents angles.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, while acknowledging that the document prepared was well written, pointed out the need to proceed with caution if “buffer zone” was to be replaced by “area of influence,” as it might create more problems than there were at present. For example It expressed concern that such an expansion on the meaning of the term might prove unfair to those sites rejected on the basis of a lack of a buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Tunisia, stressing that, taking into account different angles, in particular legal implications, a detailed study of the subject was needed. It was absolutely necessary to obtain the opinions of all States Parties and to submit the issue to the next General Assembly. The Delegation was against the adoption of the draft decision or any amendment.

The Delegation of **Cuba** supported the proposal for a detailed study and wished to know which experts had been involved in the preparation of the recommendations.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the Delegation of Sweden's comments and expressed its skepticism concerning the introduction of the new notion of “area of influence”. It preferred to take more time before a decision was adopted, and questioned the reference to a paper publication in Paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested discontinuing the use of the term “core zone”, since it was not mentioned in the *Convention*, but only in the *Operational Guidelines*. The concept of buffer zone was sufficient. Furthermore, it was premature to publish a report of the meeting. It suggested that a lexicon and draft revisions should be circulated to States Parties for a more comprehensive discussion at the 33rd session of the Committee in 2009.

The Delegation of **China** commented that, although the report gave a clear definition of the concept of buffer zone, some problems needed further discussion, such as how to define buffer zones for certain categories of heritage property and careful consideration needs to be given to their potential impact on sites such as cultural landscapes.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, supporting previous interventions concerning the importance of a detailed study, appealed for a “slow approach” and opposed adoption of the draft decision.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, while indicating that the paper cleared up many issues for them, nevertheless also stressed the importance of taking more time to reflect on the issue, since the implications of the new concept could cause some legal and administrative problems when implementing the decision domestically.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne qu’il s’agit d’une question difficile et complexe qui doit être présentée lors de l’Assemblée Générale des Etats Parties. La Délégation souligne qu’une des questions principales est celle de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the work done by the experts was a good starting point, and debate on the issue should continue. It was against bringing the matter to the General Assembly as the matter was really one for debate amongst experts. It supported the recommendation made by the Delegation of Canada, adding that it would be useful to hear the views of the Delegation of Switzerland, host country of the experts meeting.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** obtient la parole en tant qu’Etat hôte de la Réunion internationale d’experts sur le patrimoine mondial et les zones tampons à Davos. La Délégation souligne que, grâce à cette réunion, de réels progrès ont été effectués en la matière, et félicite la ville de Québec pour son 400ème anniversaire tout en remerciant Mme Mechthild Rossler du Secrétariat et le Rapporteur de la réunion Mr Greg Terrill. La Délégation annonce son intention de poursuivre sa collaboration en invitant, fin octobre 2008, une réunion sur le tourisme durable.

IUCN, observing that the meeting had been valuable as it had been attended by many site managers from around the world, and the conclusions had been well-informed by their experience. It pointed out that there was a need for States Parties to recognize that the values of the OUV must be present in the actual site and not in the buffer zone, and noted that there was ongoing concern regarding buffer zones. The role of buffer zones in achieving the fifth “C” (community) objective of the strategic objectives should be further explored; establishing a buffer zone was not the only solution to the threats a heritage property faced. It also offered to advise further on those areas if requested.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft decision **32 COM 7.1**, paragraph by paragraph, and asked the Rapporteur to inform the Committee on the amendments received.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the proposals received would allow paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft decision to remain as they were, the proposed amendments made by the Delegations of Sweden, Jordan and Canada affecting paragraphs 4, 5 and 6. Canada and Jordan’s proposals suggest the deletion of these three paragraphs, Sweden having proposed an amendment to Paragraph 5. Jordan proposes replacing paragraphs 4, 5 and 6

by a reference to the decision taken concerning the experts' report and recommendations on buffer zones. Canada would insert four new paragraphs referring to buffer zones not being part of a property, requesting the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to use the word "property" instead of "core zone", and to prepare and circulate a draft revision of the *Operational Guidelines* accordingly, together with a lexicon of terms prior to the next session of the Committee. The Swedish amendment would be read at a later stage.

In reply to a question raised by the Delegation of Brazil regarding the relevance of the Paper Series publication referred to in Paragraph 3, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said there would be no problem since the Paper would not be a statutory document, but a meeting report of a technical nature which would be useful as background.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the suggestion made by the Delegation of Jordan to bring the issue to the General Assembly.

After declaring paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 adopted, the **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to read out the amendment proposed by Canada, and clarified that it was aimed at providing all States Parties with an opportunity to review the issue carefully.

The **Rapporteur** read out the relevant text proposed by Canada.

Following interventions by the Delegations of **Jordan** and **Brazil** regarding this proposal, the **Chairperson** and the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that it is the Committee which is authorized to make changes to the *Operational Guidelines* and not the General Assembly.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande de projeter le texte sur les écrans afin de faire avancer la discussion sur ce projet de décision; demande ne pouvant être satisfaite dû au manque d'équipement disponible dans la salle.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked whether the Rapporteur could read the amendments slowly for everyone to follow and move on with this draft decision.

La Délégation du **Maroc** réitère sa demande d'avoir le texte des amendements sur les écrans par la suite et demande que la Rapporteur lise les amendements proposés sans les commenter.

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Rapporteur** reads the amendment proposed.

In response to a further question by the Delegation of **Brazil** as to whether the issue considered was an interpretation of a provision of the *Convention*, the **Legal Adviser** said that it was up to the appreciation of the Committee and that it had been done historically by the Committee. If the Committee wished to bring an item to the General Assembly, it could do so.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, after congratulating Canada on the National Day, expressed their wish to adopt paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 despite the general tendency in favour of removing paragraphs 4 and 6. The situation was still unclear and it was absolutely necessary to undertake several evaluations from the legal, archaeological, sociological and other standpoints. It supported the postponement of this issue until the General Assembly.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne qu'il s'agit d'une question épineuse et que les membres du Comité sont partagés. Ils ne souhaitent pas rentrer dans le vif du sujet concernant les zones tampons.

The Delegation of **Jordan** specified that what it had meant was to take the matter to the States Parties Conference, not to the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that there might be some confusion between the UNESCO General Conference and the General Assembly, which is the gathering of all the States Parties.

The Delegations of **Kenya**, the **United States of America**, **China**, the **Republic of Korea** and **Sweden** supported the proposal made by Canada in order to ensure that all the States Parties were consulted and to allow more time for consideration on this important issue.

The **Rapporteur** read out the three paragraphs proposed by the Delegation of Canada, requesting the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to use the words “property” and “buffer zone” in all documents and not “core zone” any further; also requesting the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to prepare draft revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* taking account of the current Committee’s debates on the results of the experts meeting accompanied by a lexicon of terms; and finally, requesting the World Heritage Centre to circulate these draft revisions to States Parties so they can be considered by the Committee at its next session in 2009.

After discussion and interventions from the Delegations of the **United States of America**, **Morocco**, **Canada** and **Egypt**, Decision **32 COM 7.1** was adopted, as amended above.

ITEM 7.2 PROPOSAL FOR THE PREPARATION OF A REVISED RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING THE SAFEGUARDING AND CONTEMPORARY ROLE OF HISTORIC AREAS

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7.2

Decision: **32 COM 7.2**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the item, recalling that there had been very intense debate at the Committee sessions on new challenges which urban and historic areas were facing regarding heritage conservation and urban development. It was proposing the preparation of a new recommendation related to historic urban landscapes, which would be submitted to the UNESCO Executive Board the following spring and then, to the General Conference in 2009.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, drawing attention to the experts meeting on cultural mapping held in Jerusalem in June 2006, stressed that the matter should be considered with due regard for conformity with international law.

The Delegation of **China** agreed with the need to develop new UNESCO guidelines and suggested that the Committee should take a leading role by establishing a special working group of the States Parties, Advisory Bodies and other organizations in order to speed up the process.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** s’associe à tous les membres du Comité pour remercier le Canada. La Délégation pose une question concernant le paragraphe 4 du projet de décision. La Délégation précise que ces dernières datent de janvier 2008 et propose de supprimer le paragraphe 4. S’inquiétant des changements fréquents apportés aux Orientations, la Délégation demande si le Comité a l’intention de réviser à nouveau les Orientations. En se référant au paragraphe 47 des Orientations relatifs aux paysages culturels, la Délégation a exprimé son désir de voir les paysages urbains intégrés dans cette catégorie.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it was not clear in Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7.2* what exactly was being proposed. In its view, the Committee did not need to put the matter to the Executive Board. It felt that while there was no reference to urban landscapes that it might be considered under historic towns. It proposed the need for a policy paper on historic urban landscapes. It added that it had submitted amendments to the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, referring to the international workshop it had organized in Korea the previous year on the subject, and the declaration emanating from it. It stressed the importance of intersectoral collaboration in UNESCO, in particular between the World Heritage Centre and the Urban Planning programme of the Human and Social Sciences Sector.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it strongly supported the broadening exploration on urban landscapes and doubted that “preparing a road map for...” in Paragraph 6 fell within the mandate of the Committee, and indicates that it had submitted an amendment accordingly.

The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed with Bahrain and Australia and asked the World Heritage Centre to clarify the relationship between the involvement of the Director-General of UNESCO and the respective roles of the Executive Board and the Committee in this regard.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that at each Committee session the issue of conservation of historical landscapes came up when the State of Conservation was discussed for cities around the world.

The **World Heritage Centre** observed that the purpose of the discussion on the item was to inform the Committee on the process.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee of the several amendments proposed by the Delegations of Israel, Bahrain, Australia and the United States of America, Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remaining as they were in the draft decision. Two proposals were about changing Paragraph 4 (Australia) and inserting a new Paragraph 4 (Israel). Paragraph 5 was proposed for deletion by Australia and the United States of America. Paragraph 6 was proposed for deletion by Bahrain, the United States of America and Israel, or to be amended by Australia (withdrawn in favour of deletion).

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that it was drafting an additional preambular paragraph between current Paragraphs 2 and 3, and which will take note of the decision adopted at the 179th session of the Executive Board.

Taking into account proposals for amendment by the Delegations of the **United States of America**, **Brazil** and **Israel**, and comments by the Delegations of **Kenya** and **Bahrain**, Decision **32 COM 7.2** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 7.3 REPORT ON THE REINFORCED MONITORING MECHANISM

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7.3

Decision: **32 COM 7.3**

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the item.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested more information on the USD 35 000 mentioned in the document and how the Secretariat had arrived at that sum. It asked how many sites were involved and suggested that the item be reopened for discussion later.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** welcomed the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism as an important initiative and said that it should be applied to more sites and that more resources should be allocated to respond effectively to the increasing demand.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that the amount mentioned should be left open until all the reactive monitoring reports were completed.

The Delegation of **Canada** also questioned the USD 35 000 allocation, asking where and how the amount would be sought and used, and proposed amendments to the draft decision asking the Centre to establish a protocol with regard to the frequency and expected results of reporting.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the Delegation of Canada's proposals concerning the draft protocol and said that a timeframe for the mechanism should be decided by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** suggested merging the proposals of the Delegations of Brazil and Canada.

The Delegation of **Spain** asked whether the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was applicable for sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger only or for all properties. It also inquired whether the Committee could include more proposals on the list of sites established for Reinforced Monitoring at the current session or remove sites from the list.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained, on the subject of the USD 35 000 figure that it had arrived at that rough estimate on the basis of the missions undertaken, as indicated in Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7A*, and that an evaluation would be undertaken in 2009.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled Decision **31 COM 5.2**.

The Delegation of **Israel** commented that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was a positive development and inquired whether it could be used for all sites in order that they avoid Danger listing, not only those on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **World Heritage Centre** pointed out that Decision **31 COM 5.2** did not specify that it concerned danger-listed sites only and suggested that the Committee might wish to clarify the matter.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that it was an expensive mechanism and that it should be used cautiously.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should be used in specific circumstances only and should be documented in specific reports.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** endorsed the comments made by other members, observing that the mechanism was new, had no protocol and also had budgetary implications, and suggested that those issues could be addressed by preparing a protocol, following which it could be discussed by the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment to the draft decision proposed by the Delegation of Canada (additional paragraph between current paragraphs 3 and 4) requesting the World

Heritage Centre to develop a protocol for the implementation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to address the frequency of reporting, the expected results, the distribution of the reports and its cost.

Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were adopted without amendment.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked for further clarifications.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, supported by the Delegation of **Brazil**, asked whether a report on the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism would be presented to the Committee in 2009, and said that the Committee should wait for that report before discussing any changes.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled the extensive description of the way the mechanism operated to be found in the working document.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** requested the Delegation of **Canada** to elaborate on its proposals to avoid duplication.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its concern about the timing.

The **Rapporteur** proposed to add the words “*As part of*” or “*In the light of*” in the preambular part of the Canadian amendment, and that the paragraph should be left open.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed to that suggestion, pointing out that the amount should be decided after the budget discussions.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the amount would be left open until the conclusion of the budget discussions.

On that understanding, Decision **32 COM 7.3** was adopted as amended.

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

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/7A
WHC-08/32.COM/7A.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/7A.Add.2

Decisions: **32 COM 7A.1** to **7A.32**

Introducing the item, the **Chairperson** explained the rotation policy that would be adopted for the discussion of the State of Conservation of properties. The Committee would review items 7A and 7B, cultural properties followed by natural properties, by region, in the following order - Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa and finally, the Arab States.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to make its presentation on cultural properties.

ICOMOS highlighted specifically the need for sustainable development to sustain Outstanding Universal Value and deliver much needed social and economic benefits in preventing further threats to the properties. Concerning the issue of infrastructural development, the high-rise buildings and their impact on important views and visual integrity was pointed out. In this regard the threat of wind farms was for the first time brought to the attention of the Committee as a major theme which would need joint analysis for both cultural and natural heritage.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it wished to make some general comments on the item. It congratulated the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the high quality of State of Conservation documentation. It requested the World Heritage Centre to mention the year or period of International Assistance provided and sought clarifications on monitoring missions undertaken, asking whether all monitoring missions should be joint missions between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. The Centre's evolving role as a professional body rather than just a Secretariat to the *Convention* needed to be either reviewed or supportively expressed in its personnel capacity and budget. It also asked whether it was feasible to discuss boundary changes presented under item 8 at the same time as item 7A.

The Delegation of **Australia** endorsed the comments made by the Delegation of Bahrain and also questioned the need for all missions to be joint missions. It also suggested that a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be added within the State of Conservation report.

The **Chairperson** said that it was clearly necessary to tighten up State of Conservation presentation in terms of content and that the need for missions was to be decided by the Committee on an individual basis. She also requested the World Heritage Centre to answer Bahrain's question about combining discussions on items 8 and 7A.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded that it would be difficult to do so and did not recommend such an approach but left the decision to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** agreed that it would be very difficult to do so but suggested that the Secretariat should reflect on the matter in the coming year as such a method could generate some economies in time management.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C211 rev)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.20**

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the report and provided an update on the latest developments. Consolidation works had been carried out following major flooding in spring 2007 which had destroyed the gabions placed along the river to protect the foundations of the minaret and retaining walls, built by the Government with financial support from UNESCO through Italian and Swiss funds-in-trust. No recent measurements had been carried out to determine whether the minaret had moved. It had not moved between 2002-2006, following restoration of the lower section.

Further new developments included the holding of an Expert Group Meeting, which had taken place on 9 and 10 June at ICCROM in Rome, with Deputy Ministers of Culture and Tourism and the Government of Herat. The meeting had reviewed the current situation and formulated the prioritized action plan to achieve the State of Conservation Report, with available resources. Starting in summer 2008, priorities included surveying of the minaret, i.e. its leaning; investigation of the foundations; completion of the retaining wall (diaphragm); completion of documentation and cartography; development of a monitoring system covering various aspects (water, leaning, deterioration of glazed bricks, etc); and training throughout with ICCROM support (strategy). Some funds were available, but were not sufficient. An exhibition was currently being held in Kabul.

Decision **32 COM 7A.20** was adopted.

Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 rev)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.21**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of new developments concerning the approval and funding of four initiatives: the Bamiyan project was entering phase III which would be funded by Japanese funds-in-trust to the tune of USD 1.5 million, in continuation of phases I and II, with the focus on corrective measures; funding of United Nations-UNESCO demining operations (Japan) USD 400,000; funding from Germany Government through the ICOMOS national committee (150,000 euros) ; and the New Zealand Eco-Tourism Project funded in the amount of USD 1.2 million. A seventh Expert Group Meeting had been held on 12-13 June in Munich, Germany, with high-level participation from Afghanistan (three Vice-Ministers and a Governor), an action plan had been developed for the implementation of projects, with a significant capacity-building component, and a small advisory group had been established. The project would be presented in the context of a very important exhibition on Gandharan Art to be held in Bonn (Germany) later in the year.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested the Secretariat to explain paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft decision: how was it possible to establish a time-frame for the implementation of corrective measures while at the same time asking for a statement of Outstanding Universal Value?

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the corrective measures had been adopted by the Committee in previous decisions despite the fact that a full statement of Outstanding Universal Value was not available, as was the case for most properties inscribed before 2004.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it understood the security situation but suggested that a statement of Outstanding Universal Value could be prepared without undertaking a mission.

The **Chairperson** clarified that indeed no missions were proposed.

Decision **32 COM 7A.21** was adopted.

Property	Bam and its Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	C 128
State Party	Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.22**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that no further developments had taken place beyond those reported in the document. Progress was being made towards the Desired State of Conservation, especially in conservation and documentation of Arg-e-Bam (i.e. the Citadel), but work was still required to stabilize the structures; work was also in progress as far as the wider landscape was concerned (documentation, protection and management). With reference to Paragraph 5 of the draft decision, clarification of the issue of the inconsistency between the nomination file and boundaries was given.

Decision **32 COM 7A.22** was adopted.

Property	Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore
Id. N°	C 171-172
State Party	Pakistan

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.23**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that there had been no developments since the drafting of the report and that a mission could not yet be organized. The State Party report indicated that progress was being made towards the Desired State of Conservation, but considerable work remained to be done, particularly with regard to the actual removal of the illegal building and parking lot, establishment of a buffer zone (Shalamar Gardens and Fort); conservation and drainage works in accordance with approved plans; and redefinition of boundaries. In the draft decision it was mentioned that there would be another reactive monitoring mission, to assess the situation and define a time-frame for the implementation of corrective measures.

Decision **32 COM 7A.23** was adopted.

Property	Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras
Id. N°	C 722
State Party	Philippines

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.24**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that there had been no major developments with respect to the report contained in the document before it; the report submitted by the State Party was particularly well prepared and showed a deep understanding of the issues concerning the property and the challenges for its long-term conservation. A progressive erosion of traditional life systems had led to a deterioration of the tangible heritage. Now the question was to preserve as much as possible of what was

left of the intangible heritage and complement it with a new institutional, administrative and financial framework. That vision was reflected in the Conservation and Management Plan of 2004 which had still not been fully implemented for lack of resources and an effective management structure. Some important concrete progress had been made at the site, especially with the rehabilitation of 42 communal irrigation systems, the establishment of the Ifugao Cultural Heritage Organization and of its Project Development Unit, and awareness-raising activities. However, considerable efforts were still required to reverse the trend that had led to the site's inclusion in the Danger List. They included the development of a resource strategy to support the implementation of the 2004 Plan; the establishment of land-use zoning plans; the development of a community-based tourism business and rice marketing; the establishment of impact assessment procedures for proposed development; and continuation of education and awareness-raising activities. The World Heritage Centre suggested that the State Party representative might be given the floor to update the Committee.

The Delegation of **Israel** commended the twinning programme and asked for more details, suggesting that language be added to the draft decision to the effect that such partnership should be considered a model to be replicated for other properties.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded that it was still in an early phase, but that a visit by the Philippines site managers to the Cinque Terre World Heritage property in Italy was planned.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** considered that it was too early to add in the draft decision the language proposed by the Delegation of Israel; the Committee should wait for further development of the initiative and the Secretariat should provide a report to the Committee the following year.

The Delegation of **Spain** expressed satisfaction with the progress achieved in the preservation of the property and the collaboration established with universities. It requested a comment from the Secretariat on the advisability of modifying the boundaries of the property.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the State Party wanted to extend the property as a serial nomination.

The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** updated the Committee with the latest developments and commended the World Heritage Centre for its efforts. It assured the Committee that it would do its utmost to maintain the value of the World Heritage property by integrating its tangible and intangible aspects.

Decision **32 COM 7A.24** was adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Property	The Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and the Meidan Tower
Id. N°	C 958
State Party	Azerbaijan

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.25**

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the report, explaining that the State Party report dated 13 March 2008 noted some progress: the management structure had been established and protection and conservation activities carried out, and there was an overall improvement in the integrity of the area. Restoration and rehabilitation of the monuments had been undertaken and territorial development work carried out, including removal of illegal buildings, rehabilitation of historic roads and repair works in 33 residential buildings. The Integrated Area Management Action Plan had been established, although it had not been provided to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies. Information from various sources had been received indicating that numerous demolition, restoration, rehabilitation and rebuilding works were being carried out within the boundary of the World Heritage property without adequate planning and conservation procedures. On 5 May 2008 the Centre had sent a letter to the State Party and a reply letter dated 16 May 2008 had been received on 5 June 2008, including the Integrated Area Management Action Plan, prepared by the World Bank, which had been transmitted to ICOMOS for review. The letter reported that no illegal construction works had taken place, and all rehabilitation/conservation works had been carried out in accordance with the Management Plan. In addition it noted that the Urban and Conservation Master Plan was under preparation in coordination with ICOMOS and a statement on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was being prepared. The State Party invited a World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission for 2008/2009 to evaluate the situation and to assist in preparing a statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed the addition of two new paragraphs, one between paragraphs 7 and 8 of the draft decision, and one between paragraphs 8 and 9 of the draft decision, concerning demolitions and the extension of boundaries of the property.

Decision **32 COM 7A.25** was adopted, as amended.

Property	Dresden Elbe Valley
Id. N°	C 1156
State Party	Germany

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.26**

The **World Heritage Centre** updated the Committee about the latest developments. The German authorities had sent additional information on various alternative projects for the Elbe crossing, including an assessment of the feasibility of a tunnel, carried out by an independent engineering firm. On 14 November 2007, the Centre had been informed of a court decision taken which had ordered that the bridge be constructed immediately, according to the original plans that had been approved by the City Council. On 20 December

2007, the World Heritage Centre had received a letter from the German Permanent Delegation transmitting an invitation from the Mayor of Dresden to conduct a Reinforced Monitoring Mission to the site. That Reinforced Monitoring Mission had taken place on 4-5 February 2008, with an expert from the World Heritage Centre and from ICOMOS.

The mission noted that construction work on the Waldschlösschen Bridge had already started. The mission considered that the modifications made to the original design of the bridge testified to a genuine attempt to make it less intrusive, but the fundamental concept of the proposed construction had not changed. The preliminary evaluation by the mission was that the tunnel solution would obviously have less direct impacts on the Elbe Valley cultural landscape. The mission recommended that the construction of the foundation pillars be stopped in order not to prejudice the possibility of the choice of an alternative solution.

The Secretariat further explained that the detailed mission report had been sent to the authorities on 8 March 2008 for comments, and a specific Reinforced Monitoring report had been sent to the Permanent Delegation and Committee members by letter dated 8 April 2008. On 7 April 2008, the World Heritage Centre had received by email a letter from the Mayor of Dresden with comments on the mission report and recommendations. That letter had been discussed with the authorities during a meeting on 14 April 2008. The letter had raised several issues and to answer those queries the Secretariat had convened a meeting on 29 May 2008 with the Ambassador of Germany to UNESCO and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

The possibility of a referendum was currently being discussed by the court. No time-frame had been fixed for a decision. The Permanent Delegation of Germany had transmitted a statement by the City of Dresden dated 18 June to the Centre which summarized the overall situation of the bridge in Dresden, the referendum of 2005, the legal position under the German law, the tunnel proposal of 2007 – noting that there had been a petition for a referendum for the tunnel solution which was being dealt with by the courts; the slight shape modification of the 2008 version in relation to the previous versions of the bridge, changes to lighting and a one-metre reduction in width, as well as the current works that had been carried out since November 2007, including civil engineering works. The Mayor had made a plea for another extension of the deadline for a decision which had been transmitted to ICOMOS for review.

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to comment.

ICOMOS explained that, since the construction of the Waldschlösschen Bridge could not be stopped in spite of all public protest and was now being pushed forward, ICOMOS – by reference to the decision **31 COM 7A.27** of the World Heritage Committee– wished to comment once again on the allegedly altered plans which were presented in the brochure “Waldschlösschenbrücke 1997-2008” of January 2008, published by the City of Dresden.

The comparison of the “altered” project with the result of the competition of 1997 showed that in the meantime the old design of the bridge which severely affected the World Heritage was under construction in all major areas, including the connections to the city’s road network, and remained unaltered in accordance with the definitions of the planning approval procedure: the marginal “alterations” to the project were only cosmetic changes; therefore, they must still be regarded as a severe disturbance and not as an “alternate proposal” within the meaning of point 7 of Decision **31 COM 7A.27**.

ICOMOS made the following further comments on the individual “alterations”:

Lighting: Instead of the previously planned lamp-posts the lighting of the lanes was now largely integrated in the balustrade, which would alter the impression at night in that the light-band created by the lighting was lower. All the same, the construction at night would look like a barricade in the Elbe valley, also because of the traffic.

Stairs at the bottom of the arches: Apparently, the previously planned stairs in the area of the middle arch as an access from the lanes to the valley ground had been removed altogether, the intention being to make the bottom section of the arches up to the lanes look slimmer. However, ICOMOS believed that that was not relevant, since that effect was mostly only visible in the orthogonal depiction, not in the normal foreshortened crossovers and superpositions of the arch constructions. Moreover, the two abutments of the arches were planned to be built lower. That change of plan was somewhat surprising, because it reduced the safety of the construction in the case of ice drift without really improving the visual appearance of the middle area of the bridge.

Bridgehead on the right side of the Elbe: The entrance building into the tunnel on the right side of the Elbe was to be changed without altering the width of the tunnel mouth. The planned alterations to the stairs and the position of the lift between the valley ground and the higher terrace must be considered positive; furthermore, the banks planted with grass were to be enlarged in comparison with earlier concrete walls. The larger trees in blossom shown in the photomontage on page 16 could equally be depicted in the earlier state on page 15. All in all, such small horticultural interventions would not be able to conceal the massive construction.

The width of the bridge was to be reduced from 24.4 m to 23.4 m; however, that would also reduce the paths for pedestrians and cyclists as well as the emergency lanes. The four lanes projected in the planning approval procedure would remain, while their width was to be increased by 25 cm.

ICOMOS believed that the only marginally changed planning was no essential improvement of the situation. The four-lane, city highway-like construction defined in the planning approval procedure would remain; it would cross the Elbe valley as a very disturbing block and cut the valley into two separate areas. The indicated changes could only be considered cosmetic. The irreversible disturbance of the World Heritage values already defined during the report mission of 4 and 5 February 2008 could not be reduced by small visual changes.

Finally, under Paragraph 7 of Decision **31 COM 7A.27**, the World Heritage Committee had decided “to delete the property from the World Heritage List, in conformity with paragraphs 192-198 of the *Operational Guidelines* in the event that the construction of the bridge had an irreversible impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property”. The foundations for the nine pairs of pillars had largely been completed and the works on the access ramps on the left side of the river as well as on the tunnel on the right side were far advanced. Thus, the authorities in charge had created dynamics which could only be reversed with enormous effort and under the greatest difficulties; they were practically irreversible.

ICOMOS concluded that, under those circumstances, it was feared that there was hardly any hope that the tunnel solution, which it had also recommended as a compromise, would be realized.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for debate, noting that if delisting was decided it would be the first property to be delisted without the consent of the State Party. The World Heritage Centre had provided two options for consideration by the Committee, the first being that the Committee “regrets and delists” and the second being that the Committee “requests the State Party for the situation to be revised” and, if nothing was done, to propose delisting in 2009.

The Delegation of **Sweden** requested that a German non-governmental organization present in the room, the Faculty of Architecture of Dresden University of Technology, should be given the floor.

The **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee so agreed.

Professor Ralf Weber, Dean for Academic Affairs of the the Faculty of Architecture of Dresden University of Technology—for the tunnel initiative, took the floor to update the Committee. It thanked the Committee and expressed the hope that the Committee would not delist the site, requesting that it withhold its decision until the results of the two lawsuits under consideration as well as the result of the referendum were announced.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested that the Committee should wait for the results of the two court cases before taking any decision and suggested allowing a statement by the State Party.

La Délégation d'observation de l'**Allemagne** rappelle que son pays est un partisan fidèle de la Convention et qu'il acceptera toute décision du Comité. En revanche, l'Allemagne ne demandera pas elle-même le retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. En tant que bien du patrimoine mondial, Dresde n'appartient plus uniquement à l'Allemagne mais au monde entier. La délégation soutient le maintien du bien sur la Liste et ainsi que l'Option 2 où il est demandé à l'État partie d'interrompre immédiatement les travaux de constructions actuels et de redonner au bien son état de conservation antérieur. Elle croit que les décisions attendues des tribunaux seront prises avant la fin de cette année.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** stated that deletion in the case under consideration would be an unprecedented and tragic decision and would frustrate civil society in Dresden. It suggested waiting until the courts had ruled. Deletion as punishment and an example to other States Parties would be easy but it was wiser to be humane and patient and seek amicable solutions. It would prefer the second option.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, regretting that the case had been on the table for such a long time already, urged the Committee to understand the position of the people of Dresden and their expectations from the Committee. Dresden's leadership did not seem to be listening to their wishes and the Committee should not allow itself to be led into the same trap. It agreed with the Delegation of Nigeria that the Committee should wait and give a chance to the State Party which had always been a strong supporter of the Convention. However, the State Party should be warned that if it did not undertake the measures requested the property would be deleted at the next session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed with the suggestions made by Nigeria and Kenya to give another chance to the people of Dresden.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its concern for the people and NGOs involved. It was also concerned about the conflict between two of the 5Cs: Community (and NGOs) and Credibility. It added that Option 2, as written, was not acceptable: Indeed, Paragraph 6 of the draft decision considered that the work "already implemented" would irreversibly damage the property. It added that this option would only be acceptable if it said the work "planned" would irreversibly damage the property. It suggested the need for monthly monitoring.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** est convaincue que tout doit être fait pour maintenir Dresde, en tant que bien qui appartient à l'humanité entière, sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle reconnaît que nous sommes là confrontés à un cas où les considérations économiques sont en conflit avec celles de la culture, mais un projet s'appuyant purement sur l'économie ne peut être durable. Elle propose de garder le bien sur la Liste et d'attendre que la bonne décision soit prise par les autorités locales.

The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its conviction that the issue was one of great importance, and recalled that the *Convention* was an example of multilateralism. When one country failed, all failed, as World Heritage was the responsibility not only of one country but

of all. Stating that it appreciated ICOMOS' report, the Delegation supported Option 2 and the solution to build a tunnel instead a bridge. The authorities of Dresden should know that the Committee was determined to delete Dresden from the World Heritage List if its expectations were not met and suggested strengthening the wording of the decision in paragraph 11 to express the Committee's will to delete the property from the list if there was no change. However, another chance should be given to stop the plans for the bridge and construct a tunnel.

La Délégation du **Maroc** est également favorable à l'Option 2, après avoir entendu les déclarations de l'Etat partie, des ONG et des membres du Comité. Elle considère que nous avons besoin de temps, ainsi que l'Etat partie, pour y voir plus clair. Elle ajoute qu'en 2009, il y aura assez d'éléments pour pouvoir décider.

-

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Israel to amend Paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Brazil** joined the consensus for Option 2 and said that it would be regrettable if the property was delisted; it evoked the delisting of a property at the previous session even though it had been at the request of a State Party and said that it was the duty of the Committee not just to put sites on the list but also to maintain them on it.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** concurred with the other Committee members to keep the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and amend the draft decision as proposed by the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** also expressed support for Option 2 with an amended text. It congratulated the NGOs working for the site to remain on the List while sympathizing with the people of Dresden.

The Delegations of **Israel, Canada, Peru, China** and **Madagascar** agreed with the proposed Option 2 on the condition that a strong recommendation be made to the State Party that if the construction continued the site would be delisted the following year.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested clarification from the Legal Adviser whether the Committee could take the decision as proposed in the amendment proposed by Israel.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed solidarity with the citizens of Dresden and NGOs and suggested that the Committee wait until the following year to take a decision.

The **Legal Adviser** confirmed that the Committee had the prerogative to express a firm intention to delete a property if certain conditions or problems still existed.

ICOMOS emphasized once again that the work already undertaken had had a detrimental effect on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property but was not as yet irreversible; it would, however, become so unless the property was restored to its original condition. It noted that that would entail massive expenditure and a tremendous amount of work for the State Party.

The **Chairperson** suggested that Option 2 be adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read out the paragraphs of the draft decision: paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were adopted as stated. The Delegations of Morocco and Israel proposed amendments to Paragraph 5.

La Délégation du **Maroc** clarifie en proposant de remplacer « regrette » par « déplore profondément ».

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that the word “Deplore” be replaced by “Deeply disappointed” as it had a very extreme connotation.

La Délégation du **Maroc** estime que le mot “déplorer” convient en langue française, mais demande à l’ADG/CLT de se prononcer là-dessus.

L’**ADG/CLT** remarque que « déplorer » exprime un sentiment plus émotionnel que « regretter », en précisant que dans ce cas un mot exceptionnel serait utilisé pour une situation exceptionnelle.

The **Rapporteur** read out Paragraph 5, which achieved the consensus of the Committee. Paragraph 6 was to be amended as per the suggestions of the Delegations of Morocco and Israel.

The Delegation of **Australia** referred to the statement of ICOMOS regarding Outstanding Universal Value but said that a threshold must be found and suggested that Paragraph 6 be retained as in the draft decision.

The Delegations of **Canada** and **Kenya** recalled that Paragraph 6 dealt with the damage already caused which had already had a very negative impact.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed that Paragraph 6 should remain as it was and that Paragraph 5 should be amended.

La Délégation du **Maroc** exprime son inquiétude quant aux travaux réalisés, en précisant que dans le cas où ceux-ci ont déjà porté atteinte à la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, le Comité devrait prendre ses responsabilités. Selon elle, la décision doit faire mention des travaux futurs et non des travaux déjà réalisés.

ICOMOS stressed once again that if the work undertaken was not reversed the damage would be irreversible.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with the proposal made by the Delegation of Israel but said that consideration should be given to damage done to the Outstanding Universal Value as opposed to its disappearance.

ICOMOS responded that a threshold should be established for the safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value; in the case under discussion the landscape had already suffered a huge impact and if the work was not undertaken to reverse that, the Outstanding Universal Value of the site would no longer be present.

The Delegation of **Brazil** concurred with ICOMOS.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** demande si, dans le cas où la construction du pont était abandonnée, le bien récupérerait sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

ICOMOS responded that the underground work on the foundations could not be removed whereas the work above the ground could be restored to its original condition, thus restoring the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it believed that the foundations could be removed. Comparing the situation with the case of the deletion of the Omani property from the World Heritage List in 2007, it stated that, while the Oman property had lost its Outstanding Universal Value, that was not the case of Dresden.

Paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

The Delegations of **Egypt, Brazil and Kenya** agreed on the phrasing of the amendment to Paragraph 6 and asserted that a strong message should be conveyed to the State Party informing it that the work undertaken should not only be stopped but reversed for it to retain its Outstanding Universal Value.

Paragraph 6 was adopted as amended.

Paragraphs 7 and 8 were adopted without any change, and Paragraph 9 was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that a progress report be presented as relevant.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraphs 10 and 11.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** felt that it was difficult for the property to be restored to its original condition by the following year if the State Party undertook work on a tunnel. If the Committee adopted a hard line the efforts it had been trying to build would be undermined. Germany should be assisted in conserving the common world heritage.

The Delegation of **Israel** replied that if the property was not restored then the Outstanding Universal Value would be lost.

The Delegation of **Spain** stressed that it was important to demonstrate the Committee's goodwill and stated that the solution of a tunnel would allow the property to recover its cultural landscape.

The Delegation of **Kenya** once again stressed that the Committee should not be soft on taking the decision to delist the property if the damage to the site was not reversed.

Decision **32 COM 7A.26** was adopted, as amended.

The meeting rose at 06.30 p.m.

THIRD DAY – FRIDAY, 4 JULY 2008

THIRD MEETING

9.00 a.m. – 01.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

ITEM 7A STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (continued)

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/7A
WHC-08/32.COM/7A.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/7A.Add.2

Decisions: **32 COM 7A.1 to 32 COM 7A.32**

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Property	Medieval Monuments in Kosovo
Id. N°	C 724 bis
State Party	Serbia

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.27**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the State Party had reported that access to the site was difficult on account of the political situation. Although the State Party had confirmed that a check-up on the state of the property had been scheduled for February 2008 and a follow-up report was to be submitted, no such report had been received. The Centre had, however, receive a draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value which had been preliminarily reviewed by ICOMOS. It had been transmitted to the Venice Office and a mission team dispatched to Kosovo from 1 to 3 July 2008 to visit two sites of the serial property in the framework of the follow-up to the Donors Conference in Kosovo. The reviewed statement of Outstanding Universal Value would be presented to the Committee in 2009.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** observed that the Committee should take into consideration that the Government of Kosovo had declared independence from Serbia. The decision should not pose any obstacles to practical steps to address conservation issues, but the Delegation sought the opinion of the Legal Adviser on the issue.

The **Legal Adviser** provided information on the situation concerning Serbia and Kosovo. The three main points were that: (a) the United Nations, as such, did not recognize the independence and sovereignty declared by Kosovo, although several Member States had so far recognized it; (b) for the United Nations, Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) continued to apply with adjustments to the realities on the ground and what the Secretary-General referred to as the “changing circumstances”; and (c) Kosovo itself pledged continued adherence to resolution 1244 (1999), thus allowing for the continued presence of

the international administration led by UNMIK which was still vested by the international community with the authority to oversee the development of the self-governing institutions of Kosovo. Consequently, until such time as a final settlement is reached, Kosovo would continue, as far as the United Nations was concerned, to be under United Nations administration and supervision, in accordance with resolution 1244 (1999), despite its declaration of independence, and UNESCO would have to continue to act through UNMIK and in cooperation with it as far as its technical assistance activities in Kosovo were concerned.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** read out its amendments to the draft decision in paragraphs 3, 6, 7 and 8, suggesting that the term "State Party" be deleted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked whether the Delegation of the United States of America **would** accept a reference to the State Party of Serbia in brackets within the name of the property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it preferred the name of the property to be given without indication of any name of State.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that paragraph 9 be amended. It also asked why the Committee was afraid of not mentioning the country name, Kosovo.

The Legal Adviser said that within the UN system Kosovo was not yet considered an independent State. The UNMIK is responsible for the administration under the resolution and that situation has not changed. Kosovo is located in the territory of Serbia, but the Serbian authorities do not administer Kosovo. That is the legal situation. If the Committee wishes to make adjustments within that legal context, that was for the Committee to decide.

The Chairperson said it was her understanding that the proposed amendment from the United States would qualify as a practical adjustment.

The Legal Adviser said that, as he understood it, the United States was not attempting to say in this resolution that Kosovo is independent but was rather trying to find a solution whereby no position is visible as to the status of Kosovo. If Serbia was retained, the implication is that Kosovo is located on the territory of Serbia, which would be in line with resolution 1244. It becomes a practical matter if reference to Serbia was removed. With whom will the Committee and Secretariat deal concerning Kosovo? Up to now it was UNMIK. But if the Secretariat did not have clear instructions on that issue, it would need to know if the partnership with UNMIK can continue. Within the legal framework there is a certain leeway, but it comes back to practical questions. A question of labels as to where Kosovo is located: The Legal Adviser suggested some variations for consideration - Kosovo site nominated by Serbia, or variations. The Secretariat needs guidance on this regarding the work to be done.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that the United Nations authorities could continue to abide by the framework of United Nations Security Council resolution 1244, and indeed noted that there was a footnote in the document before the Committee that indicates that UN Security Council resolution 1244 continues to apply and the Legal Adviser has informed us that this is the legal framework within which UNESCO operates per guidance from the Secretary-General in New York, as it was sufficient to provide clear legal guidance to the World Heritage Centre and UNESCO, and that a new decision could be made at a later date if necessary. Should that situation change, the Secretary General of the United Nations can be expected to issue a new decision if appropriate and UNESCO can abide by that decision. In the future, when there is an end to the transition, the Committee could then regularize the language in this resolution to reflect the new situation.

The **Chairperson** proposed to work through the draft decision with the amendments made by the Delegation of the United States of America and come back to the Legal Adviser at the end for reassurance that they are within the legal framework as prescribed.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** pointed out that the title above the decision also needed to be amended, to reflect paragraph 9.

The **Legal Adviser** stated that, in order to avoid possible misunderstanding, it should be noted that the amendments applied only to the text of the decision under consideration. They did not change the fact that Serbia was the State Party to the Convention, not Kosovo, and that the Secretariat would continue the existing practice of referring to Serbia in lists, documentation, agenda items, headings, etc. with regard to the property concerned. It was also said that, even if it is not written specifically in this text, the Secretariat will also have to interact with Serbia as a State Party to the Convention. For practical reasons, the Secretariat will also have to deal with UNMIK which acts as the intermediary with the local authorities. This has to be made clear so that there are no misunderstandings.

Decision **32 COM 7A.27** was adopted as amended.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Property	Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works
Id. N°	C 1178
State Party	Chile

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7A.28**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that, by the end of March 2008, emergency interventions had been fully executed on the nine properties most affected. The second stage of the Programme, financed by the Consejo de Monumentos Nacionales and partly by the World Heritage Fund under international assistance, was planned and was currently out for tender. The regulation for the buffer zone had been pending since the Zoning Plan had been submitted for environmental impact assessment. Also, the Ministry of Public Works had submitted a proposal for re-routing road A-16, and relocating the connection to road 5 further south. Technical and administrative archives are in place to improve the social memory of the property. The World Heritage Centre concluded that the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre recognized that important efforts had been made in accordance with the corrective measures identified by the Committee; however greater emphasis should be placed on defining controls of the buffer zone and on a medium-term financial programme to undertake priority interventions.

The Delegation of Spain congratulated the State Party of Chile for the progress made since the previous session of the Committee, and also for the study provided and the proposal for an alternative layout of road A-16. Taking into account all the progress made concerning the re-routing of the road, the completion of the first phase of programme and the process for

management plan implementation, Spain considered that the property should not be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Decision **32 COM 7A.28** was adopted.

Property	Chan Chan Archaeological Zone
Id. N°	C 366
State Party	Peru

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.29**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that, according to the report submitted by the State Party, much progress had been made in implementing corrective measures in terms of management, sustainable funding and archaeological consolidation works. Regulatory measures, however, had not been put in place and no solution had been found either for the illegal occupation of the property or for the relocation of illegal occupants. The World Heritage Centre also indicated that the boundaries of the buffer zone had been revised and restoration of the perimeter walls of the property was in progress. There were increased concerns about stabilizing the rising water table levels and vegetation in the property-

The Delegation of Spain congratulated the State Party of Peru for all the progress made but noted that some questions still remained, such as the date of the implementation of the law protecting the property as well as the selection of excavations, as it was not necessary to excavate the whole site.

The Chairperson requested the State Party of Peru to answer the three questions asked by the Delegation of Spain: (1) Date of approval of the legal standard (2) Impact of the earthquake and (3) The recent action and archaeological plan in terms of archaeological excavations and whether they are selective or otherwise.

The Delegation of **Peru** responded to say that a legal process had been initiated in order to proceed with the relocation of illegal occupants on the property and explained that the law had been voted but that regulatory measures prescribed in the law had yet to be approved. The National Institute of Culture (INC) had continued to elaborate the regulation. The State Party still did not know the exact date of implementation of those legal measures. Furthermore, it reported that the property had not suffered damage from the 15 August 2007 earthquake. The Delegation confirmed that no excavations were being undertaken, and explained that whatever archaeological methodology was being applied at the site was for structural consolidation. The excavations which started in 2007 continued in 2008. The Delegation stated that the master plan was fully respected, as were all the works. Progress had been made in terms of geo-reference, thanks to the support of the City of Trujillo and the Italian Government.

Decision **32 COM 7A.29** was adopted.

Property	Coro and its Port
Id. N°	C 658
State Party	Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A.Add.2

Decision: **32 COM 7A.30**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that a reactive monitoring mission had been undertaken in May 2008 and progress was confirmed. An endowment of US\$32 million had been established for the consolidation of buildings and the drainage system. A social campaign to improve public awareness of earthen architecture had been developed and had resulted in the publication of a book, thus providing a basis for reinforced training. The plan was expected to be signed by the President in two weeks' time. Although it had not yet been signed, a management structure was already in place.

The Delegation of **Kenya** applauded the good work that had been done by the traditional workers and said that that should be reflected in the decision. It wondered why a presidential signature was needed.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked where the "recommendations made by the reactive monitoring mission" referred to in paragraph 6 of the draft decision could be found.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated that its Government would like to offer Venezuela its technical staff and the experience and knowledge gained in Chan Chan regarding earthen architecture, if it could be useful.

The Delegation of **Israel** stressed the importance of help and assistance by other States Parties. Does this also deal with capacity-building and preparatory workshops?

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande des précisions sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien à l'origine.

The Delegation of **Spain** reiterated its commitment to Coro and stated that the Spanish Fund was willing to contribute financial and technical resources to support the organization of a meeting for the workers on the issues raised.

The Chairperson said there were three questions (1) What are the recommendations which were to be endorsed (2) Capacity-building or awareness within the community (3) whether the original nomination inscribed had included a statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

Responding to questions, the **World Heritage Centre** said that the reactive monitoring mission report, which included the recommendations, was on the World Heritage Centre website. The workshop mentioned was a part of training activity conducted by a local university, for the people inside the community, and the Agencia Espanola & Cooperacion International. Regarding the statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property, it should be reviewed, since the inscription had been made in 1993. The World Heritage Centre added that it was implementing a retrospective inventory exercise for the Latin America and the Caribbean region.

The Chairperson asked if there were any further questions or issues.

The Delegation of **Israel** wished to add an amendment after paragraph 4, and noted that paragraph 7 should come before paragraph 6. It asked whether it had been decided that Outstanding Universal Value is with or without capitals.

The **Chairperson** said that it was usually with capitals.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed amendments to paragraphs 3 and 5.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendments.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said a minor adjustment was necessary.

Decision **32 COM 7A.30** was adopted as amended.

AFRICA

Property	Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara
Id. N°	C 144
State Party	United Republic of Tanzania

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A.Add.2

Decision: **32 COM 7A.14**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that a joint ICOMOS/World Heritage Centre mission had visited the property from 1 to 6 June 2008 and had evaluated the State of Conservation of the property. The mission, while recognizing the efforts made by the State Party to improve the State of Conservation of the property, had noted that much work remained to be done, including the implementation of management and conservation plans and placement of management staff on-site. The World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS joint mission had outlined a six-point Desired State of Conservation for the property's removal from the Danger List and recommended a five-year time-frame, underlining the changes required for that purpose.

The Delegation of **Kenya** indicated its surprise that five years were needed to remove the property from the Danger List. It asked for clarification of what was meant by "70% of the number of buildings". It stressed the importance of teaching people to coexist with the site. It further observed that climate change would have a huge impact on the site and needed to be addressed by the State Party. It also raised the question as to how the World Heritage Centre would assist the State Party, instead of leaving sole responsibility to the State Party.

The **Chairperson** was requested and gave permission for the Delegation of Tanzania to speak.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** thanked the Governments of France, Japan and Norway for the assistance that they had provided and appealed to other Committee members to assist in removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** suggested an amendment to the draft decision, putting property extension in a separate paragraph, rather than under 'corrective measures'.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested adding a time-frame.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that the Desired State of future Conservation for the site in question would be a good model for other properties on the Danger List, since most of those did not have a Desired State of Conservation. It suggested requesting further guidance from the Advisory Bodies as to the content of the Desired State of Conservation.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked the World Heritage Centre to specify what was meant by “at least 70% rehabilitation of the heritage monuments” in paragraph 7.

The **World Heritage Centre** answered that “70 %” referred to the number of the monuments in the area.

After interventions from the Delegations of **Kenya, Bahrain** and **Israel** on the proposals for amendment, Decision **32 COM 7A.14** was adopted as amended.

ARAB STATES

Property	Abu Mena
Id. N°	C 90
State Party	Egypt

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.15**

Le **Secrétariat** explique que l'élévation de la nappe phréatique, en raison d'un programme d'irrigation et des effondrements de structures, avait provoqué la mise en péril du bien en 2001. Depuis cette date, le Comité a encouragé les autorités égyptiennes à prendre des mesures pour interrompre le processus de dégradation.

En novembre 2005, la mission de suivi réactif demandée par le Comité à sa 29e session a considéré que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien était malgré tout maintenue, mais que différentes actions étaient à mener d'urgence, notamment :

- Une étude de l'état des vestiges
- Des mesures urgentes de consolidation et de conservation
- L'abaissement de la nappe phréatique
- La mise en place d'un système de surveillance du niveau de la nappe
- L'élaboration d'un plan de conservation à court, moyen et long terme
- Des consultations avec les parties prenantes (notamment la communauté de Mar Mena, le monastère installé à proximité du bien) pour la préparation d'un plan de gestion.

Parmi ces dernières, le rapport transmis par l'Etat partie indique la mise en œuvre d'un certain nombre d'activités, à savoir :

- L'élaboration du projet d'abaissement de la nappe phréatique devrait être achevée d'ici un an, et le système de surveillance mis en place ;
- Certaines structures sont en cours de consolidation ;
- Le plan de conservation a été élaboré et sera mis en œuvre après l'achèvement des travaux de drainage ;
- Une zone tampon a été définie et une clôture du site est prévue.

Cependant, le rapport de l'Etat partie est extrêmement bref (une dizaine de lignes) et ne donne aucun détail sur ces activités. Il n'est donc pas possible d'évaluer leur réalisation.

Le projet de décision qui vous est soumis (p. 47 fr et 45 ang) demande à l'Etat partie de poursuivre la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, supported by the Delegation of **Israel**, expressed concern, as the site was sacred for Egypt, Egyptians and Christian Egyptians. It stated that progress had been made in every direction and hoped that the decisions of the Committee and ICOMOS would serve as a dialogue for hope.

Decision **32 COM 7A.15** was adopted.

Property	Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat)
Id. N°	C 1130
State Party	Iraq

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.16**

Le **Secrétariat** explique que le rapport transmis par l'Etat partie signale une dégradation due à l'érosion et aux infiltrations des eaux du Tigre dans la partie orientale du bien et insiste sur la nécessité d'intervenir rapidement. Malgré les consultations avec le Ministère des ressources en eau, aucune solution n'a encore été trouvée et l'Etat partie demande l'assistance du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'ICOMOS pour protéger le site et préparer un plan de gestion.

L'Etat partie a établi une liste d'actions prioritaires, en particulier la consolidation et la restauration des structures en terre dont l'état se détériore de façon alarmante, notamment la Porte de Tabira et la ziggurat.

Néanmoins, le rapport indique que la gestion et le gardiennage du site sont assurés et que des mesures ont été prises contre les fouilles illégales.

Le projet de décision demande à l'Etat partie de faire son possible pour mettre en œuvre des mesures urgentes.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested more information from the World Heritage Centre regarding the issues that affected the site, such as the effect of police being positioned on site.

The **World Heritage Centre** replied that it was extremely difficult to obtain information as it was impossible for a mission to go to the site and the only information it had received was from the State Party and the State Board of Antiquities and Heritage.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested that the State Party of Iraq be invited to comment.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** attire l'attention du Comité sur le fait que les deux sites qui viennent de lui être présentés, Abu Mena et Ashur, doivent faire face à des problèmes d'érosion et de dégradation liés à la construction en terre. Se référant à son expérience

personnelle, le délégué de la Tunisie rappelle que l'architecture de terre, que l'on trouve dans plusieurs régions du monde, rencontre des obstacles parfois insurmontables et que sa restauration est très onéreuse. Il exhorte le Comité à orienter ses recherches pour aider la sauvegarde de ces architectures dégradables.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed concern and understanding regarding the need to conserve the site and called on the Committee for efforts beyond simply Danger Listing to remove it from the Danger List.

The Delegation of Jordan stated that it was difficult to implement capacity-building measures given the problematic situation in the country.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer State Party of Iraq to comment.

The Observer Delegation of Iraq drew the Committee's attention to the fact that it was awaiting new information from the Director of the State Board of Antiquities but, on account of the situation in Iraq, he had been unable to attend the meeting. It should be borne in mind that the country still lacked stability and that it was difficult for the Iraqi people to take any action as long as the situation in Iraq prevented accessibility of information.

The Delegation of **Kenya** reiterated the severity of the situation and the fact that it was the responsibility of the international community and the World Heritage Centre to assist the State Party.

Further to that comment, the Delegation of **the United States of America** proposed adding the term "by all means" in paragraph 7 of the decision.

The Delegation of **Jordan** said it shared the concern of the Delegation of Kenya.

La Délégation du **Maroc** précise que le Comité se trouve face à un problème complexe, aggravé par une situation politique instable et des problèmes de sécurité. Il propose d'appliquer le mécanisme de suivi renforcé à ce bien.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed to include in the decision the list of corrective measures identified.

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested adding "under the supervision of ICOMOS" in paragraph 7.

ICOMOS welcomed the mention of ICOMOS but would prefer "with advice from ICOMOS" to "under the supervision of ICOMOS."

The Delegation of **Egypt** specified that by "supervision" it meant the sending of experts to the site.

The **Chairperson** clarified that that would be done in collaboration with the State Party. She further took it that, since the proposal from Morocco for Reinforced Monitoring had received no reaction, it would be retained.

The **Rapporteur**, summing up, said that paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4 remained unchanged. Paragraph 5 would be amended to include the corrective measures (a) to (e) as identified in the SOC Report. Paragraph 6 would remain unchanged. Paragraph 7 would call upon the international community to assist the State Party in every way possible in the protection of the property with advice from ICOMOS. Paragraph 8 would remain unchanged.

In response to a request for clarification by the Delegation of **Israel** regarding collaboration between the State Party and ICOMOS, the **Chairperson** said that the debate was between “advice” and “supervision” and that ICOMOS preferred “advice”.

Decision **32 COM 7A.16** was adopted as amended.

Property	Samarra Archaeological City
Id. N°	C 276 rev
State Party	Iraq

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.17**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** présente brièvement l'état de conservation du bien. Il souligne que les problèmes de conservation y sont plus aigus et complexes qu'à Assour, étant donné qu'il s'agit d'une ville vivante. Le rapport de l'Etat partie a été reçu le 12 février 2008. Les mouvements continus de véhicules militaires sur les vestiges archéologiques et autres activités militaires à l'intérieur du bien sont préoccupants. Les problèmes de sécurité rendent le travail de maintenance difficile. A ce jour, le Centre n'a pas reçu de nouvelles informations.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked for the same addition as had been made in paragraph 6 of the draft decision on the Ashur property to be inserted in the decision on Samarra.

The Delegation of **Jordan** proposed that a mission to Samarra be organized and that, given the proximity of the site to Ashur, a coordinated mission be organized for both sites.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Ashur decision was now closed, but that there was no objection to reopening it if Jordan put its request in writing. She also asked for clarification whether it was a joint WHC/ICOMOS mission being requested by Jordan.

The Delegation of **Jordan** replied in the affirmative.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** asked for inclusion of a note that the State Party should ensure that the heritage was not impacted by human-induced disturbances.

The **Chairperson** asked for the proposed amendments to be submitted to the Rapporteur in writing.

Le **Directeur général adjoint à la Culture** informe le Comité que l'UNESCO, en tant qu'agence des Nations Unies, n'a pas le droit d'entrer sur le territoire de l'Irak. Une mission conjointe, constituée de représentants de l'UNESCO et des organisations consultatives, n'est donc pas envisageable.

The **Chairperson** noted that the sentence could still be included in the event that the situation changed.

The Delegation of **Jordan** proposed to add "... should the situation allow it..."

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that, regarding the joint mission, the discussion went back to the question of whether joint missions were necessary. If ICOMOS was able to fulfill that mission on its own, did it have to wait until the situation changed regarding United Nations accessibility to Iraq?

The Delegation of **Jordan** clarified that by “joint mission” it meant a mission to both sites (Ashur and Samarra).

ICOMOS pointed out that, even if the mission were to be carried out only by ICOMOS, there would still be a problem given that the mission would be requested by the Committee – a United Nations body - and therefore a mission would not be possible.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed that one way of circumventing the problem would be to ask the State Party to invite ICOMOS rather than having the Committee request the mission.

ICOMOS specified that, nonetheless, the mandate for such a mission would be from the Committee. Further clarifications could be given, if the Committee so wished, by another representative of ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Maroc** voulait proposer de mettre en œuvre le mécanisme de suivi renforcé pour tous les biens en Irak, mais vu la remarque du Sous-directeur général, elle comprend que cela ne soit pas possible. Elle remarque que trois mesures correctives sont mentionnées dans le document de travail, alors que seulement une est retenue dans le projet de décision, à savoir l'établissement « d'une unité de gestion » au point 4. Elle demande s'il serait possible d'amender ce même point, en y ajoutant « un programme d'activité d'entretien et de conservation d'urgence ».

The Delegation of **Jordan** noted that the State Party was not in a position to invite a mission of that kind and that the invitation should be initiated by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre.

ICOMOS noted that as an NGO it could carry out a mission in Iraq - it did so in other places where the United Nations did not have a mandate, for example in Afghanistan. It noted, however, that there must be an invitation.

The **Secretariat** noted that a formal invitation from the State Party was indeed required for such a mission. The World Heritage Centre had regular contact with the Ambassador of Iraq to UNESCO and therefore no problem regarding a State Party invitation for a mission was foreseen.

The **Rapporteur**, summing up, said that paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remained unchanged. The paragraph proposed by Kenya would be placed between paragraphs 3 and 4. Paragraph 4 would be amended to include Morocco's point and Canada's amendment. Paragraph 5 remained unchanged. Paragraph 6 would be amended as proposed. The Rapporteur suggested an insertion to take up the recommendation made by Jordan and others, requesting a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to Ashur and Samarra. Paragraph 7 remained unchanged.

The Delegation of **Jordan** said that in paragraph 5 it would prefer to include the wording “should the situation allow it” given that the current situation did not allow the State Party to implement paragraph 5.

The **Chairperson** said that it would be preferable not to include the Ashur site in the decision under discussion but rather to re-open the Ashur decision and insert it there.

Decision **32 COM 7A.17** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** noted that the site of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls would be considered later in the agenda as a draft decision had not yet been prepared.

Property	Historic Town of Zabid
Id. N°	C 611
State Party	Yemen

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.19**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** présente brièvement l'état de conservation de la Ville historique de Zabid (Yémen) (C 611). Il rappelle que les problèmes de conservation, connus depuis 2000, ont déjà été présentés au Comité. Bien qu'aucune tendance de renversement de la situation ne soit notable, les efforts déployés par les autorités ont été considérables, renforcés par un projet de coopération sur neuf ans entre l'Assistance technique allemande (GTZ), le gouvernement du Yémen et le Fond social pour le développement (SFD - une institution yéménite). Ce projet, qui a déjà débuté, a permis la mise à disposition d'experts internationaux et régionaux ainsi que du personnel local. L'Etat partie a pris des engagements fermes pour satisfaire les demandes du Comité. Des mesures juridiques, financières, institutionnelles ont été mises en œuvre, les constructions illégales ont été arrêtées. L'Etat partie demande un sursis au Comité du patrimoine mondial, à savoir d'attendre que la première phase du projet, qui devrait se terminer en 2010, ait eu un premier impact sur la conservation du site. Le Comité pourrait alors considérer de retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that the project developed by GTZ was strongly interlinked with the community, that that was key, and that it was important to recognize that that took time. It asked for clarification of the corrective measures which remained to be implemented.

The **Secretariat** explained that the legal decrees were signed and published; that the law had been revised but was pending approval; that the inventory was being elaborated but that no conservation work had commenced; and finally, that expert missions and plans were being prepared.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for each corrective measure identified to be considered individually.

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** se réfère au document de travail WHC-08/32.COM/7A, pages 54 et 55, qui fait état des progrès déjà accomplis concernant les demandes spécifiques du Comité, à savoir la nouvelle publication du Décret renforçant le GOPHCY, la fourniture par le gouvernement d'un budget adéquat, l'achèvement des lois et projets de

conservation, l'arrêt de la dégradation physique déjà engagée et inversion en deux ans. Il reste cependant à mettre en œuvre un certain nombre de projets.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande si l'Etat partie envisagerait de mettre en œuvre les mesures demandées par le Comité dans un délai plus court que celui annoncé dans la décision. De plus, le Comité ne pourra pas retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril sans garanties de la part de l'Etat partie ; la date fixée à 2010 est peut-être trop optimiste.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** souhaite exprimer une opinion personnelle concernant l'état de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. A son avis, il est essentiel de ne pas ignorer l'élément humain, ainsi que l'adhésion de la collectivité et des citoyens aux projets de conservation. Le Centre devrait insister auprès des responsables des sites sur la sensibilisation des citoyens aux questions de conservation, et mettre en œuvre des moyens pour renforcer cette sensibilisation. Les biens qui font l'objet de discussion ne sont pas seulement des biens nationaux, ils appartiennent également à la communauté internationale.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked whether there was a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that was adequate for discussing and assessing damage and restoration work. It further noted that if GTZ concludes its first phase of work by June 2010 and deletion might also be considered by mid-2010, it might be assumed that there would be no time to assess the impact of the project.

The **Secretariat** replied that a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had been requested but the State Party had said that it was not in a position to provide it at present. It was hoped that it would be done in the current year with the help of the Advisory Bodies. Moreover, with regard to the Delegation of Australia's second question, it was indeed difficult to assess results in a few weeks. The previous year it had been requested that the property be considered for deletion in 2009 but, given that the time-frame was too short, the State Party had requested postponement of such consideration until 2010.

The Delegation of **Egypt** noted that the Secretariat accepted that there had been some improvement and therefore proposed to delete from the last paragraph the clause "with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible deletion of the property from the World Heritage List, at its 34th session in 2010."

The Delegation of **Australia** asked whether the GTZ work was well targeted to the areas of greatest importance for the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and requested ICOMOS' and the World Heritage Centre's view on the matter.

ICOMOS noted that a detailed mission report had been considered by the World Heritage Committee the previous year regarding actions and measures to be taken to reverse the degradation. One of the key measures identified at the time had been that the economic role of the town had vanished and that economic development is therefore needed in order to allow for conservation.

The Delegation of **Jordan** seconded Egypt's suggestion for deletion of part of paragraph 7 of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft decision with the amendments proposed by Canada and Egypt, as seconded by Jordan.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie**, se référant à sa dernière intervention, pense qu'il n'est pas suffisant de mentionner seulement la dimension socio-économique, les intérêts économiques et culturels ne convergeant que rarement. Elle demande donc au **Rapporteur** de rajouter le mot « culturel ».

The **Rapporteur** noted the change to “socio-cultural and economic”.

Decision **32 COM 7A.19** was adopted as amended.

The Chairperson announced that IUCN would make a general introductory statement concerning the State of Conservation for natural heritage properties.

Souhaitant respecter l'admirable multiculturalisme du Québec, la **Directrice générale de l'UICN** intervient en anglais et français. Rappelant que l'UNESCO a joué un rôle important dans la création de l'UICN il y a 60 ans, elle se réjouit de cette coopération continue ainsi que de pouvoir soutenir et compléter le travail important du Comité du patrimoine mondial notamment lors des missions scientifiques, grâce à son très large réseau d'experts et aux conseils de l'ensemble du Patrimoine Mondial. Elle a aussi fait remarquer que de nombreux Etats parties de la Convention sont également membres de l'UICN.

The **Director General of IUCN** noted that World Heritage properties covered some 8% of the total surface of protected areas around the world and, if properly managed, should represent the flagships of global conservation. To that end, political will, instruments and standards were needed. She then highlighted the following three issues:

Premièrement, les menaces à la biodiversité dans certains sites sont préoccupantes. Les menaces principales sont le braconnage, la perte d'habitat due à la déforestation, et l'abattage illégal d'arbres. Le taux d'extinction des espèces augmente de façon alarmante, et leur conservation devrait être désormais une priorité.

Secondly, she noted that it was very important to find measures to protect World Heritage properties that also supported livelihoods of people living in and adjacent to those areas, for example through sustainable tourism. The international community needed to support concrete and feasible projects developed with local communities and raise their awareness of conservation.

She further noted that mining impacts on World Heritage properties were a serious concern. IUCN called for the “no-go” principle for mining or exploration to be adopted urgently by all private and state companies, and enforced by all signatory governments to the Convention. IUCN proposed that that principle and its strict enforcement by governments should be, in essence, a condition for any new listing, and its non-respect should eventually lead to taking a property off the List.

L'UICN termine en demandant qu'une plus grande attention soit portée aux sites déjà inscrits sur la liste et à leur conservation.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Property	Manas Wildlife Sanctuary
Id. N°	N 338
State Party	India

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.12**

The **Secretariat** noted that a report had been received on 29 January 2008 from the State Party and that the mission requested by the Secretariat at its 31st session in Christchurch had taken place in February 2008. The Secretariat further noted that, while progress had been made, the corrective measures had not yet been fully implemented. The Secretariat noted that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property had been significantly affected during the past conflict, in particular its wildlife values.

The mission strongly regretted that no baseline survey of wildlife populations had been conducted, making it difficult to evaluate the recovery of the wildlife populations. However, the mission noted that wildlife encounters remained rare and limited to the central range. It was noted that the Indian rhinoceros was extinct and that the swamp deer had had only one reported sighting. Efforts were under way to reintroduce the Indian rhino as part of the India Rhino Vision 2020 programme, with a first wild-to-wild reintroduction of two males in early April 2008. However, it would need time and further translocations to build up again a viable population. Translocations could also be necessary to allow recovery of the reported relict swamp deer population.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN considered viable populations of all key wildlife species and a clear upward trend of those populations as key elements of the Desired State of Conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

With only part of the corrective measures implemented and no evidence of the recovery of the wildlife population, the Centre and IUCN considered that the property should remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN commended the progress made by the State Party but emphasized that the Outstanding Universal Value had not yet been sufficiently restored for the property to be deleted from the Danger List.

La Délégation du **Maroc** note qu'alors que le document de travail dénombre certains progrès accomplis par l'Etat partie en matière de conservation du bien, à la page 35 du document est mentionné « qu'il est très difficile d'estimer le calendrier nécessaire à la réalisation des objectifs » et « qu'une tendance pourrait être clairement identifiée d'ici deux à trois ans. ». La Délégation demande des précisions à ce sujet, elle souhaite également que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat partie sur ce sujet.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that the State Party was being called upon, among other things, to extend the boundaries of its property and that there ought to be a priority given to fulfilling the corrective measures before more responsibilities were added.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** commended the State Party for the progress made, but requested more information on the additional report submitted on 18 June by email by the State Party.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer State Party of India to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **India** congratulated the Chairperson and Canada. It noted that a quick baseline survey had been prepared and that another was under preparation. The number of elephants had increased from 500+ to 800+ and the Indian rhinoceros had been re-introduced. There had also been additional sightings of the swamp deer. Regarding the report submitted by email, the Delegation noted that five points were addressed in the report: (1) a rapid wildlife assessment had been conducted; (2) 12 new anti-poaching units had been built; (3) 76 posts are vacant and they are in the process of filling these. 28 staff appointments had been made since the mission and only six remained vacant; (4) the Western part of the property was free of encroachment and poaching; (5) regarding the rhinoceros, there was a long-term plan for its introduction.

The Delegation was grateful for the point raised by Kenya regarding paragraph 8 and requested that it be revised as the State Party was of the view that the issue of a transboundary nomination would further complicate the issue.

The **Secretariat** noted that it was impossible to set a precise timeline for the rehabilitation of the site's Outstanding Universal Value as no data on current wildlife populations were available. It explained that the additional report provided by the State Party did not provide the required information on all the species, nor on numbers, and therefore could not be considered for the establishment of a baseline.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it welcomed the comments made by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre and asked for an appreciation of how long it would take for the property to recover its Outstanding Universal Value.

IUCN explained that the challenge was to first establish a baseline survey and that, if it could be implemented rapidly, it was estimated that it would take three to four years for the wildlife populations to recover. IUCN stressed that even though progress in implementing the corrective measures had been made, a recovery of Outstanding Universal Value should be clearly demonstrated.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked whether the State Party agreed with the time-frame estimated by IUCN.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer State Party of India to answer.

The Observer Delegation of **India** stressed that in its opinion the property could be taken off the list as of now. It believed that the additional report addressed all the concerns put forth and that three years was too long a time-frame. It noted that a baseline survey was included in the report and proposed that the property be taken off the List, a survey made and, if need be, the property replaced on the List in Danger. Finally the Delegation asked that paragraph 8 be deleted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that paragraph 8 be deleted.

La Délégation du **Maroc** soutient la proposition du Kenya.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked for the decision in paragraph 9 to be more specific.

The **Rapporteur**, summing up, said that paragraphs 1 to 7 and 10 to 12 remained unaltered. Paragraph 8 would be deleted as proposed by Kenya and Morocco, and paragraph 9 reworded to reflect the amendment made by Israel.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it was sympathetic to the request by the Observer Delegation of India to delete paragraph 8, but pointed out that that paragraph merely invited the State Party and was therefore not binding. It noted that the extension proposed in the draft decision was professionally sound and was the way to proceed, and therefore requested that it not be deleted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** objected to the Delegation of Israel's comment about professionalism which implied that those who had asked for the deletion of the paragraph were being unprofessional. It insisted on the deletion of the paragraph and requested that the State Party be asked its opinion.

Respectant à la fois la déclaration du Kenya et celle d'Israël, la Délégation du **Maroc** pense que même si elle est d'avis qu'une extension du bien serait favorable à sa conservation à long terme, il est plus sage d'écouter l'Etat partie quand il déclare que les conditions pour une telle extension ne sont pas encore réunies. Elle demande donc la suppression de l'article 8 du projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that it would like the deletion of paragraph 8 in the decision.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, seconded by the Delegations of **Mauritius** and the **Republic of Korea**, noted that it was a matter of principle as the issue of collaboration between State Parties should be left to the State Parties themselves, and therefore requested the deletion of paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it would go along with the consensus.

Decision **32 COM 7A.12** was adopted as amended.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Property	Galapagos Islands
Id. N°	N 1bis
State Party	Ecuador

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.13**

The **Secretariat** reported that two reports had been received in Spanish. Efforts of the State Party had focused on more effective management and decision-making processes within the Galapagos by strengthening existing institutions, clarifying mandates, developing plans and applying regulations focusing on issues such as control of introduced species, migratory control, vehicle importation and aircraft landings. While the Galapagos National Park Service with the support of the Charles Darwin Research Station continued to demonstrate their technical capacity to deal with complex field-level conservation challenges, the impact of their success was undermined by the ongoing weaknesses in establishing island-wide measures to prevent problems from arising. For instance, the World Heritage Centre had just received news two days earlier that the bird flu virus had managed to circumvent quarantine measures and had arrived in Galapagos for the first time, infecting the already endangered Galapagos penguins. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN noted the efforts of the State Party to address the management challenges in Galapagos, but also noted that to date they had been largely limited to developing plans and strategies, while significant measurable results on the ground had yet to be seen. Until measurable progress in reversing the threats to the property was achieved, the recommendation was to maintain it so inscribed.

IUCN noted that Danger Listing had been made at the request of the State Party and that progress had been made since. The activities undertaken were positive and showed how the Danger List could provide a positive impetus to conservation efforts and stimulate international cooperation, such as in relation to the Galapagos Invasive Species Fund. Good progress has also been made on planning to address key issues such as tourism and fishing. The challenge was now to implement identified actions as part of those and other corrective measures.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that the Galapagos Islands were a landmark and that some concerns were raised in the report, notably the instability of management given that there had been many changes of Directors, and asked whether that would have an impact on the property. It noted that the impact of climate change was not mentioned in the report and asked for confirmation about whether bird flu had reached the islands.

Approuvant les autres Membres du Comité qui considèrent les Iles Galapagos comme un bien emblématique de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, la Délégation du **Maroc** souhaite émettre deux remarques. La première est une remarque de forme et concerne l'utilisation du terme « piètre gouvernance » dans le document de travail. Elle regrette vivement l'utilisation d'un terme aussi peu respectueux envers l'Etat partie. La deuxième est une remarque de fond concernant le calendrier des activités fixé à 2007-2010. Beaucoup de rapports d'avancement ont été demandés et fournis depuis 2007, mais ce calendrier est-il réaliste ? Elle souhaiterait que l'Etat partie s'exprime à ce sujet.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred in stressing the importance of the Galapagos Islands, particularly at this time of climate change. It congratulated IUCN for its work in cooperation with other partners and the State Party for the work done and progress made in the issues of immigration, fishing and tourism. It agreed that, for stability, it was regrettable that within the administration, there had been 12 changes in a short period of time.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** asked a technical question regarding paragraph 8 and whether the State Party was responsible for the preparation of the Desired State of Conservation as well as the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was no representative of the State Party of Ecuador in the room.

IUCN said that the issue of the position of Director was one of effective governance which needed to be addressed by the State Party. It further noted that there had been individual action targeted both directly and indirectly at climate change but that there was no comprehensive climate change strategy. Regarding bird flu, IUCN noted that it was a challenging issue which ought to be addressed because, given the many islands, there were also many entry points.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that the property was an example of the benefits of cooperation between the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre, the Committee members and the international community.

The **Secretariat** said that Outstanding Universal Value and Desired State of Conservation were closely linked and that the State Party was responsible for the drafting but with the advice of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as mentioned in the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that only minor amendments had been proposed.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that it preferred a more positive twist to paragraph 6.

Decision **32 COM 7A.13** was adopted as amended.

AFRICA

Property	Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park
Id. N°	N 475
State Party	Central African Republic

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.1**

The **Secretariat** reported that the State Party had submitted a report shortly before the 31st session, on 20 June 2007. In addition, a letter had been received dated 27 February 2008, in which the State Party had announced that the European Union-funded conservation programme ECOFAC IV had started, but without further information on the State of Conservation of the property. The Secretariat noted that so far it had been impossible to

organize the monitoring mission requested by the Committee as a result of the security situation.

The Secretariat further noted that the June 2007 report confirmed the extremely worrying situation in the property as described in previous reports to the Committee, with wildlife resources further dwindling as a result of the increasing poaching pressures and a renewed degradation of the security situation. The security situation in the northern Central African Republic was heavily influenced by two major regional conflicts in South-Eastern Chad and the Darfur region of Sudan.

The recent start of the ECOFAC IV programme provided some hope for an improvement in the situation but, without a change in the security situation, it seemed doubtful that poaching could be brought under control. So far, the ECOFAC programme was concentrating its efforts on the hunting areas to the South of the property as a result of the insecurity in the North. Finally, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN noted that until a mission could take place it was unclear if the loss of integrity of the property had caused a permanent loss of its Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee contact the State Party of the Central African Republic and that that be included in the draft decision.

On the request of the Chairperson, the **Rapporteur** advised that paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remained unchanged. Then there was an insertion suggested by the Delegation of Canada. Paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 remained unchanged.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it was uncomfortable with paragraph 6 and asked how a workshop would lead to enhancing security. It wondered whether such a workshop would not be a waste of money and of time.

The **Secretariat** responded that the workshop would be useful in two ways: there had been very limited information exchange with the authorities on account of the security situation, and therefore the workshop would provide the opportunity to have such contact; and it would be useful to hold discussions with the ECOFAC programme at an early stage in order to ensure that World Heritage issues were also addressed in the programme.

The Delegation of **Israel** shared Kenya's concern and proposed an amendment to paragraph 6 of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the Delegation of Israel and with the Secretariat's response regarding the usefulness of the workshop proposed in the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended paragraph 6.

Decision **32 COM 7A.1** was adopted as amended.

Property	Comoé National Park
Id. N°	N 227
State Party	Côte d'Ivoire

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7A.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7A.2**

The **Secretariat** said that a report had been received from the State Party on 12 March which mentioned that, since the peace agreement of Ouagadougou, both the political and the security situation had improved greatly. The Secretariat further noted some progress in the implementation of the corrective measures, in particular in the development of the management plan. However, the park staff still only had access to two of the five park sectors, although an agreement had been established between the park service and the national programme for disarmament, with the objective of regaining control over the entire property by the end of 2008. Unfortunately, the report did not provide the ecological monitoring data requested by the Committee at its 31st session, which would make it possible to evaluate the current status of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that, although some progress had been made towards implementing the corrective measures, much work was still required. With the improvement of security conditions, it seemed crucial to increase funding to the property to fully resume management activities and expedite the implementation of the corrective measures and other recommendations of the 2006 mission.

IUCN drew attention to the continuing challenges of poaching and agriculture encroaching on the property, which underlined the need to build support and awareness among local communities living in and around the property.

The Delegation of **Israel** raised a question about the paragraph on international assistance included in the draft decision and asked what the criteria were for applying such a paragraph.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked for clarification by the State Party regarding paragraph 3 of the draft decision, which mentioned that “the improvement of the security situation would allow the management authority to regain control over the entire property in the near future.” It noted that that statement was contradictory to the previous one made which implied that that had already been achieved.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party.

La Délégation de **la Côte d'Ivoire** souhaite un bon anniversaire à Québec et remercie l'UNESCO d'avoir soutenu son pays depuis le début de la crise qu'il traverse. Concernant les points soulevés par les Membres du Comité, elle tient à souligner que des progrès significatifs ont été obtenus dans ce sens. Deux projets soutenus par la Banque mondiale vont bientôt être mis en œuvre. L'ensemble du Parc national est désormais couvert par l'Office Ivoirien des Parcs et Réserves grâce à la radio financée par l'UNESCO. Les pressions au Nord du Parc national concernent le braconnage, alors que les pressions agricoles touchent la partie sud. Le Parc est désormais sous l'autorité de l'Office Ivoirien des Parcs et Réserves. De 15, le nombre d'agents travaillant sur le bien est passé à 36 aujourd'hui, et sera prochainement de 69. Grâce à un programme cofinancé par la

Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau et la Banque mondiale, la population locale peut développer des microprojets. Depuis mai dernier, quatre des cinq secteurs du parc sont gérés par un directeur de zone, qui n'est malheureusement pas encore sur place. Grâce à ces efforts de coopération visant à une meilleure gouvernance, la Délégation assure que la gestion du Parc national s'est améliorée.

The **Secretariat**, responding to the question on funding posed by the Delegation of Israel, said that, while many properties might need external funding, the paragraph in question was applied in situations where lack of funding was a main bottleneck. In some cases, for instance, even if there were more funding, security and/or other situations might continue to block progress.

The Delegation of **Israel** thanked the Secretariat for the clarification, stating that the implication of its query was in no way to question whether the State Party ought to receive funding, but was more a general query.

Decision **32 COM 7A.2** was adopted.

The meeting rose at 01.00 p.m.

THIRD DAY – FRIDAY, 4 JULY 2008

FOURTH MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

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

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/7A
WHC-08/32.COM/7A.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/7A.Add.2

Decisions: **32 COM 7A.1 to 7A.32**

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Property	Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve
Id. N°	N 155 bis
State Party	Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7A.3 Rev** (submitted by the Secretariat)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented a summary of the State of Conservation of the property, noting that the mission to the property had been very brief, with only three hours spent on the property. It explained that discussions had been held with all stakeholders, but that a full assessment of the State of Conservation had not been possible. Park staff was reported as not being present on the property. The mission team indicated that threats had not appeared to have increased since the last mission, and that integrity was maintained. It noted that local communities respected the boundaries but that poaching was occurring, although its effects remained unclear due to the absence of survey data. The World Heritage Centre indicated that the property's Outstanding Universal Value seemed intact. The main threat was a potential mining project within the property. If implemented, the project would lead to irreversible loss of the property's Outstanding Universal Value. At present, the Delegation had not officially replied to the Secretariat letter of March 14 requesting further information on the mining project. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN urged the State Party to reply to the letter. The mission report included recommendations for corrective measures and noted however that no information was available on the Guinean side of the property. The mining company agreed to hold regular meetings with stakeholders on the matter.

IUCN underlined that the proposed mining project was the main issue of concern and that, if implemented, it would lead to the loss of the property's Outstanding Universal Value. It also noted that previous Committee decisions had recognized the incompatibility of mining within World Heritage properties.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the local communities were reported to respect the property's boundaries. It further requested the States Parties of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea to provide information on their intentions to allow mining.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** reiterated the request made by the Delegation of Kenya.

A l'invitation de la Présidente, la Délégation d'observation de la Côte d'Ivoire rappelle que beaucoup de données concernant la conservation des aires protégées ont évolué. Concernant la question spécifique des activités d'exploration, elle souligne les efforts accomplis par l'Etat partie en direction de la sauvegarde et de la conservation des aires protégées, en ajoutant qu'un grand nombre de personnel a été déployé dans les zones auparavant assiégées. Elle rappelle en outre que, depuis la dernière mission de l'UNESCO, un directeur pour l'exploitation du site avait été nommé. Quant à l'engagement de la Côte d'Ivoire en faveur de la protection de son patrimoine et du respect des décisions du Comité du patrimoine mondial, elle cite le fait que la délégation qui représente l'Etat partie à la présente session du Comité est forte de 6 membres.

En ce qui concerne les activités d'exploitation des minéraux, elle explique que celles-ci ne relèvent pas d'une décision de l'Etat et qu'aucun document officiel autorisant l'exploitation du site n'a été délivré. Elle conclue en rappelant son engagement ferme en faveur de la protection du bien.

The **Chairperson** called on the Rapporteur to read the revised draft decision and invited comments on the decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recommended two amendments, asking the international community to assist the States Parties in their efforts to achieve the acceptable State of Conservation of Mt. Nimba, and to focus on ensuring sustainable livelihoods for neighbouring communities, to be inserted between paragraphs 14 and 15.

Decision **32 COM 7A.3** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the draft decisions for properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and for Ethiopia be postponed, as representatives of those States Parties were not yet present.

It was so agreed.

Property	Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves
Id. N°	N 573
State Party	Niger

Document: WHC-08//32.COM/7A.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7A.10**

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that the report from the Delegation had been received in late May, and that it did not include the required information on progress related to corrective measures, but only provided information on the state of the wildlife populations, which was gathered by park staff field observations. The findings indicated alarming declines of species numbers along with local extinction for others. Overgrazing by domestic livestock was also noted to have severely affected the property. Poaching and encroachment were cited as being major issues, as were increasing population pressures. The Secretariat

indicated that a comprehensive survey of wildlife was needed so that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property could be evaluated. The return of security problems in the area was noted as being an added concern, with armed attacks now reported to be taking place within the property, jeopardizing the capacity to implement corrective measures. The Secretariat and IUCN were concerned that security problems might lead to further erosion of the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

IUCN noted that insecurity and poaching were the main concern.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed an amendment, requesting that the difficult conditions of insecurity and the limited resources available to the authorities be noted, as well as the support provided by donors, and calling upon the donor community to increase support.

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique qu'on demande au Paragraphe 9 du projet de décision de remettre au Centre des observations sur les espèces et demande si l'IUCN serait associé au processus demandé.

IUCN said that it was in touch with its Species Survival Commission, which it assumed would provide assistance in the follow-up of the decision.

Decision **32 COM 7A.10** was adopted as amended.

Property	Niokolo-Koba National Park
Id. N°	N 153
State Party	Senegal

Document: WHC-08//32.COM/7A.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7A.11**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that a concise report had been received in March 2008, describing the September 2007 workshop, which had developed a proposal for a USD 33 million remedial action plan to deal with the threats to the property. No copy of the plan had been made available to the World Heritage Centre. The report provided no details on how the funds would be obtained and was not clear on how the plan would be implemented. Information on progress made on anti-poaching activities and livestock management issues had been provided. The World Heritage Centre said that the State Party had not been able to respect the time-frame for measures adopted by the Committee at its previous session. It reported that illegal logging, road construction, a dam and mining were ongoing issues and that the need for greater national and international support remained.

IUCN noted the serious degradation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and highlighted the fact that key wildlife species populations were down by 60% to 90% since 1991.

La Délégation du **Maroc** remercie l'IUCN pour son rapport et poursuit en remarquant que la formulation du rapport à propos des mesures correctives n'est pas adéquate, surtout au paragraphe g), où il est fait mention de la nécessité de faire de la conservation « une priorité de la politique, des projets et des budgets nationaux et prendre des mesures dynamiques afin de solliciter l'aide des donateurs pour la gestion du bien ». Selon elle, l'ingérence dans la politique intérieure d'un Etat n'est pas envisageable. Il ne se peut en effet, elle continue, s'ingérer dans la politique intérieure d'un Etat.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed concern over the lack of information, and wondered why the Secretariat could not simply call the State Party to seek clarification on such issues.

Decision **32 COM 7A.11** was adopted as amended.

IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.32**

The **World Heritage Centre** provided background on the document, explaining previous documents produced in 2006 and 2007, and referring to Decision **31 COM 7.7**, whereby it was requested to develop criteria to help guide decision-making on when to inscribe properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger for reasons linked to climate change. The document presented was the result of that effort. The document stated that the existing provisions of the *Operational Guidelines* were adequate to deal with the issue. The Secretariat suggested that the Committee follow the *Operational Guidelines* procedure for Danger Listing when faced with threats arising from climate change. Small changes in the text of the *Operational Guidelines* were suggested, to ensure that climate change issues were also considered for natural sites, as they were only mentioned for cultural sites in the existing text. Those changes under Paragraph 181 would result in a clarification of language emphasizing that threats, and the results of the threats, were being addressed.

The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed the draft decision and encouraged its adoption, underscoring the differences in the corrective measures for mitigation and adaptation, as recognized in Paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Brazil** welcomed the report, and asked the World Heritage Centre if the focus should not be on adaptation. It also noted that technology transfer was recommended in other conventions as a means of coping with climate change, and asked if that had been considered at the Expert Meeting.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that Africa suffered from climate change impacts and expressed its satisfaction at the effort being put into the issue, thanking the World Heritage Centre for its work in that field.

The Delegation of **Australia** said it had been involved in the Expert Meeting and suggested changing the word “effects” to “impacts” in Paragraph 5 so that the language would be aligned with that used in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. It also noted that the role of the *World Heritage Convention* was to focus on adaptation, rather than mitigation, of the impacts.

The **World Heritage Centre** in its response said that Israel was supportive of the draft decision, and that the question asked by Brazil had been answered by Australia.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* would be covered in item 13, and suggested that the revisions be done at that time.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft amendments proposed by the Delegations of Kenya, Australia.

Decision **32 COM 7A.32** was adopted as amended.

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

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/7B
WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add 2
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.7B
WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Corr

Decisions: **32 COM 7B.1 to 7B.128**

The **Chairperson** explained how properties to be the subject of a State of Conservation report were selected, along with providing background to the process of dealing with those reports. She also recalled the rotation policy that would be adopted for the discussion of the State of Conservation of properties. The Committee would review cultural properties followed by natural properties, by region, in the following order - Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa and finally, the Arab States.

At the request of several Committee members, the **World Heritage Centre** provided information on the two properties affected by the earthquake in China (Sichuan Giant Panda Sanctuary, Mt. Qincheng and Dujiangyan Irrigation System). The properties were located close to the epicentre of the earthquake, where many buildings had been affected, some of them collapsing, causing casualties. The irrigation system had not been substantially damaged. In addition, operations for the management of the property had been disrupted. Assessment was proceeding through emergency assistance from the World Heritage Fund (USD 40,000), being implemented in cooperation with the State Agency for Cultural Heritage.

The Observer Delegation of **China** reported that the Er-wang temple complex had suffered severe damage, but that the main part of the irrigation system was largely undamaged. The Giant Panda Sanctuary had suffered from secondary impacts such as landslides, occurring in over 1,000 places, 40% of the World Heritage site. The relevant authorities had organized emergency teams to evaluate the damage. The World Heritage Centre had been duly informed of the situation and appropriate responses had been widely publicized in China – such moral support was very important at a critical time. The Observer Delegation thanked all those who had provided support to China.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Property	The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur
Id. N°	C 322
State Party	Bangladesh

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B
Decision: **32 COM 7B.64 Rev**

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that a revised decision had been produced as a result of recent information obtained from the UNESCO Office in Dhaka about ongoing work that was affecting the site. It related to drainage pipes being installed on the property, and digging of trenches in sensitive archaeological areas. That new information had reinforced the concerns already expressed in the original report over the lack of capacity of the Department of Archaeology to manage its property effectively.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** sought information on when international assistance had been offered to the property in the past.

The **World Heritage Centre** replied that the World Heritage Committee had granted international assistance in 2005, during the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee in Durban.

Decision **32 COM 7B.64** was adopted as amended.

Property	Angkor
Id. N°	C 668
State Party	Cambodia

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.65**

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that no new information was available, but that consultations with the Delegation suggested that Paragraph 8 of the draft decision should be changed from 2009 to 2010.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted the project for the Heritage Management Framework referred to in paragraph 5 which was near to receiving funding. It congratulated the Delegation on that work, in which Australia had been cooperating, and considered that the change of date was appropriate, proposing the change as an amendment.

The Delegation of **Israel** stated that Angkor was a textbook example of conservation work and welcomed the work done by New Zealand and Australia. Israel asked the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies if there was any concern over the impact of urban development on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, requiring a report in 2009.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the date change from 2009 to 2010 and requested clarification on the *ad hoc* group of experts cited in the report.

The Delegation of **Israel** recommended that the word "property" be used instead of "core zone".

The **World Heritage Centre** responded to the Delegation of Kenya, explaining that the *ad hoc* group of experts already existed, created by the International Coordinating Committee for Angkor. The Committee had requested that the *ad hoc* group be activated for Angkor. With regard to the point made by the Delegation of Israel, the World Heritage Centre said that Angkor benefited from the support of the International Coordinating Committee, which closely monitored ongoing work twice a year.

ICOMOS said it agreed with the World Heritage Centre, but added that it could be helpful to have a report in 2009 on the urban expansion issue, which was of grave concern.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** (observateur) rappelle que l'Etat partie avait proposé de fournir le rapport avant le 1er février 2010, en citant les problèmes de restructuration qui nécessitent du temps afin de remettre un rapport en bonne et due forme.

Decision **32 COM 7B.65** was adopted as amended.

Property	Red Fort Complex
Id. N°	C 231 rev
State Party	India

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.69**

The **World Heritage Centre** said it had no additional information.

The Delegation of **Canada** sought information from ICOMOS on the monorail construction.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked why the World Heritage Centre could not simply call the Delegation and seek the information.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted that a progress report had been received by the World Heritage Centre in January 2008 and expressed uncertainty about its relation with the most recent report.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed surprise that there was no new information, and asked if the Delegation of India could provide additional information.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of India to comment

The Observer Delegation of **India** said that the information on the monorail had not been requested, and that it was not an issue, as it was in a generalized pre-feasibility stage, adding that the Archaeological Survey of India had insisted on an archaeological impact assessment.

ICOMOS responded that it had expressed concern over the monorail, but required more information to be able to make a better judgement on the issue.

In response to the question on the conservation management plan asked by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, the **World Heritage Centre** said that an initial draft had been produced, and that the State Party in its report had clarified that it was being revised, explaining that there were not two distinct plans, but just one plan which was under revision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the discussion was somewhat confusing, and proposed that there be an appropriate amendment, written in such a way so as not to imply that the Delegation had already decided to carry out the monorail project.

The Delegation of **Israel** therefore asked for Paragraph 3 be amended to request that the impact assessment takes into consideration the impact of the monorail on the property's Outstanding Universal Value before any further decision is made on the project.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that environmental impact assessments were often regulated under specific legislation in a country, and might not necessarily include consideration for Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the language should be such as to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value was considered when assessing impact.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of India to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **India** said that the draft decision was not suitable, as it was based on hearsay and resulted in asking India to carry out an impact assessment on an initiative that had not been formally considered by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that it was a matter of principle – that the Committee was going ahead of itself in foreseeing potential problems at a property, suggesting that the issue be addressed if ever it became a real one.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed that the reference to calling for an environmental impact assessment, hence Paragraph 3, could be eliminated and withdrew its amendment.

Decision **32 COM 7B.69** was adopted, as amended.

Property	Group of Monuments at Hampi
Id. N°	C 241
State Party	India

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.70**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that the Archaeological Survey of India had organized a national workshop in Hampi, bringing together managers of all World Heritage cultural sites in India. The master plan for Hampi had been approved in early June. The Hampi staff had been strengthened from 11 to 17. The Committee requested the banning of large vehicles, along with the revision of the bridge design, which had not yet been addressed by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it felt that it should be the responsibility of the World Heritage Committee to adopt statements of Outstanding Universal Value and integrity. It also requested that the abbreviation in the report be clarified.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value should nevertheless be reviewed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The **Rapporteur** indicated having received an amendment from the Delegation of Bahrain for the end of Paragraph 6 of the draft decision to add the 1 February 2009 deadline and the examination by the Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

Decision **32 COM 7B.70** was adopted, as amended.

Property	Meidan Emam, Esfahan
Id. N°	C 115
State Party	Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.72**

The **World Heritage Centre** said it had no additional information.

The Delegation of **Canada** recognized the efforts of the State Party for the conservation of the property and in successfully diverting the subway. It submitted a written amendment to Paragraph 3 of the draft decision in this sense.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked if the State Party could say a few words about the matter.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer State Party of the Republic of Iran to comment.

The Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** explained that the question had been difficult and challenging. The buildings in question were privately owned and beyond the control of the municipal government. But the issue had served the question of heritage conservation well in the region. The Government was fully committed to implementing the Committee's decision.

The Delegation of **China** also expressed its appreciation for efforts made.

Decision **32 COM 7B.72** was adopted as amended.

Property	Town of Luang Prabang
Id. N°	C 479 rev
State Party	Lao People's Democratic Republic

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.74**

The **World Heritage Centre** said it had no additional information.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked the World Heritage Centre for further details on the five recommendations and wondered if there was a time-frame for dealing with them.

The Delegation of **China** noted that Paragraph 183 in the *Operational Guidelines* requested that a programme for corrective measures be adopted for properties considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the comments from China, and suggested that they should be reflected in another paragraph within the decision, requesting that the State Party, with the participation of local stakeholders, carry out a consultation to that effect.

The Delegation of **Canada** wondered if there were barriers preventing the identification of corrective measures, noting that no Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had been prepared prior to the mission taking place, and reminding the World Heritage Centre that that

should be done before a mission went ahead. It also requested clarifications as to why a coordinating meeting had not taken place.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded that the mission report, available on-line, included the time-frame recommendations requested by the Delegation of the United States of America. The World Heritage Centre also noted that the point raised by the Delegation of China regarding the need to explain to the Delegation the meaning of Danger Listing had been addressed with the State Party during the mission, including the steps necessary to be carried out to avoid inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It further stated that the meeting referred to in the report, which had not yet taken place due to unavailability of key stakeholders, concerned the coordination of various international donor projects to reduce impacts within the urban development planning process, and that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had not been prepared before the mission because of a lack of State Party capacity and a lack of clarity on where matters stood in that regard within the *Convention* processes.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it was important to invest in preparing such Statements of Outstanding Universal Value before a mission took place.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested amending Paragraph 4 of the draft decision to include the participation of local stakeholders.

Decision **32 COM 7B.74** was adopted, as amended.

Property	Lumbini, the birthplace of the Lord Buddha
Id. N°	C 666
State Party	Nepal

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.75**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented developments focusing on the expert mission that was conducted in April 2008 in the framework of International Assistance funding provided for the elaboration of the Management Plan. The aim of the mission was to define the appropriate methodology for the development of the Master Plan and the identified priorities. The Centre specified that it had received information from a group of Buddhist Institutions and communities in Lumbini that felt strongly about industrial development in the vicinity of the site, which has been raised with the State Party of Nepal and ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, referring to Paragraph 4 a) of the draft decision, indicated that the drafting of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was requested to be done “in consultation” here yet in other decisions, the State Party was requested to do it on its own. It added that they were too many discrepancies which needed to be harmonized throughout the decisions.

The Delegation of **Brazil** concurred with Kenya.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee about an amendment proposed to Paragraph 6 to include the conditions of authenticity and integrity and a report on the progress made on the issues mentioned, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and for examination by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that, if the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had to be done in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, there was no need to ask for them to review it.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed to delete the request for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Decision **32 COM 7B.75** was adopted, as amended.

Property	Old Town of Galle and its fortifications
Id. N°	C 451
State Party	Sri Lanka

Decision: **32 COM 7B.77**

The **World Heritage Centre** said it had no additional information.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that while the document on buffer zones and properties discussed under item 7 had not been concluded, it noted that buffer zones were not considered to be part of the property and thus the Outstanding Universal Value did not apply to zones outside of the property. It called for clarification regarding some issues concerning site protection and communities. Communities are considered as an essential part of the life of a site but in some cases, it emphasized, there is a need to reconcile the site with its communities. The cricket field, it reminded, was outside the property and it thus called for information as to how the field benefited the community, as well as how it could impact on the value of the property.

The Delegation of **Israel** commented on the fact that Italian Funds in Trust appeared to have been used to assess the impact of a cricket stadium. It further noted that the report suggested that the proposed port “would not critically affect the World Heritage property....” if the recommendations of the Environmental Impact Assessment were fully implemented. In light of this, the Delegation wondered why the draft decision called for the abandonment of the port project.

The Delegation of **Canada** drew attention to the fact that the last two missions had been characterized as UNESCO missions and asked for confirmation of the involvement of ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer of Sri Lanka to take the floor.

The Observer of **Sri Lanka** congratulated the Chairperson on her chairpersonship and for the warmth and organizational aspects linked to the Committee meeting. Regarding the mission, it commented that it had reported illegal construction at the site, and confirmed that the Department of Archaeology of Sri Lanka had taken action to minimize the illegal activity. It recalled that the property is a living site and thus it has drawn the attention of the community to the issue at stake. A consensus is required to remove the illegal portions of the construction, and also noted that discussions with the Sri Lankan Cricket Board were underway. As concerns the Harbour project, it confirmed that it should be downscaled and that no major port activities would take place. It further specified the fact that Sri Lanka has limited land use and that this area is congested. In addition, there are insufficient funds to deal with the problem and the relocation of the communities and the buildings is complicated. A revision of the buffer zones may be required. It acknowledged funding received for the property.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded as pertains to the missions by specifying that they were carried out at the request of the State Party at a time when ICOMOS could not participate. Given the urgency of the situation, with two projects underway at the site, extra-budgetary funding was identified from Italy and the mission conducted without ICOMOS. In reply to the question posed by the Delegation of Israel, the World Heritage Centre clarified that the port project had been assessed against two possible impacts: the damage to the underwater heritage and the obstruction of views within the Bay of Galle. As explained in the report, the recommendations of the Environmental Impact Assessment, if implemented in Galle, might have addressed the first issue. The question of the visual integrity, however, would have remained a major problem, hence the suggestion to consider abandoning the project altogether.

ICOMOS added that the State Party was concerned about the impact that the Stadium would have on the views to and from the fort. ICOMOS's view was therefore shared with the Urban Development Authority and the Department of Archaeology.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether downscaling would be acceptable and enough to allow the conservation of the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that by suggesting the abandonment of the current port project, the text of the proposed decision also implied the possibility of downscaling it.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne que Galle est un cas intéressant qui inspire une réflexion d'ordre général : sur le terrain il est difficile d'évaluer l'impact des constructions dans les villes vivantes, d'autoriser la construction à côté des biens inscrits, et de déterminer quels formes et matériaux sont acceptables. A l'avenir, le Comité sera confronté à de nombreux cas similaires.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked for clarity on the exact nature of the issue. It felt that the cricket field is actually well placed at this location. It further related to the issue of visual integrity and the subjective nature of this concept.

La Délégation du **Maroc** propose un amendement au Paragraphe 4c) sur les limites «des zones centrales et tampon » à remplacer par les limites « du bien et de sa zone tampon ». .

The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to proceed with the presentation of amendments to the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** urged the State Party to remove the illegal constructions, thanked the Committee for its dedication and commended it for the important decisions it was taking.

The **Rapporteur** read out the changes proposed by the Delegation of Kenya to Paragraph 4 a) to "remove intrusive and illegal constructions within the cricket Stadium as recommended by the mission"; and to add "Consider abandoning or downscaling the port development to an acceptable size respecting the World Heritage property" in Paragraph 4b).

Decision **32 COM 7B.77** was adopted, as amended.

Property	Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures
Id. N°	C 603
State Party	Uzbekistan

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.79**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented its report, offering new information received on 13 June by email from the State Party, as pertains to its commitment to continue working on the management plan, and consultations with local stakeholders to that end. It also confirmed that World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS welcome the intentions expressed by the State Party but emphasised the need to translate this into concrete steps built on the understanding of the Outstanding Universal Value and supported by an appropriate regulatory framework.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported by the Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** asked for clarification as to what was intended by “substantial progress” with reference to Paragraph 8 of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** was confident that progress is being made but it was unsure of the degree of progress and suggested that a Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism may be suitable in this case.

The Delegation of **Canada** concurred.

ICOMOS noted that a mission undertaken two years earlier looked at a new road and reconstruction of a crumbling building in the old town where numerous threats were impacting on the property due to the lack of a management plan and of appropriate zoning. Since that mission, a great deal of work had been done by the State Party and progress made. Encouragement needed to continue being provided as threats from new development proposals were present, and no robust system was yet in place to cope with these threats. It did not consider that there is yet an adequate management system in place that will reverse the situation.

The Delegation of **Israel** pointed out that the standard paragraph on Reinforced Monitoring should be integrated between the current paragraphs 6 and 7. It also suggested deleting, in Paragraph 8 of the draft decision, the reference to the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Brazil** concurred.

The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to proceed with the presentation of amendments to the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 7B.79** was adopted, as amended.

The **World Heritage Centre** read out the list of the State of Conservation reports of properties for noting by the Committee:

- Classical Gardens of Suzhou (China) (C 813 bis)
- Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811)
- Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110)
- Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C 593)

- Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)
- Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121)
- Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (Turkmenistan) (C 1242)

Decisions **32 COM 7B.66**, **32 COM 7B.67**, **32 COM 7B.68**, **32 COM 7B.71**, **32 COM 7B.73**, **32 COM 7B.76** and **32 COM 7B.78** were therefore adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Property	Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg
Id. N°	C 784
State Party	Austria

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.81**

The **World Heritage Centre** took the floor to specify that no information had been provided from the State Party for the State of Conservation report and to date no management plan for the property had been submitted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked to hear from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its concern about the possible non compliance with the prescriptions by the State Party.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer State Party of Austria to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Austria** congratulated the Canadian authorities and the City of Quebec for the warm hospitality. It then apologized for the delay in submitting the report that was requested and reassured the Committee about the fact that it would be provided in the very near future.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed deep concern because the subjects raised and issues will be seen in other city centres around the world. It specified that the Committee should not be content with this situation and asked for a deadline to be assigned for 1 November 2008.

The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to proceed with the presentation of amendments to the draft decision.

The Rapporteur indicated that the Delegation of **Bahrain** had proposed to delete Paragraph 5 and replace it with "Requests the State Party to submit a detailed report ... at latest October 2008". A new Paragraph 6 is proposed: "Further requests the State Party to assess the Potential impact of the urban development project under discussion" and a new Paragraph 7: "Also requests the State Party to submit 3 copies of the management plan by 1 February 2009".

The Delegation of **Kenya** reiterated the need for greater commitment from the State Party in providing a report as requested, showing activities underway and how these may affect the property.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism may be required.

The **Rapporteur** carried out another reading, following the interventions by the Delegations of Bahrain, Brazil and Israel.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested reversing the last two paragraphs.

Decision **32 COM 7B.81** was adopted, as amended.

Property	Historic Centre of Vienna
Id. N°	C 1033
State Party	Austria

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.82**

The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that it had no new information to provide.

The Delegation of **Israel** recalled that the issues of Vienna are to be considered a milestone and could not be dealt with lightly. It further noted that the *Vienna Memorandum* should not be considered as an opening for high rise buildings. Clarification was sought about the relationship between ICOMOS Austria as a federal body and ICOMOS International. It stated its concern and reiterated the need to look closely at the site. It further specified the need for the State Party to be urged to stop the construction and suggested that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism could be introduced as well as possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested that the State Party be asked provide additional information about the site.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked ICOMOS if there had potentially been destruction of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer State Party of Austria to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Austria**, representing the City of Vienna, confirmed that it was fully aware of its responsibilities to the *Convention* and was working in the interest of compatibility between the World Heritage status and the development of the city. It confirmed that, in early 2004 it was decided that views should not affect the property negatively. It further confirmed that only one of a total of 132 buildings will be visible, the 2 last floors of which can be seen behind trees and thus did not compromise the view of the site. It specified that it was looking forward to continuing work with the Centre and ICOMOS in the spirit of the *Convention*.

The Representative of **ICOMOS** confirmed that work undertaken was headed by ICOMOS through the Austrian office and that the impact of the tower on the Outstanding Universal Value was a concern for both ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. It suggested a comprehensive visual impact study in order to assess the impact appropriately.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested a more complete response and reacted concerning the overall responsibility of ICOMOS recalling that it was not to be dealt with by national branches but by ICOMOS International.

The President of **ICOMOS** took the floor to confirm that the work was carried out under the full responsibility of ICOMOS International.

The **Chairperson** turned to the **Rapporteur** for a review of the draft decision.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande une clarification des paragraphes 3c) et 4 du projet de décision.

The **Chairperson** suggested deleting Paragraph 3c), which received the support from the Delegation of Morocco.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments received: Paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unchanged; Paragraph 3 would read “Urges” instead of “Requests”, Paragraph 3c) would be suppressed; Paragraph 4 would have an addition to include the results of the visual impact assessment; as well as a reference to a potential inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2009.

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated it was unnecessary to add this reference to Danger Listing.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that the Committee could wait to see the results of the project before considering inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. When dealing with historic centres, development does not systematically affect the site negatively, pointing to the fact that this issue may not require in-Danger Listing.

The Delegations of **Kenya** and **Egypt** supported this statement.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked the Committee to remember that this is the city that began the discussion that generated the *Vienna Memorandum*. It recalled that a report would be provided by the United Kingdom about these issues.

Decision **32 COM 7B.82** was adopted, as amended.

Property	Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn
Id. N°	C 786
State Party	Austria

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.83**

The **World Heritage Centre** did not have any new information to provide.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed concern over projections that reminded of the case of Vienna and suggested that this was putting the credibility of the *Convention* at risk. It asked to hear from the State Party.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer State Party of Austria to comment.

The Observer from **Austria** said that the main building is still 60 metres and confirmed that the absolute maximum height is at 73 meters. It confirmed that studies done in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre would be submitted as soon as possible, to secure compatibility between conservation of the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn and the development of the site.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its concern and referred to previous statements by the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of **Israel** also expressed concern and said it understood the pressures the site was facing. It asked for clarity in exchanges on the subject and called for a visual impact study. It did not accept the 2010 deadline in Paragraph 5 of the draft decision set to examine the next progress report and asked that it be brought forward to 2009.

The Delegation of **China** asked for clarifications about the procedure as concerns the provision of new information which should have been provided at a much earlier stage.

The Delegation of **Barbados** stated that there should be acceptable limits fixed, while recalling that it would be difficult to agree on this given the diversity of views on the subject. It recalled that the important aspects to keep in mind were the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and possible threats to it.

The Delegation of **Australia** seconded the points made by Barbados and called for guidance in the Historic Urban Landscapes context. It added that the credibility of the Committee was at stake, as it took a decision on this issue; and there seemed to be no consistent application of this decision.

The Delegation of **Israel**, supporting the Delegation of Australia, added that there may be an interest in including the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value systematically in the State of Conservation reports.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision: Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 5 remained unchanged; Paragraph 4 was proposed to be amended by the deletion of the last part of the sentence and would end with “of the property”.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested that the Committee’s deep concern should be referred to in Paragraph 3 of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** reminded the Committee that there was a need to re-examine this decision’s terminology and deadline in line with Historic Urban Landscapes discussion and the new Recommendation on this matter. Therefore, Paragraph 5 should have a 2009 deadline instead of 2010.

Decision **32 COM 7B.83** was adopted, as amended.

Property	Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar
Id. N°	C 946 rev
State Party	Bosnia and Herzegovina

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.85 Rev**

The **World Heritage Centre** provided explanations as pertains to a joint mission undertaken with ICOMOS to the site in May 2008. It specified that the mission had come up with new recommendations which were reflected in a revised draft decision.

ICOMOS stressed that the mission had been able to determine that the proposed hotel “Ruza” to be built was aggressive in scale and height and did not respect the integrity of the bridge. The mission concluded that a completely new design was required for the hotel.

ICCROM explained that it had been invited to Mostar and could confirm that the report of ICOMOS was accurate. It added that the hotel project had been stopped following a letter that had been sent by the Assistant Director General for Culture of UNESCO in December 2005. The authorities had requested assistance in identifying solutions for reducing the visual impact posed by the hotel. In addition, ICCROM specified that the bridge had two small cracks after the earthquakes of November 2007 and that a mission with Professor Croci was under preparation and would be reporting about the impact of the earthquakes. Finally, it confirmed that a discussion had taken place with the President of Bosnia and Herzegovina, who said he was committed to reducing the negative visual impact of the hotel “Ruza”. It added that the Committee might want to invite the State Party to request technical assistance to reduce such negative impact.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked that the decision note with satisfaction that the works will be suspended. It added that the nature of the cracks mentioned in Paragraph 5 of the draft decision should be specified.

The Delegation of **Bahrain**, having read the report and listened to the Advisory Bodies, noted that the authorities had been dealing with this issue with the utmost attention, in particular as concerns the hotel project. It supported the request for technical assistance made by the authorities in particular regarding the hotel and agreed that the Mayor should be assisted in designing a new project that would aim to reduce the negative visual impact on the site.

The Delegation of **Kenya** offered a general comment pertaining to ICCROM’s contribution which could be better used. It emphasized the fact that ICCROM had a major role to play, in particular on training, capacity building as well as monitoring.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision: paragraphs 1, 2, 4 and 6 would remain unchanged; Paragraph 3 would be revised to add “with satisfaction”, Paragraph 5 would take on board the nature of the cracks “that appeared on the Old Bridge of Mostar structure after the earthquake”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested that, in Paragraph 5, the word « earthquake » should be plural since there had been two earthquakes affecting the bridge.

La Délégation du **Maroc** propose deux modifications au paragraphe 5 du projet de décision afin de demander à l’Etat partie des indicateurs précis, et remarque qu’au paragraphe 6 le mot « définitif » est problématique, puisque c’est au Comité que revient une telle appréciation.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with the Delegation of Morocco. It also suggested replacing, at the end of Paragraph 5, “ICOMOS” with “the Advisory Bodies”.

Decision **32 COM 7B.85** was adopted, as amended.

The meeting rose at 06.30 p.m.

FOURTH DAY – Saturday, 5 July 2008

FIFTH MEETING

09.00 a.m. – 01.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

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

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
WHC-08/32.COM/ 7B.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/ 7B Add.2

Decisions: WHC-08/32.COM/7B.1-128

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Property	Historic Centre of Prague
Id. N°	C 616
State Party	Czech Republic

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.86**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee about the content of a letter addressed to it by the State Party on 3 June 2008 containing the latter's comments on the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission report. According to the letter, the law of 1987 was operational and applied to historic centres, while the 2006 law on regional and territorial planning had been applied to Prague through a new master plan. On 16 June 2008, the Centre had also received from the City of Prague the proceedings of the seminar "Sustainable management of historic cities in Europe" organized in May 2008. On 2 July 2008, a letter had been received from the NGO Pankrac Society concerning several new proposed developments in the Pankrac area of Prague, including a new skyscraper project named "Ice Tower" as well as two skyscraper projects and a road development.

The Delegation of **Israel** commended the report submitted by the State Party, which it considered an example of best practice to be used in future as a reference.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada, suggesting that a new paragraph 3 be introduced, commending the State Party for its exemplary report.

Decision **32 COM 7B.86** was adopted as amended.

Property	Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn
Id. N°	C 822
State Party	Estonia

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.87**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of a letter it had received dated 26 May 2008 from a group of concerned citizens concerning the demolition of cultural heritage and construction of inappropriate buildings in the Old Town of Tallinn. New information had been received on 27 June from the same group informing the Centre about partial destruction of the bastion of Ingermanland. The Centre had addressed a letter to the Estonian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO on the same day asking for detailed information. Meanwhile, on 26 June 2008, a four-page document and a letter had been received from the Tallinn Cultural Heritage Department containing information on the “*Development Plan for Tallinn Old Town*”, and on the comprehensive management plan, new building activities in a section of the town wall and the halting of new construction projects and particularly of the extension of the Viru Hotel. The authorities had also agreed to lower buildings so as to limit their impact on the integrity of the property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** wondered if the State Party could provide its comments on paragraph 6 of the draft decision, suggesting that it should challenge a court decision to allow the construction of new buildings in the section of the town between Suurtüki and Rannmäe streets.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of Estonia to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Estonia** clarified that the decision by the court would not have any impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The agreement reached between the authorities and the owner of the land concerned was considered satisfactory and therefore the State Party was not contemplating challenging the decision of the court.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, having listened to the position of the State Party of Estonia, suggested deleting paragraph 6.

The Delegations of **Barbados** and **Australia** said that it was difficult to follow the discussion without the images on the screen and considering the very short text of the draft decision.

The **Chairperson** informed the members of the Committee that the replacement of the images with the text of the draft decisions had been decided by the Bureau earlier in the morning. She requested the Secretariat to clarify whether it would have been technically feasible to have both the images and the text at the same time.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that shifting from images to text would take some time, thus delaying the deliberations. He also clarified that for the current session it would have been impossible to show corrections to the draft decisions in real time.

The Delegation of **Brazil** pointed out that the technology to show simultaneous corrections of draft decisions on screen in real time was normally available at other UNESCO meetings and expressed the wish that that would also be possible for future sessions of the World Heritage Committee, with the image of the property on the centre screen and the text of the decision on the side.

The **Chairperson** asked for the views of the Committee on this subject.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, supported by the Delegations of **Tunisia** and **Sweden**, requested switching back to the images.

The **Chairperson**, noting that there were no objections, asked for the images to be put back on the screen and asked the Rapporteur if there were two different draft decisions on the go.

The **Rapporteur** recalled that the Delegation of the United States of America had proposed deleting paragraph 6 of the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 7B.87** was adopted as amended.

Before moving to the following property, the **Chairperson** informed the members of the Committee that the Legal Adviser had a clarification to provide concerning the case of the World Heritage property of the Medieval Monuments of Kosovo, discussed earlier by the Committee under item 7A.

The **Legal Adviser**, having been informed that there was some confusion among the delegations about the amendments made to the draft decision concerning the property, said that the amendments applied only to the text of the decision and did not change the fact that Serbia was the State Party to the *Convention*, not Kosovo. The Secretariat would continue the existing practice of including Serbia in lists, documentation, agenda items, headings, etc. with regard to the property concerned.

Property	Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley
Id. N°	C 85
State Party	France

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.88**

The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that there had been no new information available but asked if the Committee would like a brief presentation.

The **Chairperson** thought the document was quite thorough.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that the problems affecting the property were of great concern, considering also that Spain had many similar sites that could be affected by the bacterium responsible for the black mould which had appeared on the paintings in the Lascaux cave. It asked for the State Party of France to be invited to share the results of the studies currently being undertaken.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** likewise asked that the State Party be given the floor to address the question.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that it appeared to be a case requiring Danger Listing.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of France to comment.

L'Observateur de la **France** expose que les études en cours seront finies à la fin de l'année 2008 et que leurs conclusions seront communiquées au Comité.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed the extraordinary importance of the property and the fact that every effort should be made to protect it.

La Délégation du **Maroc** propose d'écouter l'Etat partie pour gagner du temps.

La Délégation d'observation de la **France** tient à assurer le Comité que son gouvernement prend très à cœur la sauvegarde de la Grotte de Lascaux, et que d'importants moyens scientifiques, humains et financiers ont été déployés à cette intention. Elle rappelle que la conservation d'une grotte est un processus très complexe, avec plusieurs phénomènes naturels qui interagissent. Le Comité scientifique, créé en 2002 et dédié à la protection de la Grotte, a été renforcé en 2006. La cause du problème ainsi que les solutions à y apporter ne font pourtant pas encore l'unanimité chez les éminents experts scientifiques qui le constitue. Le Comité scientifique s'est fixé la fin de l'année 2008 pour trouver des solutions à mettre en œuvre.

La représentante de la France souligne également que le document de travail présente une inexactitude concernant la décoloration de la Grotte qui serait entreprise par les autorités françaises ; ceci est en effet inexact, seules des études visant à atténuer l'impact visuel du champignon sont en cours.

L'Etat partie propose des réponses ciblées aux demandes du Comité : l'accès à la grotte, déjà limité, le sera encore plus strictement ; le rachat des terrains autour de la grotte, notamment pour éviter des constructions sur la cavité, est en cours ; les autorités françaises organiseront début 2009 un symposium sous la présidence d'une haute personnalité scientifique et de l'UNESCO qui rassemblera les meilleurs experts scientifiques dans le domaine de la conservation des grottes ; par soucis de transparence, la France s'engage à informer régulièrement le Comité et la Communauté scientifique de l'état de conservation du bien ; la France accueille volontiers la mission scientifique demandée par le Comité.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that there seemed to be no agreement as to the causes of the damage affecting the very important property under discussion and no guarantee that they would be identified by the end of 2008 through the study mentioned. It considered that the property would benefit from being included in the List of World Heritage in Danger and wondered what the reaction of the State Party would be to that suggestion.

The Delegation of **Barbados** shared the view that the study being undertaken was of great importance, including to States Parties of its region, which possessed similar cave sites.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supporting the view that the study mentioned would be beneficial to many States Parties and not only to the property in question, noted that the inclusion of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger should not be considered a punishment. In its view, the actions that the State Party was undertaking would correspond to the corrective measures that the Committee would recommend for a property inscribed on the Danger List. Therefore, the Delegation supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Kenya and offered its support if needed, including by sending experts to the announced scientific symposium.

The Delegation of **China** considered that the completion of the study was essential and stated its readiness to join in that research project.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked that the State Party be given the floor to express its view on the possibility of Danger Listing the property.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of France to comment

La Délégation d'observation de la France pense qu'une décision de cette nature est prématurée. Elle affirme que la surface présentant ce phénomène représente moins de 1 % et que le site n'est pas en danger. Les études scientifiques avancent. Elle propose d'attendre les résultats attendus à la fin de l'année 2008, et d'organiser en 2009 un Symposium sous l'égide de l'UNESCO avec la participation des spécialistes reconnus.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** suit avec beaucoup d'intérêt la démarche de la France et la félicite des efforts accomplis et des résultats attendus. Elle suggère de ne pas se précipiter et de ne pas inscrire le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that the State Party should be given sufficient time to address that delicate question and that Danger Listing might result in excessive pressure leading to rushed decisions.

The Delegation of **Peru**, having listened to the State Party, agreed with the view expressed by the Delegations of Spain and Tunisia.

La Délégation du **Maroc** soutient ses prédécesseurs.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed not to request Danger Listing the property, but stressed that the whole question of Danger Listing should be demystified. Inscribing a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger should not be interpreted as a condemnation.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, recalling that France was a pioneering country in the study of cave art, noted that the proposed international scientific symposium would present an excellent opportunity for exchange and cooperation, and should also include representatives of ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, having listened to the intervention of the State Party, said it would support the draft decision as it was.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested deleting from paragraph 5 the part in bold.

The Chairperson, noting no objections from the members of the Committee, gave the floor to a representative from the NGO International Committee for the Preservation of Lascaux for a short intervention.

The Chair of the **International Committee for the Preservation of Lascaux** urged the Committee to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, stating that over 50% of the property, and in particular the areas containing most of the over 1600 paintings existing in the cave, was affected by the fungus. By the same time the following year the property would risk disappearing.

The **Rapporteur** read out a proposed amendment concerning paragraph 3, with the addition of a subparagraph 3 (f) to encourage the State Party to make available the report of the scientific study under way. A minor amendment was also proposed for subparagraph 3 (c). A new paragraph 5 had been proposed by the Delegation of Bahrain, referring to the

introduction of the reinforced reactive monitoring mechanism for the property. Finally, an amendment to paragraph 6 had been introduced by the Delegation of the United States of America, to delete the part in bold.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, supported by the Delegations of **Sweden** and **Australia**, made a further suggestion concerning paragraph 5 of the draft decision, suggesting that the words “in finding out the causes and treatment” be added after the word “progress”.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the positions expressed by the Delegations of Bahrain and Kenya, stressing the importance of ensuring the coordination of the various committees established to advise on conservation measures at the property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** withdrew its proposed amendment to paragraph 5; however, it considered that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should be used only in the most extreme cases, and was not justified in the circumstances.

The Delegations of **Spain**, the **Republic of Korea** and **Tunisia** agreed that no Reinforced Monitoring was required in the case under consideration.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that the application of Reinforced Monitoring should not be considered a censure, and suggested retaining it in the text of the decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the situation concerning the property reminded it of the international cooperation which had taken place concerning the World Heritage property of the Temples of Abu Simbel, and stressed the desirability of involving the Advisory Bodies in the joint effort for the safeguarding of the property.

The Delegations of **Brazil**, **Kenya** and **Bahrain**, sharing the view expressed by others that Reinforced Monitoring was a positive measure, said they wished to hear the position of the State Party on that subject.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of France to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **France** explained that it would be difficult to implement monitoring activities in the very short term since the study was expected to be completed only by the end of the year and the scientific symposium was planned for 2009.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** withdrew its proposed amendment.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments to paragraphs 2 and 3, noting the proposed deletion of paragraph 4 and the new language introduced in paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Australia**, pointing out that the questions addressed in paragraphs 3 and 4 were of a different nature, suggested retaining paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Kenya** considered that Reinforced Monitoring was being reintroduced in practice by the new proposed additions. Noting that States Parties should be trusted by the Committee as a matter of principle, it asked whether the Delegation of Israel would be willing to withdraw its proposed amendment.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed.

ICCROM took the floor to stress that it was already actively cooperating with the State Party of France, since its experts and Council members were part of the Scientific Committee established to advise on the conservation of the property.

The **Rapporteur** read out the revised draft decision with the various proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested that the word “damage” be added after “cause of the” in the text of the decision.

Decision **32 COM 7B.88** was adopted as amended.

Property	Bordeaux, Port of the Moon
Id. N°	C 1256
State Party	France

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.89**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the State of Conservation of the property had been discussed during a meeting held with the French Permanent Delegation to UNESCO on 4 May 2008 in Paris. On that occasion, the Delegation had expressed concern about the procedures for sharing information between the Centre and the State Party on new projects. At the invitation of the Mayor of Bordeaux, the Director of the World Heritage Centre had visited the site on 23 June 2008 and discussed with relevant local authorities the issues mentioned above, including the safeguarding measures for the Passerelle Saint-Jean, also called “Passerelle Eiffel”, located at the limit of the property, foreseen for demolition. In early June the Centre had been informed about its imminent demolition. Soon after that visit, however, the Ministry of Culture of France had announced in a press release the listing of the Passerelle as a national historic monument. Concerning the destruction of the metal Pertuis swing bridge, the Mayor had recognized that no information had been provided to the World Heritage Centre and offered his apologies. As for the construction of the bridge across the Garonne between the Bacalan and Bastide, the Mayor had informed the Director of the World Heritage Centre of the 15-year process that had led to the choice of the bridge option, as well as of the different technical alternatives examined, including the construction of a tunnel. The Director of the World Heritage Centre had then indicated that detailed documentation was required before a comprehensive view could be expressed on that project, but had noted his reservations on the solution adopted, due to the visual impact on the urban skyline of the property.

The Delegation of **Canada**, supported by the Delegation of **Israel**, expressed its great concern and disappointment over the destruction of the historic Pertuis swing bridge, only weeks after the property had been inscribed on the World Heritage List by the Committee. The loss of that component of the property appeared to affect its Outstanding Universal Value

. The Delegation also wanted more information regarding the project for the new bridge, hoping that a situation similar to the case of Dresden could be avoided in the present case. It proposed to inscribe the property on the list of World Heritage in Danger and apply the provisions of Reinforced Monitoring.

La Délégation du **Maroc** propose d’écouter l’Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Australia**, noting that the information contained in the report was raising very serious concerns, likewise wished to hear from the State Party.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of France to comment.

La Délégation d'observation de la **France** dit comprendre la préoccupation du Comité mais estime qu'il y a des incohérences dans le Projet de Décision. Par exemple, l'ICOMOS était au courant du projet du nouveau pont, qui avait fait l'objet de longues études. Elle ajoute qu'une mission conjointe de l'ICOMOS et du Centre du patrimoine mondial sera la bienvenue.

ICOMOS clarified that during an evaluation mission its experts were often shown different development projects at various stages of elaboration. However, it was not their task to evaluate them in detail. To date, a complete environmental impact assessment for the bridge did not exist.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegation of **Australia**, expressed its surprise that just one year after inscription the Committee should be already discussing the possible Danger Listing of a property. That raised concerns about the way in which candidatures were assessed in the first place. When an evaluation was carried out, the context should always be taken into account.

La Délégation du **Maroc**, après avoir entendu l'ICOMOS, se dit étonnée que le projet concernant le nouveau pont n'ait pas été considéré par l'expert de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** se demande si la valeur universelle exceptionnelle et l'intégrité du bien ont été affectées.

The Delegation of **Sweden** disagreed with the Delegation of Canada and supported the current draft of the decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that it was an unfortunate situation, especially as it was taking place in a country where people were supposed to understand the obligations of the World Heritage Convention. Did the local authorities know that they were making a mistake? Had the property's Outstanding Universal Value been affected? And, if so, what corrective measures could be contemplated in case of Danger Listing?

ICOMOS, in reply to the question asked by the Delegation of Tunisia, said that the bridge which had been demolished was an integral component of the property and that therefore its loss had a negative impact on its Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Australia** shared the view of ICOMOS that the property's Outstanding Universal Value had been affected. It requested, however, more information from the State Party concerning the terms of the "contract" negotiated with the Advisory Body at the time of inscription. Had the bridge been considered in that context ?

The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment to paragraph 3, submitted by the Delegation of Canada, reminding the State Party of its obligations in the framework of the *Convention*. On paragraph 5 there were two proposed amendments submitted by the Delegations of Morocco and Canada. Further amendments concerned paragraphs 6 and 7, which the Delegation of Morocco proposed to be merged. An additional paragraph after paragraph 7 was proposed by the Delegation of Canada suggesting that the Committee would inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A further amendment concerning

paragraph 8 had been submitted by the Delegation of Bahrain, while the Delegation of Canada had suggested adding new language at the end of the last paragraph whereby the Committee would consider delisting the property the following year.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** withdrew its amendment concerning paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the proposal by the Delegation of Canada but wished to qualify the word “solution” by adding the adjective “negative” or “inadequate”.

The Delegation of **Australia**, noting that Danger Listing seemed in general to work better when decided with the consent of the State Party, asked that it be given the floor.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that the State Party be asked also what it thought about the possibility of applying the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to the property. The Delegation also agreed with the view expressed by the Delegation of Brazil that development projects should be assessed by ICOMOS in the context of its evaluation of a nominated property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** wanted to be sure we were talking about Reinforced Monitoring and not reactive monitoring and noted that paragraph 8 should have referred to a swing bridge, not a suspended one.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party of France if World Heritage in-Danger Listing would be appropriate and helpful and whether it would accept a Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

La Délégation d'observation de la **France** confirme que l'Etat partie regrette vivement la destruction du pont de Pertuis. Le Maire de Bordeaux s'est lui-même exprimé ainsi lors de la visite du Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial en juin dernier. Par contre, concernant le projet de construction du nouveau pont, la France souhaite exprimer une fois de plus sa surprise. En effet, ce projet était bel et bien mentionné dans le dossier de candidature d'inscription du site et dans son évaluation, qui ont été soumis pour examen au Comité lors de sa session en 2007. Elle questionne alors le principe de la méthodologie d'évaluation des sites, qui ne permet apparemment pas aux membres du Comité d'avoir accès à toutes les informations disponibles. Elle estime que ce débat n'a pas lieu d'être. Elle accepte cependant le mécanisme de suivi renforcé.

La représentante de la **France** répète que l'Etat partie accepte le mécanisme de suivi renforcé, mais refuse l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril pour les raisons invoquées précédemment.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested ICOMOS to clarify the issue of the information concerning the new bridge project within the nomination file.

ICOMOS stressed that no information on the demolition of the swing bridge had been contained in the nomination. As for the new bridge, it was superficially mentioned in the file and not referred to as an agreed project that ICOMOS was requested to evaluate.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that the State Party had made extraordinary efforts in terms of the overall conservation of urban heritage. During his recent visit to the property he had had the opportunity to review the situation concerning the bridges, including the one demolished and the proposed new bridge. With regard to the latter, he had expressed to the Mayor of Bordeaux his concerns about the possible impact of

the project, considering that the new bridge would become the second highest building in town.

La Délégation du **Maroc** se demande dans quelles conditions le dossier a été examiné par l'ICOMOS. Elle regrette la destruction du pont et s'interroge sur le processus d'évaluation du dossier relatif au projet du nouveau pont.

The Delegation of **Kenya** wondered where the Committee had failed. Was it possible for the State Party to restore the Outstanding Universal Value of the property? It also observed that ways should be found to accommodate change within World Heritage properties.

The Delegation of **Australia** read out the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property with relation to criterion (iv), as adopted by the Committee the previous year, and concluded that the Committee had no other option but to go for the Danger List.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked whether ICOMOS could state whether the construction of the new bridge would compromise the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

ICOMOS said that it would have been preferable to have a full environmental impact assessment, but that from information available it would appear that the proposed project would have a negative impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the amendments received, including one from the Delegation of Morocco noting that the information received was incomplete.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegation of **Canada**, suggested linking the text proposed by the Delegation of Morocco to that submitted by the Delegation of Canada, or else inserting a new paragraph.

The **Rapporteur** accordingly proposed including a new paragraph, after paragraph 4, as suggested by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Chairperson asked if there was any objection to the proposal. As there was none, the new paragraph between 4 and 5 was adopted.

The **Rapporteur** then proposed reading the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada to revise the existing paragraph 5.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the proposed amendment. As there were none, it was adopted.

The **Rapporteur** also read out once again the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Morocco, concerning a request for an environmental impact assessment of the new bridge project "and other possible river crossing so as to be able to compare solutions".

ICOMOS requested that the reference to a "fully independent environmental impact assessment conducted by a qualified body" be maintained.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souhaite savoir si l'Etat partie serait d'accord.

The **Chairperson** said the issue was whether or not the environmental and cultural study on the drawbridge project would be carried out by a qualified independent body.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that the specific legal context of each State Party should be taken into account. Perhaps in France environmental impact assessments were conducted by governmental agencies, and not independent experts. It therefore suggested not using the language proposed by ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the environmental impact assessment be conducted “in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies”.

La Délégation du **Maroc** rappelle que, pour des cas similaires antérieurs, le Comité a fait confiance à l’Etat partie et que l’ajout proposé par l’ICOMOS n’est donc pas nécessaire.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested the Rapporteur to clarify whether the amended decision included the proposal by the Delegation of Kenya concerning the reconstruction of the demolished bridge.

The **Chairperson** noted that no proposals in writing had been received at the podium.

Following a query by the Delegation of the **United States of America**, the **Rapporteur** read out the latter’s proposed amendment to paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Canada** stressed that the key point was the delaying of the implementation of the new bridge project. That had been captured by the amendments put forward by the Delegation of Morocco, and therefore the Delegation withdrew its amendment on paragraph 7.

The **Rapporteur** referred to a proposed new paragraph concerning the Danger Listing of the property, as well as the introduction of Reinforced Monitoring, after a clarification requested from the Delegation of Brazil.

Paragraph 7 was adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** moved to the next amendment which proposed a new paragraph to inscribe Bordeaux Port of the Moon France on the list of World Heritage in Danger and to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, supported by the Delegations of **Spain, Egypt, Kenya** and **Morocco**, opposed Danger Listing unless it was done with the consent of the State Party concerned, and suggested that the Committee limit itself to the application of Reinforced Monitoring.

The Delegations of **Canada** and **Brazil** noted that, in the case under consideration, there was a need to clarify in what circumstances Danger Listing was to be applied.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested amending the text proposed by the Delegation of Canada to read: “strongly urges the State Party to consider requesting the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** seconded the Delegation of Australia and added that, with the introduction of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism last year, a situation arises as to how to apply the World Heritage in Danger Listing.

La Délégation du **Maroc** pense qu'il serait prématuré d'inscrire le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, d'autant plus que l'Etat partie a accepté que le mécanisme de suivi renforcé soit appliqué au site.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** s'associe à la proposition de l'Australie, mais demande que « aux besoin » soient ajouté après « envisager ».

The Delegation of **Canada** inquired when Danger Listing would be employed as it was an issue the Committee needed to confront.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it was important to take the view of the State Party into consideration and therefore asked for the language to be amended to “strongly urges the State Party to consider requesting inscription of Bordeaux for Danger Listing” as that would both send a strong message and take account of the opinions of other Delegations.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed with the Australian Delegation's proposal.

The **Legal Adviser** drew attention to the decision taken by the Committee with regard to the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. The Committee had adopted the mechanism as proposed by the Director-General of UNESCO which stipulated that, when the Committee decided to apply that mechanism, it must also decide on what kind of monitoring it wanted and for how long.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that when a date was set, such as 2009 for example, it was expected that the mechanism would be applied within 2009 and until the next Committee meeting, but asked for the guidance of the Legal Adviser on the question.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended new paragraph from Canada.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that, as one of the three States Parties that had experience with the mechanism, it would like to draw the Committee's attention to the mechanism's positive aspect and importance. It was a mechanism which allowed the Committee to take decisions. Finally, it proposed to defer it for one year as the Delegation of Kenya had proposed.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it did not see the benefit of using language such as “as needed”, and would therefore prefer it not to be included.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** agreed with Israel and stressed that guidelines and protocols for the mechanism were still needed. Requesting the State Party to submit reports and so on would be akin to applying the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. It noted that reports were to be submitted by February 2009, a deadline that was not very distant, and would therefore like to abide by the draft decision and the date given.

The **Rapporteur** read out the revised paragraph.

The revised paragraph was adopted.

The **Rapporteur** noted that paragraph 8 remained unchanged, with the exception of a minor amendment. Paragraph 9 would take up the final revision proposed by the Delegation of Canada.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that it had previously withdrawn its amendment, but that one element still remained relevant now in paragraph 8, namely that the property's Outstanding Universal Value had been compromised, not altered.

The **Rapporteur** noted the changes in the language to reflect Bahrain's point.

Paragraph 8 was adopted as amended.

At the request of the Delegation of **Brazil**, the **Chairperson** re-opened the discussion on paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that it did not see how the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism worked in relation to reactive monitoring, and asked the World Heritage Centre to clarify. The Delegation also asked whether perhaps reactive monitoring could be requested.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism involved informing the Committee throughout the year, whereas with reactive monitoring, the Committee was informed only at Committee sessions.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said it still had in mind the Legal Adviser's point about giving substance to reactive monitoring. It asked whether the State Party should be asked to invite reactive monitoring and whether it could provide information on the results of the mission.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that it was important to establish the duration of the mechanism.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked whether the Committee could suggest that, upon receiving the report in February, it could be immediately given to the Committee for consideration.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said it wished to know if the property could be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, even if the State Party had not agreed.

The **Chairperson** noted that the consensus in the room appeared to show a preference to consider requesting the State Party to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Cuba** sought clarification regarding the criteria for inscription of a site on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

The **Legal Adviser** asked whether the Delegation of Cuba wished to know the substantial or procedural conditions.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said it wished to be briefed about the procedural conditions for such an inscription.

The **Legal Adviser** said that, as mentioned by the Delegation of Australia, the issue had been the subject of intense debate at several Committee sessions, and that, with due regard for the views and opinions of each State Party, the Office of Legal Affairs had already made a presentation at the World Heritage Committee's 26th session in Budapest regarding procedural conditions for inscription on the Danger List. That document had been submitted to the Committee. The opinion of the Office of Legal Affairs was that States Parties should be consulted as defined in the *Operational Guidelines*, but it was up to the Committee to make an assessment as to the substance of the matter and the degree of danger. The conditions for inscription were set out in Article 11.4 of the *Convention*. Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger required that there was a danger and that there was a request for assistance to protect the property. Article 11.4 went on to say that in case of urgent need the Committee could inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger without the State Party requesting assistance for the property concerned. Hence, two situations were foreseen: one ordinary request by which the State Party asked for inscription, and a second one in the event of urgent need, in which case the Committee could proceed without

a request by the concerned State Party. That was in the *Operational Guidelines*, and it was up to the States Parties to interpret it and up to the Committee to take a decision depending on the case.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** wondered whether the impact assessment as referred to in paragraph 8 did not contradict paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that paragraphs 8 and 9 were not linked and stressed that it preferred to keep them separate. It was a case for reactive monitoring and not for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. The Delegation considered that, after listening to the Legal Adviser, it would be appropriate to take the issue up at the next General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were objections to the amended paragraph. There were none, and the paragraph was adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments for paragraph 9.

Decision **32 COM 7B.89** was adopted as amended.

Property	Historical Monuments of Mtskheta
Id. N°	C 708
State Party	Georgia

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.90**

The **Secretariat** noted that the mission requested had taken place in June 2008 and that no comments had so far been received from the State Party.

Decision **32 COM 7B.90** was adopted.

Property	Upper Middle Rhine Valley
Id. N°	C 1066
State Party	Germany

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.93**

The **Secretariat** provided new information that a meeting had taken place on 20 June 2008 with representatives from the Ministry of the region and the State Party authorities. The authorities had highlighted their wish to look at all options and carry out environmental impact studies for those options and not only the tunnel.

The Delegation of **Sweden** noted that there was strong pressure for new development, and that the case showed a good initiative by the State Party to involve ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre in dialogue at an early stage in order to avoid future problems. Moreover, it noted that an environmental impact study could be carried out for Rhine crossing options, and that it would clarify issues with regards to Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it had an issue regarding the paragraph on noise pollution, asking for clarification of how noise pollution was related to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked whether the property's Outstanding Universal Value referred to the romantic nature of the site or rather its position as a traffic corridor.

ICOMOS answered that the question of noise and its impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value had come up for other sites such as Stonehenge, and that noise was a parameter used as an indicator, since in ICOMOS' view a high degree of noise in a rural landscape would have an impact on people's experience of the site. Regarding the question of the values for which this property had been inscribed, the ICOMOS evaluation summed up what it considered to be the values of the landscape in question. It was its rich historic and artistic value which conferred Outstanding Universal Value on the landscape.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it was interesting to note that the characteristics under which the site had been inscribed actually related to transport – it was a transport route. Transport produced noise over time. As a result, the Delegation would like to hear from ICOMOS in more detail how noise would impact the value of the property.

ICOMOS noted that many sites were inscribed for their cumulative development over time. Further developments along the same lines could, however, be detrimental. In the Rhine Valley the transport which was celebrated under criteria (ii) was not the same sort of transport as that discussed now.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the site had both a railway and a road network in the valley. Hence, noisy transport elements had been there for a long time, and certainly before inscription. The Delegation asked why there was concern about noise for a site inscribed for its transport features. Moreover, the Delegation asked again about the reference to a romantic landscape and asked why that point would be important if it was not inscribed as such.

ICOMOS responded that the property's statement of significance mentioned the romantic landscapes. With regard to noise pollution, ICOMOS specified that the salient issue concerned noise increase and how much increase would be acceptable.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it fully understood the explanations given by ICOMOS and noted that it was a matter of perceptions of space. The Delegation requested that alternatives be sought.

The **Rapporteur** noted that paragraphs 1, 2, and 4 remained unchanged, and that amendments were proposed to paragraphs 3 and 6.

The Delegation of **Australia** pointed out that it had not yet been determined whether the bridge was not an acceptable solution. It noted that, while different, the issue was reminiscent of the Dresden case, and asked whether it would not be more appropriate to ask the State Party to consider a range of decisions rather than one in preference to another.

The **Rapporteur** noted that paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unaffected and read out the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Australia which was the furthest from the original text.

The Delegation of **Israel**, expressing surprise at the Australian Delegation's proposal, stressed that it could not agree with it.

The Delegation of **Peru** asked that more flexibility be given to the State Party in terms of balance between the needs of the community and respect for the property's Outstanding Universal Value. Agreeing to the paragraph as proposed by the Delegation of Sweden, the Delegation said it had the feeling, however, that neither of the two solutions would affect the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** accepted the deletion of paragraphs 4 and 5 but asked that a study be carried out to determine whether the site's Outstanding Universal Value was affected.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the United States Delegation's proposal and further asked whether a property's value was static or whether it could not evolve over time.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was a desire to retain paragraph 3 and a possible consensus to delete paragraphs 4 and 5, and asked the Delegation of Australia whether it was willing to reconsider.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it would be happy to go along with the consensus. It further requested deletion of the sentence on the "tunnel" in paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the deletion of the sentence referring to the tunnel in *Document WHC-08/32.COM 7B.Add*, paragraph 3, page 118.

At the request of the Delegation of the **United States of America**, the **Rapporteur** re-read the amended paragraph 6.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that "possible constructions" be included in the amended paragraph.

Decision **32 COM 7B.93** was adopted as amended.

Property	Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue
Id. N°	C 400 and 400 bis
State Party	Hungary

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.94**

The **Secretariat** provided the new information that on 24 April 2008 the Heritage Foundation of Budapest had reported a project for the construction of a 400-metre wall along the historic banks of the Danube and that the World Heritage Centre had sent a letter to inquire further on the matter. On 24 June 2008, the State Party had transmitted a clarification letter informing the Centre that:

- the licensing delivered by the regional authorities for nature protection and water management took into account the site's heritage values;
- the technical solutions to be applied at Margaret Bridge (northern extremity of the World Heritage site) were set out in such way as not to threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the site;
- the reconstruction of the stone structures supporting the lower quays involved obligatory underwater archaeology works;
- protection against floods had to be taken into account – the potential impact of that intervention on visual integrity and traffic flow was currently being studied.

The Delegation of **Sweden** asked whether the State Party could provide any more recent information.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** inquired about activities in the buffer zone and said it would appreciate a response from ICOMOS on that subject.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked for clarification on whether the “Jewish quarter” was situated in the buffer zone or the property, and for the term “so-called” to be deleted before “Jewish quarter”.

La Délégation d'observation de la **Hongrie** souligne que l'Etat partie, qui avait pris les devants en invitant une mission conjointe UNESCO/ICOMOS sur le site, prend très au sérieux les recommandations du rapport de mission. Elle ajoute que, sur cette base et depuis février dernier, un certain nombre de mesures ont été prises, dont un moratoire sur toute nouvelle construction dans la zone tampon, et ce jusqu'à l'adoption du nouveau plan d'urbanisme, en cours d'élaboration, de cette zone.

ICOMOS answered that the Jewish quarter was located in the buffer zone. With regard to the question on the impact of the changes on the site's Outstanding Universal Value, it noted that in the case under consideration the buffer zone provided a specific urban context and there would be substantial impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Rapporteur** noted that paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unchanged, paragraph 3 was amended as proposed by Kenya, paragraph 4 was amended, and paragraphs 5 and 6 remained unchanged.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked for subparagraphs (a) and (c) in paragraph 5 to be deleted.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande des informations complémentaires sur le moratoire.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that, in the light of ICOMOS' comments, it wished to retain subparagraph (c) and, as a matter of principle, replace “etc” with “for example” in subparagraph (d).

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that subparagraph (c) be reworded.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed.

The **Chairperson** noted that a concern expressed by the Delegation of **Morocco** appeared to be met by the clarification made by the State Party that the moratorium ended in August.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it wished it to be stated clearly whether or not the moratorium would be extended after August.

The Observer Delegation of **Hungary** replied in the affirmative: it would be extended until the adoption of the new urban plan.

Decision **32 COM 7B.94** was adopted as amended.

Property	Skellig Michael
Id. N°	C 757
State Party	Ireland

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.96**

The Secretariat presented new information, namely that a draft management plan had been received on 10 June 2008. It had been transmitted to ICOMOS on 11 June 2008 for review and comments. The Centre had received information from the State Party that the key recommendations of the mission had been taken into account and ICOMOS' comments on the management plan would also be taken into account for its final publication.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested clarification of the meaning of an “advisory mission” and how it differed from a reactive monitoring mission. It further requested clarification of the process for its dispatch. It pointed out that advisory missions had also taken place to Mostar and Budapest.

The **Secretariat** explained that advisory missions took place when the State Party requested very specific advice, and were carried out by the World Heritage Centre and/or ICOMOS.

The Chairperson asked if there were other comments before going to the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out a proposal by the Delegation of **Bahrain**, namely that paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 should remain unchanged and that paragraph 4 should be revised. The Delegation of **Kenya's** proposal for an insertion after paragraph 3 was also noted.

Se référant à la proposition du Kenya, la Délégation du **Maroc** demande à ce qu'un terme plus général, comme « installations sanitaires », remplace celui de « toilettes ».

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed that the word “toilet” should be removed from the text but said that it must be clear that the lack of toilet facilities on the property was a very important issue for the Kenyan Delegation and for human needs in general.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** concurred with Morocco on the use of more general language and proposed an amendment.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the Committee must be careful to not be overly specific.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it had explained why it was being specific and that it endorsed the language proposed by the Delegation of Bahrain.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended paragraph.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that in the case under consideration there was a commitment on the part of the State Party to integrate the recommendations in its management plan, and proposed not to specify a deadline.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that the date of 2010 had already been specified, but it would like to hear a strong commitment by the State Party and how it would be implemented.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments.

Decision **32 COM 7B.96** was adopted as amended.

Property	Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor
Id. N°	C 125
State Party	Montenegro

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.101**

The **Secretariat** provided new information, with comments received from the Ministry for Tourism and Environment on the mission report stating that the authorities agreed with the need for a buffer zone to protect the property and requested expertise in order to proceed. They also agreed with the need for a visual impact study of the Verige Bridge, and for the preparation of a management plan and the improvement of management effectiveness. Finally, they highlighted the national strategy for sustainable development of Montenegro.

The Chairperson asked if they should go to the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Australia** addressed two questions to the Advisory Body: Firstly, it wished to know if the site had a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value against which the impact might be determined, and secondly, the bridge seemed to be quite far away from the site and it therefore asked what distance would be appropriate in order for it to not have an impact.

The **Secretariat**, noting that the Centre had participated in the mission, stated in response that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value needed to be prepared. Moreover, it explained that there had been a discussion by the authorities on where to place the bridge and that, while the place chosen was outside the existing property, there might be a visual impact from the village of Perast inside the property. It further noted that no full impact study, including on cultural and visual aspects, had as yet been carried out by the State Party.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Kenya.

The Delegation of **Kenya** pointed out that, regarding other conservation issues, excellent work had been done – work which involved stakeholders – and that it was important that that be recognized.

The **Rapporteur** read out the revised amendments.

In response to a comment by the Delegation of **Bahrain**, the **Rapporteur** said it was understood that paragraph 6 would be unchanged.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked for a minor change at the end of paragraph 3 because a mission should consider only issues related to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and not beyond that.

In response to a request by the Delegation of **Brazil**, the **Rapporteur** read out all paragraphs individually.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked for more generic language in order not to specify the measures that the State Party ought to undertake.

The Delegation of **the United States of America** seconded that proposal.

La Délégation du **Maroc**, se référant à la proposition de la Délégation d'Australie soutenue par la Délégation des Etats-Unis, pense qu'une des mesures correctives possibles serait de tracer une zone tampon qui permettrait de mieux protéger le bien.

With regard to paragraph 4, the Delegation of **Brazil** asked for it to be clarified whether that differed from asking the State Party to define a buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the idea was that it was up to the Committee to ask for protective measures, and up to the State Party to define what those protective measures ought to be.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted, however, that a buffer zone was desirable.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Delegation of Morocco had made the same point.

The **Secretariat** noted that the mission had recommended a buffer zone and that the authorities had agreed to that.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported Morocco's proposal.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for the reference to environmental impact to be deleted in paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that, in view of the Canadian intervention, it was proposing an amendment.

The Delegations of the **United States of America** and **Australia** suggested the removal of "legal" and "buffer zone" from paragraph 7.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** pense qu'il est difficilement concevable pour le Comité d'accepter un impact, même réduit, sur la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Regarding paragraph 7, the Delegation of the **United States of America** observed that a property's Outstanding Universal Value must be clearly defined before questioning any impact upon it.

The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment was proposed for paragraph 7, and that the Delegation of the United States of America was referring to a new paragraph.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said "would eliminate negative impact" would be acceptable.

The **Rapporteur** said that the comment made by the Delegation of Tunisia concerned an earlier paragraph and that the revisions as proposed by Canada and others were already accepted. She read out the new paragraph.

Decision **32 COM 7B.101** was adopted as amended.

Property	Kizhi Pogost
Id. N°	C 544
State Party	Russian Federation

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.104**

The **Secretariat** noted that there was no new information.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that not all conservation issues had been covered by the report so far, and said it would like the State Party to give some further clarification, especially concerning the boundaries, the proposed management plan mentioned in paragraph 7 of the draft decision, and financing.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked whether ICOMOS could advise on the seriousness of the structural instability of the church.

La Délégation d'observation de la **Fédération de Russie**, après avoir remercié la Présidente et les autorités canadiennes, rappelle que la mission conjointe CPM/ICOMOS, qui s'est rendue sur le site en avril 2007, est arrivée à des conclusions positives. La Délégation estime que la construction générale du site n'est pas en danger. Dans le cadre du plan de conservation qui a été établi il y a sept ans par le Musée du bois en plein air, des travaux relatifs à la préparation du bois, des ateliers de montage et démontage ont déjà été effectués et d'autres projets, comme le renforcement des fondations, ont déjà été approuvés par les autorités russes, et sont en cours d'élaboration. Les travaux principaux commenceront l'année prochaine.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** further specified its questions: (1) What was the current status of the management plan? (2) Had the boundaries been defined? (3) Had there been an assigned budget?

La Délégation d'observation de la **Fédération de Russie** souhaite souligner que le bien du patrimoine mondial ne représente qu'une petite partie de l'ensemble du site national dont le Musée a la charge. Le périmètre et la zone tampon sont une seule et même zone. La Délégation demande que la dernière question de la Délégation du Bahreïn soit répétée.

La Délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** informe que 23 millions de roubles ont déjà été alloués à ce projet, et que l'Etat prévoit d'augmenter considérablement le budget accordé à ce bien.

ICOMOS noted that conservation work was extremely urgent and that the Committee had already requested that the work start immediately. The state of the church was fragile and was deteriorating and, moreover, it faced severe climatic conditions. ICOMOS was very concerned about the delays incurred thus far. Regarding the landscape issue, it noted that at the time of nomination of the site it had been requested that landscape be taken into consideration, stressing that the two must go together.

The **Rapporteur** noted that paragraphs 1 to 6 remained unchanged, then a new paragraph would be introduced on the basis of Canada's proposal, and subparagraph (b) of paragraph 7 would be deleted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested information on what was meant by a "Special State Group" as it was unfamiliar with the term.

The **Secretariat** explained that it was a consultative group with stakeholders which provided technical advice and evaluated technical solutions during all the steps of the project.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it had the same question as Bahrain and noted that paragraph 6 did not imply that ICOMOS and the Centre would be involved.

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to the wording "with a view to consider, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger", asking whether that would not end up being an empty term if repeated ad infinitum. That was just by way of a comment to be borne in mind.

Decision **32 COM 7B.104** was adopted as amended.

Property	Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments
Id. N°	C 1170
State Party	Russian Federation

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.105**

The **Secretariat** presented the following new information: On 20 June 2008 the World Heritage Centre had received information from the Chairperson of the Russian World Heritage Committee with an extract of a letter signed by the Press Officer of the President of the "Gazprom" company stating that at present the development of the architectural concept, design plans and specifications was in progress, and that in June 2008 construction works in the area had not yet started. Moreover, the terms of design completion had not been determined. Once the design stage of the project was completed, all documentation would be submitted to the federal government bodies of the Russian Federation for consideration and for the adoption of all agreement procedures. It was also reported that archaeological excavations and research were being conducted.

During his meeting with the Director-General on the occasion of the Director-General's official visit to the Russian Federation in June 2008, the Minister for Foreign Affairs had given assurances to the Director-General with regard to all questions related to the construction of the Gazprom tower in St. Petersburg. He had recalled his authorities' position that any decision on the tower construction in St. Petersburg would be taken in strict conformity with the legislation and with the Government's obligations concerning the preservation of the cultural heritage. He had also recalled that the Gazprom tower project which had provoked protests was only one of the proposals, which still existed only on paper. Finally, the Secretariat informed the Committee that the city of St. Petersburg had modified the height limits from 48m to 100m at the beginning of 2008.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it was disturbing to read the report because the issue had been discussed at length at the Committee's session in Christchurch the previous year and the Committee had been told that the issue would be addressed, yet the Committee was faced with the same issues again at the current session. The Delegation noted that there was a lack of information and said that it was a waste of time for the Committee to address the same issues and to hear the same questions over and over again. It would be appropriate to ask the State Party what exactly is happening.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked whether it could be clearly pointed out on a map where the property was situated and where the tower would stand.

The **Secretariat** pointed to the map and noted that the exact definition of the boundaries of the property was complex given that it was a serial property with a component in the Leningrad Oblast.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its concern about the creation of a precedent affecting the issue of historic towns in Europe. It highlighted the following three points: (a) the visual impact on the banks of a historic city; (b) the impact of the change of height from 48 to 100 metres on the whole property; and (c) the individual Gazprom building. The Delegation subscribed to the comments made by the Delegation of Kenya and asked that the Committee be more assertive.

The Delegation of **Barbados** commented on the method of presentation of the information and stressed the importance of having the visual impact presented on the screen.

The Delegation of **Canada** shared the concerns put forth by Israel and Kenya and regretted the lack of information. It noted that the Committee was put in a very difficult situation and felt that the tower might be the first of many to be built. The Delegation further asked whether ICOMOS considered the tower a potential threat.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported Barbados and noted that there was no detailed information provided either in the report or in the Powerpoint presentation to allow for an adequate assessment.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** endorsed that view.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked whether, if the Committee session had been taking place in 1890 and Paris were being considered, the construction of the Eiffel Tower would have been considered as having an impact. The Delegation stressed that a balance must be found between historic presentation and urban landscape and social development, an issue dealt with at the Olinda seminar. The Delegation further considered that a conceptual discussion on that issue was needed.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that in the case under consideration the issue related to a commercial element, which was very different from an opera house or the Eiffel Tower, which had a social aspect attached. Interaction with place was being changed and it was not simply a question of contemporary architecture.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported Brazil. With regard to the Israeli Delegation's comment, it further noted that modern heritage issues might also enhance rather than destroy the urban landscape.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its concern about the situation of the historic towns on the World Heritage List. There is strong pressure for new development and the protection of historic urban landscapes, and stressed that rules and guidelines on urban landscape needed to be developed.

The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** said that no decisions had been taken by the Government and that the discussion was on a hypothetical project which had not been approved. The Russian Federation would fulfil its obligations in close consultation with the Committee and the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation stressed that it was important to view the project as a conceptual project.

ICOMOS said that St Petersburg was a coherently horizontal city and that, while it agreed with Barbados that cities needed to grow and develop, it wished to point out that other

development which did not affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value had already taken place. The particular tower in question and its height would, however, have an impact.

The **Chairperson** suspended the discussion on this item until the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 01.00 p.m.

FOURTH DAY - Saturday, 5 July 2008

SIXTH MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Christina Cameron

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The Chairperson proposed to give the floor to the Delegation of Azerbaijan to give a quick update on Baku.

The Observer Delegation of Azerbaijan stated it was acquainted with the Draft Decision which had already been adopted by the Committee and that special attention is given to the whole city of Baku. At the current time, no illegal constructions are being carried out in the area. A group of experts worked to prepare a Master Plan. It invited a joint mission of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to evaluate the current state of the property.

The Chairperson proposed to suspend the discussion on **Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg** and to move to the **Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation)**.

Property	Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl
Id. N°	C 545
State Party	Russian Federation

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: 32 COM 7B.107

The World Heritage Centre informed that a national expert mission had been organized in March 2008 at the property confirming that a Master Plan was adopted in 2006 and that the creation of a Buffer Zone is under preparation. 18 new construction projects within the boundaries of the property were studied by the national experts but no information regarding these had been brought to the attention of either the World Heritage Centre or ICOMOS contrary to paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment to the draft decision, adding a new paragraph 5 requesting the State Party to invite a reactive monitoring mission to assess the State of Conservation of the property, with current paragraphs 5 and 6 being retained as they stood.

Decision **32 COM 107** was adopted as amended.

Property	Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments
Id. N°	C 540
State Party	Russian Federation

(continued)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.105**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the Saint Petersburg property.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to the draft decision proposed by the following Delegations: Delegation of Israel: “also urges the State Party to finalize the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones including all components of the region and to submit a report for 1 February 2009”; Delegation of Canada: to insert in paragraph 6 “and ICOMOS” after “in coordination with the World Heritage Centre”; Delegation of Canada: a new paragraph requesting “the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to evaluate the potential impact of the proposed tower on the Outstanding Universal Value, the integrity and the authenticity of the property”. Paragraph 7 was to be retained without amendment.

The **Chairperson** read out the draft decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its disagreement with the proposed amendments submitted by the Delegation of Canada, in the light of the clarifications provided by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed the wording “expresses its concern”.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it would go along with the consensus expressed by the Committee.

Paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** read out some additions to paragraph 5, to be inserted in the second sentence after the term “Russian authorities”, reading: “and specifically with local authorities the existing proposed project of the “Ohkta Centre’ ”.

The Delegation of **Australia** questioned whether it was appropriate to involve local authorities when it was the State Party at the national level that was responsible for the property.

The Delegation of **Brazil** concurred with the Delegation of Australia and said that the distinction between the various levels of authorities was not relevant.

The Delegation of **Israel** clarified that the relation between local and federal authorities was relevant in a federal system such as the Russian Federation and that the distinction was needed to ensure correct monitoring.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that the Centre proposed to provide experts and that, in that perspective, it was appropriate to ensure constant collaboration with the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to strike out the reference to Russian authorities.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the official position of the local authorities which would issue the construction licence was indeed relevant. If it was understood that the wording “Russian authorities” included all levels of authorities, including local authorities, it could go along with the consensus.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of **Canada** clarified the rationale for the amendment it proposed which is to delete the paragraph because it is asked further that the project be suspended until the results of the mission are available.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada.

Paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 6, with the addition of the words “urges the State Party to finalize the boundary of the property and its buffer zone including all components of the region and to submit a report for 1 February 2009.”

Paragraph 6 was adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** read out the two new texts proposed by the Delegation of Canada. The first read: “Requests the State Party (a) to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to evaluate the potential impact of the proposed Ohkta Tower on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property; (b) to suspend the project until the results of the mission are available; (c) to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009”. The second amendment proposed the insertion of a new paragraph between paragraphs 6 and 7, to read: “Requests the Chairperson and the Director of the World Heritage Centre to convene a high-level meeting with the State Party to underscore the importance of cooperating with the Committee in determining the potential impact of the Ohkta Centre on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property.”

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegations of **Canada** and **Israel**, said that a text referring to the need “not to take action on any project until the results of the mission are available” would better reflect the fact that it was still a project and not an actual building or a site under construction.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed the insertion of a new paragraph to reflect the need to consider the possible change in height limits in the property and suggested that a reactive monitoring mission should also look at the proposed changes in heights for the property.

The Delegation of **Kenya** sought clarification on the issue of the core zone. It supported the notion that the property was only the core zone.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it believed that the proposed changes to heights would be more of an issue than the tower itself.

La Délégation du **Maroc** précise que ceci ne concerne pas seulement la ville de Saint-Pétersbourg, et que les détails concernant la hauteur examinés par le Comité sont spécifiques à chaque cas. Elle ajoute que le Comité ne doit pas entrer dans un tel niveau de détail.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it was not comfortable with the idea expressed but would accept that there was consensus building in the room.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed support for Israel's position on this point.

The **Rapporteur** proceeded to review the amendments proposed.

Decision **32 COM 7B.105** was adopted as amended.

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

GENERAL DECISIONS

World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.31**

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that at its 31st session the Committee had requested the State Party to adopt a comprehensive approach to the conservation and monitoring of its World Heritage properties and had decided to recommend the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to all five properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The World Heritage Centre, in consultation with IUCN, had continued to follow up very closely the situation in the five sites. A Reinforced Monitoring mission had been dispatched in August 2007 to Virunga National Park.

The Committee had also requested the Director-General of UNESCO and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to convene a meeting with the authorities of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to discuss progress in addressing the deteriorating State of Conservation of the properties and the Centre had been able to mobilize the necessary funding thanks to Government of Belgium. The meeting, scheduled for 9 May, had unfortunately been postponed at the end of April at the request of the State Party.

The World Heritage Centre concluded that, while the situation in Okapi Wildlife Reserve, Garamba, and Salonga had improved slightly, the situation remained very difficult in Kahuzi Biega and Virunga as a result of security problems.

IUCN emphasized the importance of addressing issues in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in a comprehensive manner, involving key decision makers, among them representatives of other sectors, including mining. Political buy-in and support to address conservation issues was critically important in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. IUCN expressed its hope that the high-level meeting could be re-scheduled urgently and reiterated the willingness of IUCN to be represented at the highest level.

The Delegation of **Israel** confirmed that it was monitoring the situation closely and was pleased to hear about improvements made, but expressed disappointment that the high-level meeting had not taken place. It asked to hear from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the situation at the five sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was of great concern and in need of support. It thanked the World Heritage Centre for the support it had provided to those sites. Regarding missions, it asked for clarification on the role of the Advisory Bodies in developing the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value and Desired State of Conservation. Given that the Desired State of Conservation had not yet been determined and still needed to be clarified, it was necessary to have a clear idea of the amount of work still ahead, and it wished to hear the opinion of the State Party on the issue.

La délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** (Observateur) remercie le Comité et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'attention particulière portée aux biens de la RDC. Elle présente ensuite ses excuses pour les diverses incompréhensions qui ont entraîné l'annulation de la réunion de haut niveau. Elle informe le Comité que conformément au courrier adressé à la Présidente du Comité par le Ministre de l'Environnement, cette réunion aura bien lieu à une date idoine. Elle ajoute que l'état de conservation des cinq biens du patrimoine mondial s'est amélioré et que l'implication de l'appareil juridique, judiciaire et civil aux niveaux local, régional et national a abouti à des actions concertées avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les forces armées congolaises, la MONUC et l'institut de gestion des biens, et à des résultats concrets dans divers domaines : la réduction du braconnage; la déforestation ; meilleur contrôle des aires protégées, meilleure gestion, conseil d'avocats pour des actions en justice. Elle ajoute que le braconnage de la faune et de la flore a été réduit et est maintenant considéré comme crime contre l'humanité. 18 procès sont actuellement en cours. Ces actions combinées ont permis des résultats concrets. Nous encourageons la venue d'une mission conjointe du Centre et de l'UICN pour apprécier les efforts déployés par la RDC de conscience des autorités locales.

The Delegation of **Spain** wondered whether, when applying the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, priority should not be given to providing international assistance and concentrating efforts on one property instead of the five to get it out of the World Heritage List in Danger. It expressed its satisfaction at the improvement of the State of Conservation of the properties and requested the Chairperson to give the floor to Ms. Suzana Pataro, as an in situ Observer.

Ms. Pataro (Observer) congratulated the Chairperson for her wisdom and professionalism. She reported that she had visited Virunga and Kahuzi-Biega National Parks. She alerted the Committee to the human dimension of the conservation of these parks in the Democratic

Republic of the Congo, drawing attention to the situation of the guards and the numerous widows and children of the 150 guards who had lost their lives in the conduct of their duty, and also recalling that women had been raped by poachers. She asked whether some funds could be set aside to address that dimension. Many men and women in the Democratic Republic of the Congo placed great hopes in the Committee's decisions.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded to questions raised by confirming that the efforts made covered all sites, not just one. Thanks to funding and support from Belgium, Italy, UNF and the World Heritage Fund, work was possible at each of the five sites and it was important to maintain activities in all areas as all sites were confronted with very difficult problems. It stressed that, while many donors were providing financial support, the role of the Centre went beyond that, as it was possible to use the *Convention* to raise the awareness of all stakeholders, including the political authorities. With regard to the statement of Desired State of Conservation, the World Heritage Centre specified that, with baseline inventories now being conducted in several properties, it would be possible to develop the Desired State of Conservation for the properties. That would be done in close consultation amongst the State Party, the Centre and IUCN.

IUCN responded to questions raised about the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism and suggested that it should be complemented by follow-up action on the ground. Commitment at the highest levels from partners and national agencies was a guarantee of further support and action from other countries.

The **Rapporteur** proceeded to review the amendments to the draft decision proposed by the Delegations of Israel and Kenya: a new paragraph 3: "Commends the State Party for its efforts to control poaching but expresses its concern about the on-going threats to the integrity of the property"; a new paragraph 5: "Calls on all States Parties to use its bilateral contacts to raise international awareness and promote the implementation of the WHC's recommendations"; a new paragraph 7: "Welcomes the commitment of UNF and AWHF and the States parties of Belgium and Italy in supporting the activities for restoring the Outstanding Universal Value of the five properties"; paragraph 5 and the last paragraph remained unchanged.

Decision **32 COM 7A.31** was adopted as amended:

Property	Virunga National Park
Id. N°	N 63
State Party	Democratic Republic of the Congo

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.4 rev**

The **World Heritage Centre**, presenting the report, said that more gorillas had been killed since the previous report. As part of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism a joint mission of IUCN and the Centre had been dispatched to clarify the circumstances of the killings. The United Nations MONUC mission had also been involved in the mission. The dismantling of a charcoal mine seemed to be at the origin of the conflicts which had led to the killings. The mission had also concluded that, while the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was still present, it was under increasing pressure. General insecurity, lack of governance

concerning the conservation and management of natural resources and increasing threats were seriously affecting the property and its integrity and could lead to irreversible impacts on its Outstanding Universal Value.

Following the mission, the State Party had started a judicial enquiry into the killings, which had resulted in the prosecution and arrest of a number of people. ICCN and its conservation partners had also developed an emergency plan for the gorilla sector, incorporating some of the mission's recommendations.

Unfortunately, the occupation of a large part of the sector in September 2007 by rebel troops had forced ICCN park staff to leave the area.

The World Heritage Centre had also received information that an oil exploration permit had been granted by the State Party to Dominion Oil.

The Delegation of **Brazil** commented that the case under consideration was a test case for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. It noted that the report had been produced in August but had not been forwarded to the Committee until December 2007. It asked for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to be more efficient in the future.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** asked for clarifications about the follow-up to the mission and the creation of a Trust Fund for the sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the delay in producing the report was due to the fact that the results of the mission were sensitive and required clearances before they could be distributed. The process had therefore been longer than foreseen. Don't need explained twice in same sentence

Concerning the Trust Fund, referred to in the background document, the World Heritage Centre confirmed that it was under way and that a meeting had been organized to launch the fund at the end of June, but the Centre had not yet received information on the outcomes of that meeting.

The **Rapporteur** proceeded to review the proposed amendments to the draft decision, incorporating proposals by the Delegation of Morocco: New paragraph 9: "Porte à l'attention de l'État partie le fait que la présence des camps de réunification et d'entraînement de l'armée de Nyaleke à l'intérieur du bien, ainsi que l'allocation de concessions de prospection minière et pétrolière menacent l'intégrité du bien ;

Decision **32 COM 7A.4 Rev** was adopted as amended.

At the request of the Delegation of the **United States of America**, the **Chairperson** reopened the discussion on draft Decision **32 COM 7A.4 Rev**.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** raised a legal point concerning the role of the United Nations in the Democratic Republic of Congo. It noted that the decision "requests the State Party to take action regarding the role of MONUC", but that was not appropriate given the status of the United Nations. The decision should be modified to reflect that point.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment to paragraph 7(c): "Requests the State Party to [...] take steps to improve security in the property and its periphery and in this endeavour seek any cooperation that may be extended, consistent with its mandate and capabilities, by MONUC".

Decision **32 COM 7A.4 REV** was adopted as further amended.

Property	Kahuzi-Biega National Park
Id. N°	N 137
State Party	Democratic Republic of the Congo

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.5**

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that, since the start of civil conflict, the low-altitude sector of the park had been inaccessible to park staff most of the time. That sector comprised around 90 % of the park territory and was connected to the much smaller high-altitude sector by a corridor.

In December this year, a report had been published on the status of wildlife populations in that lowland sector, showing a decrease of 25 % in the gorilla populations in the areas covered and a total absence of elephants. The presence of buffalo, sitatunga, bongo, wild pig, several species of duikers and 6 species of primate had been confirmed but signs of hunting activities and artisanal mining were observed throughout the surveyed areas. With regard to the rehabilitation of the RN3 highway which crossed the property, the Centre had been informed in June that its rehabilitation was now inscribed as part of a road rehabilitation programme for Kivu, funded by the United Nations Development programme (UNDP).

IUCN recalled that the environmental impact assessment it had conducted in 1992 on the RN3 highway had recommended that the road be realigned around the northern boundary of the park. IUCN was concerned about direct and indirect impacts of the road on the property and reiterated its position that other options should be considered, including the realignment previously suggested.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether another institution was actively undertaking work in Kahuzi-Biega and whether the presence of elephants in the park would be a determining factor for the maintenance of the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it was pleased to note the achievements made so far with 10 to 20 percent of the lowland area now under control. It requested information from the State Party on the issue of mining concessions.

The Delegation of **Brazil** wanted the State Party to give information in reference to the mining concessions and to explain if an alternative exists to the Kavuu Road.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to comment.

La délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** (Observateur) indique que les concessions minières dans le parc n'ont pas été autorisées par le gouvernement mais sont dues à des erreurs faites par le cadastre minier. D'ailleurs, une révision est en cours pour faire annuler ces concessions. Au sujet des éléphants, elle ajoute qu'au moins 38 animaux ont été observés ces deux derniers mois. Enfin, elle indique que la route n'est pas encore réhabilitée. Des dizaines de camions s'embourbent dans le parc, obligeant leurs occupants

à y séjourner parfois pendant deux semaines. Elle conclut en indiquant que des propositions seront faites au Centre du patrimoine mondial.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that UNDP was conducting a road programme for the whole area of Kivu. It specified that the road existed but that, if rehabilitated, traffic would increase significantly. That might have an influence on the gorilla populations. The Centre had already contacted the State Party and UNDP to ensure that work on the road would not start before the environmental impact assessment had been finalized.

IUCN specified that the site had been inscribed for criteria (x) and that the elephants were an important aspect of its biodiversity. The loss of elephants would affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value but there were also other species in the park that justified inscription under (x). It further specified that mining was not appropriate in World Heritage sites.

The **Rapporteur** read out the text of the draft decision, with the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Kenya.

Decision **32 COM 7A.5** was adopted as amended.

Property	Garamba National Park
Id. N°	N 136
State Party	Democratic Republic of the Congo

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.6**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that on 17 and 18 September 2007 an expert workshop on survival strategies for the northern white rhino had taken place in Kinshasa, with the participation of the IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group. The experts had discussed the different options to preserve the last northern white rhinoceros and had concluded that only the capture and transfer to an appropriate and secure place, beyond the Congolese borders, of the remaining animals provided sufficient guarantee to perpetuate that subspecies. Following the meeting, the park management agency had officially requested the Office of the President to allow the translocation but so far no permission had been granted.

In April a one-month intensive search had been organized to try to locate the remaining rhino but no indications of rhino had been found. Another intensive search for a three-month period was planned before the end of the year.

The Centre also pointed out that the continued presence of the Uganda Lord's Resistance Army remained the main problem for the conservation of the property, as it created a permanent climate of insecurity. However, considering the difficult circumstances, considerable progress had been made in the conservation of the property and implementation of part of the corrective measures, as mentioned in the working document.

IUCN added that the rhinos were under imminent danger of extinction and strongly recommended that the measures suggested by the IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group be implemented. IUCN noted that that flagship species was a very important element of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **Brazil** referred to the serious situation at the site and asked whether the State Party could provide information concerning follow-up to the meeting organized on that subject and the ensuing recommendations from the seminar. It asked if the State Party could report on measures foreseen to implement the recommendations of the meeting.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commented that moving the rhinos out of the Democratic Republic of the Congo could be problematic for the country because such a decision would imply that it was unsafe for the rhinos to be kept anywhere in Democratic Republic of the Congo. It further asked where the rhinos were planned to be relocated.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that there were currently no sightings of rhinos and queried what was likely to be the impact on the status of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to comment.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** (Observateur) indique que, concernant le projet de relocalisation in situ des rhinocéros blancs du nord, la difficulté majeure est de convaincre la population locale malgré ses croyances traditionnelles. Elle ajoute qu'une campagne médiatique auprès de la population doit être entreprise dans ce but par le gouvernement. Elle précise également que le Kenya a été identifié par des scientifiques comme un lieu potentiel de transfert des rhinocéros.

IUCN commented on questions raised about collaborative measures and noted that the expert group had confirmed that rhinos could be saved in situ if no animals were lost for at least 50 years, but that with the current conditions of security that was an important risk. On the question of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the mission to the site had confirmed that other animal species of importance in the park were still present.

The Delegation of **Cuba** recalled that the Outstanding Universal Value is not based on only one species.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne que la délocalisation constitue le terme exact en français et invite le Comité à réfléchir sur une question inédite dans l'histoire du Comité: le déplacement de ce qui constitue la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it had read in the report that there was a concern about armed groups coming from Sudan and asked for clarification from the State Party of Sudan.

The Observer Delegation of **Sudan** said it was committed to the implementation of all conventions it had ratified, including the 1972 *Convention*, and that the claim that there were armed troops originating from Sudan was unfounded. It confirmed that at present no forces from Sudan had gone across the border and no official complaints by the Democratic Republic of the Congo had been reported. It considered the matter to be an internal problem.

The Delegation of **Brazil** commented on the physical property and the issue of transfer of the rhinos, seeking clarification with regard to the absence of the animals and the potential loss of Outstanding Universal Value that that could generate.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, referring to the rhinos, recalled that the question raised by Israel had been debated in Vilnius. It had been clarified that the rhino represented an important component of Outstanding Universal Value but that other species also contributed to

biodiversity in the property. It requested information on why the expert workshop had proposed a translocation outside the country. It invited the translocation to take place in Kenya if needed as Kenya also possesses ~~also~~ populations of white rhinos.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the experts had proposed a translocation to Kenya not only on account of security issues but also because of the availability of suitable habitat. It stressed that the Congolese experts present at the meeting had supported that conclusion. It also pointed out that there existed a great deal of experience with the translocation of rhino.

The Delegation of **United States of America** suggested a technical change in paragraph 6 in reference to MONUC within its mandate and capabilities”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** highlighted that the World Heritage Committee cannot address MONUC directly and that it would be better to request the State Party to seek collaboration.

The Delegation of **United States of America** agreed with this proposal.

The **Rapporteur** read out a new paragraph 4 from the Delegations of **Israel** and **Kenya** which should be inserted “noting that the recent search mission has failed to locate any Northern white rhinos and underlines the urgency of establishing the number of surviving rhino in the property” as well as an amendment to the existing paragraph 4 adding : “if the white rhinos are located, to consider undertaking their translocation from Garamba National park to a safe place in situ, including beyond the Congolese borders....”; The Delegations of **United States of America** and **Brazil** proposed an amendment in paragraph 6.

La Délégation du **Maroc** invite à la plus grande prudence afin de ne pas déclencher un trafic de rhinocéros. La Délégation a mentionné que l’année dernière le Comité a été informé qu’il est difficile de transporter des animaux sauvages.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, referring to paragraph 4 of the draft decision and urging the State Party to authorize the translocation of the Northern White Rhino ex situ to a safe place for a 50 year period, expressed its doubts: Would such action affect the property’s Outstanding Universal Value? It reiterated the earlier question on whether the site’s Outstanding Universal Value was being depleted.

The Observer Delegation of **India** pointed out that that issue had been discussed at previous sessions and recalled that it was extremely difficult to transport rhinos.

The **Chairperson** noted that agreement had been reached on all parts of the draft decision except paragraph 4.

Final interventions were made by the Delegations of **Kenya, Israel** and **Brazil** in favor of the addition of “Urges the State Party, if remaining Northern white Rhino are located, to consider undertaking.....”

Decision **32 COM 7A.6** was adopted as amended.

Property	Salonga National park
Id. N°	N 280
State Party	Democratic Republic of the Congo

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.7**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the State of Conservation of the property, informing the Committee that, following the 2007 reactive monitoring mission, the State Party had started with the implementation of the corrective measures adopted by the Committee at its previous session. In the first year, priority had been given to the development and implementation of a security operation, with the objective of combating commercial armed poaching, one of the most immediate threats to the conservation of the property. The operation was building on the lessons learnt from a similar operation in the Okapi Wildlife Reserve, successfully implemented in 2006. Support had been provided by the World Heritage Fund for the project. Important efforts had also been undertaken to secure more political support from the provincial authorities. From 14 to 16 April, a meeting to discuss the security issues related to the property had been organized under the aegis of the Minister for Territorial Administration, with the participation of the provincial governors of the three provinces in which the park was situated and the Minister for Environment and Forests. One of the results of the meeting was the creation of a permanent consultation mechanism as proposed by the 2007 mission.

The Delegation of **Kenya** observed that a number of activities had been carried out by the Government, and that an acknowledgement of the positive efforts made should be added to the decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that paragraph 4 already expressed satisfaction and that an addition would be repetitive.

Decision **32 COM 7A.7** was adopted.

Property	Okapi Wildlife Reserve
Id. N°	N 718
State Party	Democratic Republic of the Congo

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A

Decision: **32 COM 7A.8**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the State of Conservation of the property, informing the Committee that on 15 April the World Heritage Centre had received the draft report of the survey work conducted on the property in recent years with the support of the World Heritage - Democratic Republic of the Congo partnership programme. All important flagship species, including elephant, okapi and chimpanzee and eleven other species of primate, had been found during the inventory and most of the unique habitats, including the inselbergs with an endemic flora, were intact. However, wildlife numbers had been seriously reduced, with 48% of the elephants lost, 43% of the okapi, and between 29% and 59% of duiker, depending on the species. The study clearly demonstrated that poaching had had a significant impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. However, as no key species had been lost, a recovery of the Outstanding Universal Value was possible if hunting and other pressures could be controlled. However, with many species reduced by almost half, recovery would take time.

Important progress had been achieved in the implementation of some of the corrective measures. 95% of the property was regularly patrolled by the park authorities and artisanal mining and poaching were reported to be under control. Concerning the rehabilitation of the RN4 highway crossing the property, on 15 April the Centre had received a copy of the environmental management plan, which unfortunately focused only on direct impacts of the construction works but did not take into account the long-term impact on the values of the property, in particular the potential increased immigration into the property, as well as increased trade in bushmeat and other natural resources. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN concluded that, while there had been important losses in wildlife populations, affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the fact that poaching was for the moment apparently under control was encouraging. However, other issues needed to be addressed urgently in order to secure the long-term integrity of the property, in particular immigration pressure and long-term impacts of the road rehabilitation around the property.

IUCN noted the alarming decline of key wildlife species since the 1995 census. The potential for recovery of Outstanding Universal Value at the property was greater than for other Democratic Republic of the Congo properties given the better security situation and the fact that 95% of the property was under the control of the management authority, ICCN. Advantage should be taken of that, as should concerted action to improve the conservation status of the property. At the same time, there was a need to carefully manage new threats such as the impacts of the rehabilitated road. IUCN further noted that recovery of the wildlife populations would take time.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed an amendment referring to the fact that the Okapi Wildlife Reserve was better protected and recovery of its Outstanding Universal Value expected soon; in paragraph 3, “adversely” should be replaced with “significantly”.

The **Rapporteur** read out the new wording of paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed a minor change to paragraph 6 to improve the wording.

Decision **32 COM 7A.8** was adopted as amended.

Property	Simien National Park
Id. N°	N 9
State Party	Ethiopia

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7A.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7A.9**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the State of Conservation of the property, stating that the State Party had submitted a detailed report on 16 January 2008, with information on the state of implementation of the corrective measures and other recommendations of the 2006 mission. The monitoring mission, which had been requested by the Committee at its 31st session, had been postponed at the request of the State Party. In a letter received by the World Heritage Centre on 12 May, the State Party had considered the monitoring mission premature, as work remained to be done to finalize the implementation of the corrective measures.

On 4 May 2008, a revised draft of the management plan had been submitted to the WHC. The draft plan presented a 10-year management vision for the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN were of the view that the new draft responded much better to the threats to the property than the 2006 draft. The Centre and IUCN had provided some additional

comments to the State Party in June. It should be possible to finalize the management plan before the end of the current year.

The **World Heritage Centre** and **IUCN** considered that the State Party had made good progress in the implementation of the corrective measures, in particular in the preparation of the management strategies and action plans to address the urgent threats to the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The major challenge now was to ensure the effective implementation of those strategies, for which major additional funding needed to be mobilized, in particular from external donors.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it hoped that the property would soon be taken off the List of World Heritage in Danger as many positive developments had taken place.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested moving paragraph 7 to before paragraph 6 in order to have the reference to Outstanding Universal Value before the mission.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested the inclusion of wording commending the State Party, further to the comment by the Delegation of Kenya.

La Délégation du **Maroc** fait une suggestion concernant le paragraphe 6, en proposant l'ajout suivant « l'état d'avancement de la mise en œuvre de mesures correctives »

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended paragraphs.

Decision **32 COM 7A. 7A.9** was adopted as amended.

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Property	Old and New Towns of Edinburgh
Id. N°	C 728
State Party	United Kingdom

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.117**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the new information received concerning the State of Conservation of the property, indicating that the State Party had sent a report on 25 June 2008, with comments on the working document, and had invited a mission to the property. The Caltongate development had been approved by the City of Edinburgh Council after Scottish Ministers had ruled out a public inquiry. That was of major concern to the World Heritage Centre and it had been agreed with ICOMOS that that needed to be properly reflected in the decision; a revised draft decision was therefore being presented.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested an addition to the draft decision, calling upon the State Party to prepare a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to be presented for the next meeting of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said it was worried that there were so many joint missions in spite of the Committee's earlier discussions about mandating ICOMOS to carry them out. It warned against overstretching the capacities of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Secretariat** responded that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was submitted in Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add*. As to whether there should be joint missions or missions by ICOMOS only, it was up to the Committee to decide.

The Delegation of **Kenya** withdrew its comment on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and wished to commend the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** confirmed that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was contained in the document.

Decision **32 COM 7B.117** was adopted.

The **World Heritage Centre** read out the list of the State of Conservation reports of properties for noting:

- Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160 bis)
- Belfries of Belgium and France (Belgium and France) (C 943 and 943 bis)
- Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)
- Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (C 292 rev)
- Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063)
- Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)
- Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994)
- Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541)
- Megalithic Temples of Malta (Malta) (C 132 bis)
- Auschwitz Birkenau German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945) (Poland) (C 31)
- Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania) (C 902)
- Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545)
- Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320 bis)
- Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)
- Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)
- Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)
- Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)
- Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373)
- Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)
- City of Bath (United Kingdom) (C 428)

The Delegation of **Bahrain** recalled that it had asked for the Westminster property to be discussed.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** made a general statement on draft decisions, in the light of Brazil's intervention on missions: while it was up to the Committee to decide, the draft decisions were nevertheless prepared by the Secretariat. It asked whether there were guidelines for determining what kind of mission was needed.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that that decision went back to 2000, when the Committee had decided that reactive monitoring missions should be carried out jointly. The reason why that had become practice was to ensure the institutional representation and documentation necessary, UNESCO being the partner of the State Party, and also for technical reasons relating to reporting, which was done jointly, and in particular to ensure homogeneity. He concluded by saying that joint missions were a fundamental component of the work the Committee requested from the Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Property	Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church
Id. N°	C 426
State Party	United Kingdom

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.113**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the new information received on 27 June 2008 concerning the State of Conservation of the property and the Tower of London. The Westminster World Heritage Site Liaison Steering Group had selected seven views considered best to encapsulate the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Those views were currently being reviewed in the light of the methodology for assessing the impact of development on views to and from the property, "*Seeing History in the View*" (visual impact study). Westminster City Council had produced a "*Metropolitan Views Draft Supplementary Planning Document*" which was being finalized following public consultation, and the final version was expected later in 2008. Discussions on the establishment of a buffer zone would be informed by the outcome of the work currently being undertaken as part of the visual impact study.

The Delegations of **Bahrain** and **Barbados** expressed appreciation for the study on visual impact methodologies provided by the United Kingdom and asked whether the State Party could make it available to all State Parties.

The Delegation of **Canada** commended the United Kingdom for having drafted a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

Decision **32 COM 7B.113** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the request for discussion on Tiwanaku had been withdrawn.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Property	City of Quito
Id. N°	C 120
State Party	Ecuador

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.121**

The **World Heritage Centre** announced that no new information had been made available.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested inviting the State Party to provide comments, but noted that the State Party was not present.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments received from the Delegation of Canada.

Decision **32 COM 7B.121** was adopted as amended.

Property	Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco
Id. N°	C 412
State Party	Mexico

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.124**

The **World Heritage Centre** announced that no new information had been made available.

The Delegation of **Peru** proposed an amendment to the draft decision and asked for the State Party to be invited to inform the Committee about the latest developments.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that new information had been provided with reference to the demolition of 14 historic buildings. It underscored that Mexico had suffered on account of the fact that street vendors had been asked to move out of the city and to remove their wares. The new measures aimed to provide street vendors with new market places in the historical centre. The State Party should be given the opportunity to clarify the urban policies of the Government of the City of Mexico.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande des clarifications de la part de l'Etat Partie.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked what kind of measures had been taken following the demolition of the 14 buildings and whether the State Party intended to take any steps to restore the original landscape.

The Delegation of **Egypt** likewise sought clarifications from the State Party.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of Mexico to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** informed the Committee that dialogue had been established between the Government and the city authorities with UNESCO support. It underlined that only five historic buildings had irreversibly deteriorated. However, the city authorities had committed themselves to restoring some of the most valuable buildings. Moreover, the State Party wished to invite a joint reactive monitoring mission to the property

as soon as possible. On 27 June 2008, the programme of revitalization of Mexico City had been launched by the city authorities in coordination with all stakeholders involved.

The Delegation of **Peru** asked if the State Party could confirm its commitment to halting any new destruction.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** announced that the resettlement programme for street vendors had been successfully undertaken and no further demolition was foreseen.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed a structural change to the text of the decision by placing paragraph 8 before paragraph 7, and the deletion of “prior to thearrival of the”.

Decision **32 COM 7B.124** was adopted as amended.

Property	Archaeological Site of Panama Viejo and Historic District of Panama
Id. N°	C 790 bis
State Party	Panama

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.126**

The **World Heritage Centre** announced that no new information had been made available.

The Delegation of **Canada** pointed out that the picture of the property obtained through the State of Conservation report was quite disturbing and wished to hear the explanation of the State Party.

The Delegation of **Israel** felt that an inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger was possible, as ascertained danger to the property could be observed.

The **Chairperson** noted that the State Party of Panama was not present.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested moving paragraphs 4 and 5 to before paragraph 3 and deleting “before the arrival of the mission”.

Decision **32 COM 7B. 126** was adopted as amended.

The **World Heritage Centre** read out the list of names and numbers of properties for noting:

- Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567 rev),
- Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285)
- Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285),
- Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129),
- Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414),

- Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135),
- Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)
- Historical Curator of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C747)

AFRICA

The **Chairperson** noted that the request for discussion of the State of Conservation of Aksum (Ethiopia) had been withdrawn.

Property	Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela
Id. N°	C 18
State Party	Ethiopia

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.47**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the new information received concerning the State of Conservation of the property, announcing that the shelters project was nearly completed thanks to the efforts of the Ethiopian Government and noting that the shelters were reversible. Nevertheless, their impact on the churches needed to be monitored closely. Special attention should be given to the shelter over Aba Libanos which rested on a hill that was exposed to landsliding. UNESCO and ICOMOS had already warned against building it. The World Heritage Centre was implementing conservation, management and tourism development activities in Lalibela to find long-lasting solutions that would make it possible to conserve and water-proof the churches, dismantle the shelters and ultimately contribute to poverty reduction.

The Delegation of **Kenya** observed that a great deal of work and enthusiasm were evident, as were community participation and the close involvement of local authorities. The development of a management plan was under way, with the assistance of the World Heritage Centre. It suggested listening to the reactions of the State Party.

The Delegation of **Israel** questioned the relevance of improving sanitary infrastructure in the village associated with the property (paragraph 5 of the draft decision) for the State of Conservation of the property itself.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande de préciser pourquoi les limites du bien et de sa zone tampon, demandées dans le cadre du Rapport Périodique pour l'Afrique, ne sont toujours pas établies.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of Ethiopia to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** announced that the shelters were finished, while the boundaries should soon also be completed with the help of the World Heritage Centre. The conservation issues at the property were not easy, one of the main problems being the restoration work, as no local knowledge was available and the materials at hand could not satisfy the required conditions. The Delegation accepted the recommendations, stating that more work was needed on the technical information about the Churches of churches of Aba Libanos and Gabriel Rufael.

The **Rapporteur** read out amendments proposed by the Delegations of Canada and Australia.

ICOMOS answered the question asked by the Delegation of Israel, explaining that there was concern about water management around the churches, and that drainage in the area needed to be improved.

The Delegation of **Kenya** questioned how managing floods was a sanitary concern. It wished to make an addition to paragraph 8, recalling that in Christchurch the State Party had been asked to finalize the management plan, and should again be encouraged to do so.

The Delegations of **Israel** and **Australia** suggested deleting the paragraph concerning sanitary conditions.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that the Centre, thanks to a grant by Norway and another matching grant, had launched a major project in Lalibela for the restoration of the churches and community-related activities. He also insisted that monitoring and reporting at the property should be strictly pursued and that the date of 2009 for re-examination of the property's State of Conservation should be maintained.

Decision **32 COM 7B.47** was adopted as amended.

Property	Timbuktu
Id. N°	C 119 rev
State Party	Mali

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.49**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented new information received concerning the State of Conservation of the property, recalling that the property had been removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2005 following improvement to the state of the three mosques and the elaboration of a management and conservation plan. In 2007 the Committee at its 31st session in New Zealand had expressed its regret that the State Party had undertaken construction works on the new Ahmed Baba Cultural Centre without having provided to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS evaluation documents showing the architectural design and the location of the planned centre. The Committee had also requested the State Party to collaborate with the World Heritage Centre to allow an analysis to be made of the impact of the foreseen modifications to the Sankore Mosque. The State Party had further been requested to urgently invite a joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission before 31 October 2007, in order to evaluate the impact of the construction of the cultural centre and make recommendations to the Committee on the potential threat to the property.

In March 2008 the Centre had received a letter of invitation from the State Party and a joint ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre mission to the property had been undertaken from 11 to 16 June 2008. The mission had noted with regret that construction work was well advanced and that as much as 80% of the structural work had been completed for the manuscript storage and conservation offices, administration block and general library. Work on the display rooms and auditorium was about to be started. What remained to be constructed were the amphitheatre, the Ahmed Baba house, the classroom and the public toilets. On 26 June 2008 the Minister for Culture of Mali had visited the Centre and discussed the issue of Timbuktu.

The Centre had subsequently received a copy of a letter dated 25 June 2008 from the Minister for Secondary and Higher Education and Scientific Research addressed to the Minister for Culture, and a second letter from the Minister for Culture addressed to the Centre and dated 26 June 2008. Both letters acknowledged the concerns of the Centre and ICOMOS about the threat posed to the Sankore Mosque by the constructions.

The previous draft decision had proposed two options. However, in view of the threats posed to the property not only by the proposed cultural centre but also by: (1) the lack of plans and processes to stop further major development projects irreversibly damaging the old city, (2) lack of progress in reversing the decline of traditional architecture in the old city, and (3) lack of progress in implementing the short and medium-term actions of the management plan, and also in view of the lack of any plan for concrete State Party action for remedial measures, the Centre-ICOMOS mission, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4 of the *Convention*, had concluded that Timbuktu met all the conditions set out in paragraphs 177 and 179 of the *Operational Guidelines* and confirmed their recommendation that the site be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. An alternative draft decision had therefore been provided for consideration by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the Committee should try to make decisions acceptable to all and to the people of Mali. An explanation by the State Party was needed, given that the situation seemed very serious.

La Délégation du **Maroc**, soulignant qu'un nouveau projet de la décision révisé a été distribué aux membres du Comité, demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial de donner des explications sur les raisons qui l'ont poussé à réviser le projet initial. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial a-t-il reçu de nouvelles informations?

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of Mali to explain.

La Délégation du **Mali** (Observateur) précise qu'il faut prendre en compte les conditions dans lesquelles ce bien s'est trouvé auparavant. La Délégation donne un bref aperçu des mesures mises en place depuis l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et depuis son retrait de cette Liste en 2006, et notamment la création d'une structure de gestion du bien, l'élaboration du Plan de gestion et du Plan de revitalisation de la ville. La Délégation informe qu'un projet de bibliothèque des manuscrits est en cours au titre d'un accord de coopération avec l'Afrique du Sud. La Délégation informe également que les autorités vont s'engager sur plusieurs plans pour apporter des mesures correctives: ne pas construire l'amphithéâtre et démolir les salles de classes et toilettes. Cependant, la Délégation souligne qu'il ne faut pas se concentrer uniquement sur le volume de la construction mais sur sa destination culturelle.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the change reflected the outcome of the recent meeting during the visit of the Minister to the World Heritage Centre. No commitments had been shown even though the Ministry had agreed that a mistake had been made.

The Delegation of **Kenya** pointed out that it had been very consistent in questioning conceptions and challenges that properties faced. The Delegation of Morocco had raised a pertinent question. The Committee had not been aware that there had been a change and needed to understand its full context. Double standards should be avoided and Timbuktu needed to be given the same opportunity as Dresden. It questioned whether all buildings needed to be demolished, and noted that the State Party had expressed willingness to abide by the decision of the Committee. The Committee should take into account that it had taken a long time to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed with the Delegation of Kenya and requested that the Secretariat withdraw the revised draft decision. It also warned against applying double

standards. It furthermore recommended that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism be applied for the property.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there was consensus for withdrawing the revised draft decision.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne que la réponse fournie donne l'impression que la question a été traitée à la légère. La Délégation a souligné que lors de la réunion entre le Ministre de la Culture et le Centre du patrimoine mondial, ce dernier n'a pas obtenu l'accord de l'Etat Partie sur une possible inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Barbados** agreed with previous delegations, observing that the State Party had been working hard to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value. It also noted that necessary modern developments at World Heritage properties had to be taken into account.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** s'inquiète à la lecture du rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien mais se rassure grâce à la présentation de l'Etat partie. La Délégation souligne le rôle important de ce bien dans des échanges culturels. De plus, il n'est pas possible d'imposer les mêmes conditions et la même rigueur à cette région. La Délégation demande à ne pas évoquer une possible inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril mais plutôt de donner du temps supplémentaire à l'Etat partie afin de mettre en œuvre toutes les mesures nécessaires pour sauvegarder ce bien.

The Delegation of **Peru** endorsed Option 2 proposed in the Draft Decision **32 COM 7B.49**.

The Delegation of **Israel** pointed out that the situation at the property was very different from the case of Dresden. Here, there was an obvious commitment by the State Party but not by the local community. A Reinforced Monitoring mission should prioritize the points raised by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported Morocco; a sustainable way for Mali to deal with its needs should be sought.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported Morocco.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** concurred with Kenya and thought that Danger Listing was premature. A Reinforced Monitoring mission was a possible option.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported Kenya and Israel.

The Delegation of **China** agreed with Israel and pointed out that the different situation of developed versus developing countries was to be taken into consideration. The property was not a case for Danger Listing, and more time should be given. Given that construction work at the site was 80% finished, how long would it take to redress the situation?

The Delegation of **Canada** stressed that the state of the property was deteriorating and that the challenge before the Committee was to communicate the urgency of the matter to the State Party. It did not agree that double standards were being applied, since the two cases could not be compared, Dresden being threatened with removal from the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS recalled that the mission report had developed a series of recommendations, among them reducing the scale of the building and thus reducing the impact. Following discussions with the State Party and the donors (South Africa) the project should be halted and efforts should be made to alleviate its impact.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the measures decided by the Committee were no concern of the donor's but only that of the State Party.

The **Chairperson** invited a response from the State Party on whether a Reinforced Monitoring mission was an acceptable solution.

La Délégation du **Mali** confirme l'engagement des autorités à apporter les mesures correctives nécessaires à savoir, entre autres, démolir les classes et ne pas construire l'amphithéâtre. Elle informe que les autorités ont demandé le report de toute discussion concernant une possible inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Brazil** pointed out that the representative of the property was not to be confused with a representative of the State Party. It also asked for confirmation of the withdrawal of the revised draft decision.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that that was indeed the case.

Following comments by the Delegations of **Spain, Israel, Brazil, Canada, Kenya**, the **United States of America** and **Barbados**, the **Rapporteur** read out the full text of the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 7B.49** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 06.30 p.m.

FOURTH DAY – SATURDAY, 5 July 2008

SEVENTH MEETING

07.30 p.m. – 09.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

Item 7B STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/24

Cultural properties

AFRICA

Property	Island of Mozambique
Id. N°	C 599
State Party	Mozambique

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of item 7B.

The **Secretariat** presented the report on the Island of Mozambique. The San Sebastian rehabilitation project was progressing very well. The restoration works for Phase I (to prevent further deterioration, i.e. the most urgent works required for the structural consolidation of the monument, including repair works, clearance of invasive vegetation, waterproofing, drainage and most of the paving) had started on 1 June 2008 and were expected to be concluded in December 2008. Additional funds were needed to complete Phase II (rehabilitation for re-use), including the installation of a cistern outside the fortress for public use. Cyclone Jokwe had hit the property on 7-8 March 2008, and damage repair would require further funds. The project website had been updated in June 2008. However, the State of Conservation of the rest of the Island remained worrying, as buildings were threatening to collapse, the problems of sanitation and sewage were not yet solved and the conservation and management plan had not yet been finalized. Efforts in regard to the emergency action plan and the master plan were too weak. A mission by the World Heritage Centre was scheduled for August 2008.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested an answer from the State Party about measures to ensure appropriate funding to halt the deterioration of the site and suggested that the property needed monitoring.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a mission was planned shortly.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Delegation of the State Party was not present.

Decision **32 COM 7B.51** was adopted.

Property	Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape
----------	--

Id. N°	C 1265
State Party	South Africa

The **Secretariat** explained that the World Heritage Centre had just received by e-mail a letter and a report from South Africa, the purpose of the letter being to respond to draft decision 32 COM 7B. 52, to correct factual errors identified in the draft decision and to provide information on current conservation issues relating to the property with reference to the State Party's progress report and specifically its actions regarding concerns about the granting of mineral prospecting permission in the Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape site. It further requested a modification of the draft decision in that regard. The State Party confirmed that the Department of Minerals and Energy had granted a commercial mineral prospecting permit for minerals in the Richtersveld site on 13 September 2007, under the terms of Minerals and Petroleum Resource Development Act No 28 of 2002, despite the fact that the site had been inscribed on the World Heritage List two months earlier, and had subsequently been proclaimed nationally a World Heritage site. As stated in the report, after final proclamation in a Gazette notice no commercial prospection or mining activities were authorized in accordance with section 48 of South Africa's Protected Area Act No. 57 of 2003.

The Centre and ICOMOS were informed that, following the communication received from the Centre concerning mineral prospecting in the Richtersveld property, a meeting had been convened on 9 June 2008 between the Department of Environmental Affairs, the Department of Minerals and Energy and Bushmanland Minerals (recipient of the mineral prospection rights), and on 24 June 2008 a meeting had been held for the first time at the Regional Office of the Department of Minerals and Energy in Springbok in order to determine how the licence had been issued to prospect in a World Heritage site. The Centre and ICOMOS were informed that since the permit had been granted no mining-related field work had taken place on the site. The State Party further pointed out that there were no relations between the "Deed of Settlement" signed by the Minister of Finance on 22 April 2007 and the mining companies as the Centre had been previously informed. The State Party reassured the Centre, ICOMOS and the Committee that the Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape was not threatened by mining activities. The Centre and ICOMOS noted that the Minister for Environmental Affairs and Tourism had appointed the North West Member of the Executive Council responsible for Sports, Arts and Culture as the management authority of the site. The State Party had therefore requested the removal of paragraphs 5, 7, 10 and 11 of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested to hear from the State Party

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of South Africa to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Chairperson for being given the opportunity to clarify matters. It commented on the misperception in the documentation about a connection between the mining company in question and Alescho, now partly community-owned and operating to the west of the buffer zone. If a permit had been issued it could not be exploited since the national law, the Protected Area Act, prohibited mining at World Heritage sites. Legal procedures had been initiated against the mining company and no work had taken place within the property or the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it wished to withdraw the amendment since the State Party had given guarantees to ensure the proper protection of the site and no prospection or mining activities had been undertaken.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft decision as amended, with the deletion of paragraph 10.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that, after listening to the State Party, it requested deletion of paragraphs 5 and 6. A mission would be premature.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** requested that the permission be withdrawn since mining was a very complex issue, and suggested that the decision should include reference to a mission in 2010.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the mission was foreseen by 2009 plenary session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** requested further clarification as to whether any prospection had taken place at the site.

The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** explained that while permission for prospection had been granted until 2009, it would not affect the property because of South Africa's regulations concerning World Heritage sites.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it understood that no mining would be undertaken, and therefore wished to delete paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether mining could be undertaken from 2010.

The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** stated that exploration had been undertaken for geological purposes and underlined that no field work had taken place.

The Delegation of **Kenya** wondered why prospection could be undertaken if mining was not allowed.

The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** explained that the company had requested other procedures for permission but it was not likely that permission would be given.

The Delegation of **Kenya** sought further confirmation that that was not possible in a World Heritage site.

The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** assured the Committee that no work could be carried out according to the environmental law.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it was in favour of retaining paragraphs 6 and 7.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked if permission had been stopped in the courts.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft decision as amended, with the deletion of paragraphs 5 and 10 and changes to paragraphs 3 and 9.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested deletion of paragraph 7 because above-ground mining activities did not come within the scope of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Israel** recalled that survey permission only made sense if exploitation followed, adding that it would go along with the consensus.

Following interventions by the Delegations of **Brazil, Israel** and **Kenya**, the **Chairperson** said she took it that the consensus was in favour of deleting paragraph 7.

Decision **32 COM 7B.52** was adopted as amended.

Property	Island of Saint-Louis
Id. N°	C 956 bis
State Party	Senegal

The **Secretariat** explained that the safeguarding and enhancement plan (SEP) and the establishment of a heritage bureau had not yet been effective as requested by the Committee at its 31st session. A series of uncontrolled new construction and inappropriate rehabilitation works that were seriously affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property continued to take place. Although it had submitted a report, the State Party had not addressed those issues. The implementation of the SEP which contained all the necessary guidelines could have avoided such a situation. Furthermore, a site manager had not yet been appointed because of some difficulties, since posts of that kind were not provided for in Senegal's legislation. The action plan 2006-2012 drafted in December 2006 at a heritage seminar in Saint-Louis was still to be implemented through an agreement between the State Party and UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested information from the State Party about the little progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the previous mission.

La délégation du **Maroc** demande que l'on donne la parole à l'Etat partie du Sénégal.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of Senegal to comment.

La délégation du **Sénégal** (observateur) ne se reconnaît pas dans la présentation de l'état de conservation faite dans le document **WHC-08/32.COM/24**. Nombre de mesures ont été prises telles que le renforcement du quai de l'île, le renforcement du pont, notamment avec le soutien de la France. Par ailleurs, le Décret ayant été signé par le Président de la République, nous pensons avoir répondu à toutes les demandes faites dans la Décision. En conclusion, la délégation du **Sénégal** tient à rappeler que l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial constitue une opportunité importante de développement pour l'île de Saint Louis.

The **Rapporteur** said that no amendments had been received.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked, with reference to paragraph 9, why the mission should be undertaken by three institutions.

The **Secretariat** explained that ICCROM had engaged in close cooperation to train professionals in the property.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked why both ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre should undertake the mission.

The **Secretariat** replied that joint reactive monitoring missions were an established practice requested by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it wished to delete the last sentence of paragraph 11, reading “with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger”, since the State Party had stated that every effort was being made for the proper conservation of the site.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested the Secretariat to provide additional information on the activities of ICCROM in the property, and suggested including in paragraph 9 of the draft decision a reference to the need to develop capacity-building.

La délégation du **Maroc** demande que soit introduit un changement dans le paragraphe 4 de la décision, qui se lirait ainsi : “Encourage l’Etat partie à intensifier ses efforts pour la mise en oeuvre... (reste inchangé)..”

The **Chairperson**, noting that there were no amendments proposed to paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, invited comments on paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it wished the paragraph to acknowledge that significant progress had been made.

The **Rapporteur** suggested the addition of wording such as “takes note of the advancement achieved ...”.

La délégation du **Maroc** demande que soit introduit un changement dans le paragraphe 5 de la décision, qui se lirait ainsi : “Incite l’Etat partie (reste inchangé)..”

The **Rapporteur** proposed: “encourages the State Party”.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments on paragraph 5.

La délégation du **Maroc** souhaite que l’on relise le paragraphe dont elle n’a pas bien saisi le sens.

The Delegation of **Canada**, supported by the Delegation of **Israel**, proposed the inclusion of “calls on the State Party to address the serious threats posed by...”

The Delegation of **Kenya**, supported by the Delegation of **Canada**, proposed the wording: “ensure that no rehabilitation or other interventions could affect the Outstanding Universal Value...”.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with the proposal from Canada.

The **Rapporteur** suggested including: “a serious threat to the Outstanding Universal Value...”

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed to that suggestion.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider paragraph 6.

La délégation du **Maroc** propose la modification suivante au paragraphe 6 : “Prie instamment l’Etat partie de mettre en oeuvre le plan de gestion, qui vient de faire l’objet d’un décret présidentiel ».

The **Chairperson** noted that paragraphs 7 and 8 remained unchanged and that the reference to capacity-building proposed by the Delegation of Israel would be inserted in paragraph 9.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to place paragraph 10 before paragraph 9 and to delete “before the arrival of the mission”.

The **Rapporteur** recalled that the Delegation of Egypt had proposed the deletion of the last sentence of paragraph 11.

Decision **32 COM 7B.53** was adopted as amended.

Property	Stone Town of Zanzibar
Id. N°	C 173 rev
State Party	United Republic of Tanzania

The **Secretariat** reported that it had not received any new information.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it had some concerns about several issues in the report and asked for the State Party to be given the floor.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its concern that no impact evaluation had been undertaken with regard to the port project.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** to comment.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** informed the Committee that the Zanzibar Port Rehabilitation project was a longstanding project dating from before inscription and funded by the European Commission. The European Commission had come up with a less costly option B, which might have an impact. The State Party had wished to have an impact assessment of hydro-geological movements and water level carried out, having realized that the project proposal was new in relation to the initial option A, but the Commission had declined to do so and the State Party had had no choice but to accept option B. It was unfortunately forced to accept that option. The Stone Town was a well-marked World Heritage site and there was no justifiable possibility of anyone overlooking the port area or the zone outside the conservation area. The Delegation considered that the date proposed for the mission to be undertaken by ICOMOS - November 2008 - was too early, as the United Republic of Tanzania did not have the capacity to organize the mission in so short a time, and requested more time. The reporting time was unrealistic. The European Commission should be requested to undertake the impact assessment and monitoring of the project, and the State Party should not be left alone to do so.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that, when he had contacted the European Union to discuss the matter, the latter had informed him that the cooperation was at a bilateral level and it did not wish to negotiate with the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that, in the light of the information provided by the Director regarding his contact with the European Union, paragraph 11 should be deleted as the European Commission was a body alien to the issue and it was interfering in micro-management.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with the Delegation of Brazil regarding cross-references to other agencies and supported the deletion of paragraph 11 and put it in for General Statement.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that he knew the case of Zanzibar at first hand and that he had written personally to the World Heritage Centre on the subject. The State Party could not take all the blame: it had approached the Secretariat but had received no timely response. The State Party had made every effort, but as nothing had been done it had had no choice but to accept the European Commission's proposal. The faults should be shared.

The Delegation of **Canada** stated that it was concerned and shocked by the response given by the European Union to the Director of the Centre. It suggested that the Director-General of UNESCO should approach the European Union.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed that it should not be put up to some other time, but put off in another and more general part of the item summarizing the State of Conservation.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested the Director of the Centre to offer some explanation as to when the State Party had contacted the Centre to request help in identifying alternatives.

The **Rapporteur**, at the request of the **Chairperson**, read out the draft decision, with the proposed change in the dates in the last paragraph from 2009 to 2010.

Decision **32 COM 7B.54** was adopted as amended.

The **Secretariat** read out the names of the following properties for noting: Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323), Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15) and Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055).

Decisions **32 COM 7B.45**, **32 COM 7B.46** and **32 COM 7B.48** were adopted.

ARAB STATES

Property	Ancient Thebes and its Necropolis
Id. N°	C 87
State Party	Egypt

Le **Secrétariat** présente l'état de conservation du bien, en informant le Comité que l'Etat partie a adressé, le 29 juin dernier, une lettre au Centre du patrimoine mondial commentant le rapport de la mission de suivi réactif dont il n'approuve pas les conclusions.

The Delegation of **Egypt** informed the Committee that it had received the report just before leaving Cairo. It had held several meetings with the Secretariat and ICOMOS to explain its position and had convinced them that the mission members were not egyptologists and that

the report was unfair. It reminded the Committee that the authorities had handled Thebes and Luxor with excellence. The mission had neglected the fact that since ancient times the two sites had had a special meaning. The East was for the living and the West for the dead and they could therefore not be managed together. The committee of experts, comprised of French, German, United States, Polish and Dutch archaeologists, chaired by the head of the Delegation, had come to an agreement on the best way to revive Thebes and restore it to its original state and ancient glory. It further stated that it had fulfilled all the conditions required for the Necropolis. It also informed the Committee that the bus parking area in Deir el-Bahari could not be moved as there was no possible location nearby without archaeological remains.

The Delegation further informed the Committee that the mission had been given wrong information in Luxor. The allegations were unfounded and unacceptable, and the Committee should congratulate Egypt for all its efforts. The Committee should not apply double standards and the draft decision presented should be discussed. It reminded the Committee that Egypt was one of the founder States of UNESCO and was also the first country to have put UNESCO on the map.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the Delegation of Egypt and agreed that the State Party was actively taking part in the maintenance of its sites and that it was highly involved in the restoration of the archaeological remains. The misunderstanding was due to the lack of response from the State Party over the past years and a lack of communication, and it would be preferable to establish proper communication when major works were launched.

The Delegation of **Jordan** said that, following the comments made by the Director of the Centre and the State Party, it requested the deletion of various points in the decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled the work done by the Getty Conservation Institute and the World Monument Fund regarding the Valley of the Kings and Valley of the Queens and proposed that a new paragraph should be included after paragraph 2 to congratulate the State Party for its efforts in managing its World Heritage sites.

The Delegations of **Jordan**, **Tunisia** and **Peru** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Kenya.

Decision **32 COM 7B.57** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 09.00 p.m.

FIFTH DAY – SUNDAY, 6 July 2008

**EIGHTH MEETING
09.00 a.m. – 01.00 p.m.
Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron**

**ITEM 7B STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES
INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of item 7B.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.58**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that it had received a letter dated 2 June from the Supreme Council of Antiquities requesting that the World Heritage Committee revise its recommendation regarding the height of the future Cairo financial centre.

The Delegation of **Egypt** drew attention to the importance of the property for Egyptians, explaining that it had a history dating back to 3000 BC and that it represented an important place in Islam and in the hearts of Egyptians. It asked for a paragraph to be added to the decision, inviting a high-level mission led by the Director of the World Heritage Centre to hold discussions with the concerned parties and to find a solution.

Decision **32 COM 7B.58** was adopted as amended.

Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.59**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that it had not received any new information.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested more information from the State Party on the matter.

The Delegation of **Jordan** explained that the proposed changes were in compliance with specifications proposed by the Committee and added that the site operations plan had been completed with the participation of civil society, and that the ICOMOS report had discussed those particular issues.

Decision **32 COM 7B.59** was adopted as amended.

Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.63**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that it had not received any new information.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision with two proposed amendments: one in Paragraph 3: to add “with great satisfaction” and one in Paragraph 4b) to replace “integrity” with “authenticity”.

Decision **32 COM 7B.63** was adopted, as amended.

The **World Heritage Centre** read out the list of the State of Conservation reports of properties for noting by the Committee:

- M’Zab Valley (Algeria) (C188)
- Tipasa (Algeria) (C193)
- Tyr (Lebanon) (C 299)
- Essaouira (Morocco) (C 753 rev)
- Bahla (Oman) (C 433)

Decisions **32 COM 7B.55**, **32 COM 7B.56**, **32 COM 7B.60**, **32 COM 7B.61** and **32 COM 7B.62** were therefore adopted.

MIXED PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.42**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the Gavarnie Festival would be held in July-August 2008 in the same location.

The Delegation of **Sweden** asked if the State Party could provide additional information.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed concern about the summer festival infrastructure and celebrations located within the property, pointing out that the festival coincided with the main breeding season of birds in the area, including the largest bird of prey in Eurasia, the bearded vulture, also known as the “bone breaker”, which faced several threats to its survival, including poisoning from baits used for fox control. The Delegation requested that IUCN describe any relevant conservation measures, and also reminded the Committee that a commitment had been made by the State Party of France, 9 years previously, to relocate the festival but that that had not yet been done. The Delegation would like the State Party to explain.

The Chairperson asked the State Party to comment.

The Delegation of **Spain** said, first, that the festival needed to be relocated – and that was the responsibility of France. Secondly, the cultural aspect of the location had led to investment in cultural components in the park, and in that connection Spain had set up a committee for coordination between cultural and natural matters in its part of the park. It noted that 22% of the budget was dedicated to cultural activities, helping to restore cross-boundary paths with France, and restoring cabins and cattle shelters. Finally, the Delegation stated that coordination between the two countries had improved and was adequate.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives pour la qualité de l'expertise fournie, indiquant qu'elles ont contribué au développement d'une base solide pour la gestion du bien, et explique le grand attachement des communautés locales à ces valeurs locales. La Délégation ne signale aucun problème spécifique ni d'impact durable sur le bien, expliquant que l'ampleur du Festival a déjà été réduite, tant dans le temps que dans l'espace.

The **Chairperson** asked the Observer Delegation of France to specify when the Festival would be removed from the site.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) réitère qu'une partie du Festival avait déjà été supprimée et qu'elle espère qu'aucune des installations temporaires utilisées n'ait d'impact négatif sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed, having heard the answers provided by the two States Parties involved, that the last part of Paragraph 8 of the draft decision, referring to inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, be deleted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed its understanding of the situation, and concurred with the comments of the Delegation of Egypt, but reiterated that there was still no answer on the date of removal of the festival.

The Delegation of **Israel**, endorsing that comment, recommended that the scaled-down structure being proposed by the State Party of France be evaluated to determine how it might affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande une explication de la part de l'État partie, et souhaite le retrait de la deuxième partie du projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its agreement with the comments made by the Delegation of Bahrain, and recommended that the proposal to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger be maintained.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said it wished that the end of Paragraph 8 be deleted.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed agreement with the Delegations of Sweden and Bahrain.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** concurred with the comments made by the Delegation of Israel.

IUCN said that the property was important for the bearded vulture, but reminded the Committee that the property had been inscribed under criteria (vii) and (viii), which did not recognize the birds as integral components of the property's Outstanding Universal Value. It also reminded the Committee that it had indeed requested that the Festival be moved in 1997.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the Committee appeared to be focusing on Paragraph 8 of the draft decision, leaving paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 unchanged. One amendment (proposed by Israel) was to change the deadline from 2010 to 2009, the other one being whether to keep or not the reference to in-Danger Listing.

The Delegation of **Kenya** clarified that a decision to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger would apply also to Spain, which was not responsible for the Festival, thus unfairly penalizing it.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that Paragraph 4 referred to the ascertained danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value and suggested that efforts made by Spain be underlined.

The Delegation of **Australia**, supported by the Delegation of **Kenya**, referred to the Bordeaux decision and suggested that France be invited to request that the property be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** summarized the proposed amendments to the decision, adding a reference to the States Parties being urged to request in-Danger Listing of the property.

Decision **32 COM 7B.42** was adopted, as amended.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.44**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that on 24 June it had received a 407-page report, written in Spanish, from the State Party, but time had not been sufficient to analyse it in detail. The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre remained concerned over poor governance, and noted that recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre had not been implemented for the past 9 years.

IUCN added that recent developments included illegal logging in the property, without any planning or approval.

The Delegation of **Brazil** explained that Machu Picchu was for Latin Americans what Versailles was for Europeans. The draft decision's tone was worrying due to the late submission of the report by the State Party and did not take into account some positive developments at the site. It considered that the proposal to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger was premature, pointing out that the site management committee was now operating. It added that Brazil had submitted a number of amendments to the draft decision requesting the State Party to provide additional information, and suggesting that the Committee invite the State Party to request inscription on List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported Brazil's intervention, commenting that the World Heritage Centre's State of Conservation report was negative and bore no relation to the 407-page report recently submitted.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that the report's last paragraph indicated that Danger Listing would help raise political support for the property. It warned that that approach was

sensitive due to cultural differences, and that perhaps it would be best to invite the State Party to request that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism be used instead.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, reiterating the comments made by the Delegation of Brazil, said that for Egyptians, Machu Picchu was even more important than Versailles. It supported the proposal that the property should not be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported the views of Brazil, adding that it was important to be aware of historical and regional contexts.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** prend note du très long rapport envoyé par l'État partie, et exprime son vœu de visiter le bien.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that Machu Picchu deserved time for discussion and that ways of helping such properties needed to be found, Peru only being the custodian of the site, but its conservation being the responsibility of the entire world. Instead of giving the property a one-way ticket to the List of World Heritage in Danger, very serious monitoring over the next two years to ascertain the problems could be a viable alternative.

The Delegation of **China** stressed the great importance of the property, suggesting that the approach should be one of prudence and careful consideration. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies had done a good job, having conducted six field visits in the last 9 years. However, the Delegation noted that the objective was to secure the highest political commitment by the State Party to deal with the challenges at the property, as indicated in the report. The 407-page document received showed that the State Party had given great importance to providing the necessary materials requested by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, but had unfortunately provided them only in Spanish. The Committee rule whereby reports were to be submitted in French or English only should be abided by in the future, and more opportunities should be given to the State Party to carry out corrective measures.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was not called into question, and noted that there had been progress, with the recent establishment of a management unit designed to deal with the challenges faced by the site. One year might be too short to see results and it was premature to consider inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It suggested that Reinforced Monitoring might be a way of signalling the importance to be attached to the issue by the State Party.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** concurred with the Delegation of Israel, and supported the revised text proposed by Brazil. It added having submitted a small house-keeping amendment to Paragraph 9.

The Delegation of **Australia** concurred with the Delegation of Egypt and others, and expressed concerns over the property. It noted that the information provided by the State Party was late, incomplete and not in an official language. It acknowledged that the property was a candidate for Danger Listing, but that the use of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism might be more appropriate at the present juncture.

The Delegation of **Canada** acknowledged the threats and urged the State Party to produce a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It asked the State Party to reconsider its opposition to Danger Listing as it was a way of mobilizing international cooperation, but would support Reinforced Monitoring if that was the consensus.

The Delegation of **Peru** thanked other Committee members for their comments. It pointed out that the picture on the screen was outside the property boundary, and that those engaged in logging there had been brought before the courts and would be sanctioned. In

July 2007, the new Government of Peru had reactivated the Machu Picchu management unit, and since then ongoing meetings had been taking place on a regular basis. The Delegation expressed concerns over the April 2007 mission, and stated that the World Heritage Centre had not been aware of progress made at the property since then, namely, *inter alia*, better access control, better communication coordination, the development of terms of reference for developing a risk management plan, ongoing environmental impact studies on noise, and the development of terms of reference for a public use plan, including how to handle tourists. Aguas Calientes had set up an office to draw up an urban plan. One of the Committee recommendations had been to dredge the river: that had been done in the previous three months, with 9,000 cubic metres removed. The Delegation had no objections to a new monitoring mission and invited the Committee to investigate the property further. It concluded by saying that including it in the List of World Heritage in Danger would be counterproductive.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision: paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11 remained unchanged. Paragraph 8.c).vi) would read “additional” rather than “further”, Paragraph 9 would include “and requests”. A new Paragraph 12 would also be added to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for two years. A final Paragraph 13 would also be added urging the State Party to request Danger-listing.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed an amendment, giving the text a more positive tone, and asked whether the Paragraph on the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism had been included at the Chairperson’s initiative.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that it had been her initiative to include it, as it had been requested by several members of the Committee.

For the sake of consistency, the Delegation of **Brazil** reminded the Committee that, in previous decisions, the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was to be applied on a yearly basis, but that in the case under consideration its application was being proposed for two years.

The Delegation of **Peru** indicated that it would be willing to accept such monitoring for a two-year period.

Decision **32 COM 7B.44** was adopted, as amended.

The **World Heritage Centre** read out the list of the State of Conservation reports of properties for noting by the Committee:

- Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 bis)
- Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454)

Decisions **32 COM 7B.41** and **32 COM 7B.43** were adopted.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.14**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that it had not received any no new information from the State Party; but had received some disturbing news about continuing encroachment and planned road construction.

Decision **32 COM 7B.14** was adopted.

Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.13**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that no new information had been received.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that reports had been received on the observation of the Siberian crane as recently as February 2008, which was good news, as it had last been seen in 2002. It requested that the State Party provide information on the location of the sighting, indicating that it would change the Park's conservation status, and this should be reflected in the draft decision.

The Chairperson asked the state of India to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **India** responded that the observation of the Siberian crane had not been confirmed.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision: paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 remained unchanged, Paragraph 7d) would be amended so as to include "with special attention to the Siberian crane".

The Delegation of **Kenya**, noting that the State of Conservation report made reference to Danger Listing, suggested that, instead, the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism be considered for the property, in order to ensure consistency with other properties to which that mechanism was applied.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was not necessarily automatically applied to properties at risk, and that it was also an expensive proposition.

The Delegation of **Kenya** withdrew its request for consideration of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

The Delegation of **Israel** reminded the Committee that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was to be used when specific activities were projected to take place within the property during the year in question, so that the Committee could be informed on the situation. This did not appear to be the case for the property under consideration.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** also emphasized the budgetary implications of recourse to the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

Decision **32 COM 7B.13** was adopted, as amended.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Durmitor National Park (Montenegro) (N 100)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.19**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that it had not received any new information.

The Delegation of **Kenya** wondered what would be the implications of the location of the dam, once such information had been provided.

IUCN explained that the direct and indirect impacts on the property could be ascertained once the location was clarified.

Decision **32 COM 7B.19** was adopted.

Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.24**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that no new information had been received.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that the State Party of Romania be given the floor to explain how it had been cooperating with neighbouring States Parties on the issue of reporting to the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Romania** explained that cooperation with the neighbouring countries of Ukraine and Moldova had improved over the previous year and that a multilateral agreement had been signed in Bucharest in May 2008. Cooperation with Ukraine was occurring in the context of European Union projects mentioned in the draft decision. It also noted that it had finalized rules of navigation for the area.

The Observer Delegation of **Ukraine** said that Ukraine was ready to prepare a report about activity in the Danube Delta area, having obtained information in that regard. It also indicated Ukraine's willingness to increase the size of the property so that it would include the Biosphere Reserve area within its territory, the documents for that initiative having already been prepared.

Decision **32 COM 7B.21** was adopted.

Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.25**

The **World Heritage Centre** said it had received new information from the State Party on 3 July 2008 to the effect that the location of Olympics-related infrastructure would be moved so as to not affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value or integrity.

The Delegation of **Israel**, in the light of the World Heritage Centre's intervention, requested to know what would be the exact wording in Paragraph 8 of the draft decision regarding the alternative locations for the Olympic Games.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked for the State Party to be given the floor.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said that, on the basis of the new information provided, amendments would be required to the paragraphs of the decision relating to the Olympic Games.

The Delegation of **China** agreed that the new information would require an amended decision and asked the State Party to provide further information.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked how paragraphs 5a) and 5b) related to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** confirmed its full commitment to the environmental component of the Olympic Games, and stated that it had met with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other stakeholders in that connection. As a result, it had changed the location of the bobsleigh run, the Olympic village and the biathlon, removing them from the zone adjacent to the property, and it would soon be sending that information to the World Heritage Centre in writing. It also stated that additional funding for those changes had been provided by the national Government and requested that that be reflected in the draft decision.

The Observer Delegation of **Caucasus Watch**, an NGO from the Russian Federation, stated that it had visited the Lunnaya Polyanna site on 8 April, accompanied by a scientific team. It had visited the VIP Centre and noted that construction of buildings and cable-cars was ongoing despite the assurances from the State Party to the contrary, and offered to provide photographic evidence.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that the mission to the property had noted the construction of a road and the occurrence of illegal logging, and that the events reported by the NGO were occurring in the north-west portion of the property, which was managed by a different jurisdiction, but the State Party had assured the mission that those activities had been halted since the mission.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision:

- Paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unchanged.
- A new Paragraph was proposed by Israel after Paragraph 2 of the draft decision to commend the State Party for the action taken in the relocation of facilities for the Olympic Games.
- Several amendments were proposed for Paragraph 3 of the draft decision: Kenya proposed to delete it; China proposed to delete "with concern" and Cuba to delete the end part of it.
- China proposed a new Paragraph to insert after Paragraph 3 of the draft decision to welcome the recent decision of the State Party to change the plans concerning the location of some of the Olympic facilities.
- Cuba proposed to delete Paragraphs 4,5f) and 5g) of the draft decision.
- Cuba proposed inserting in Paragraph 7 a request to State Party to provide all necessary documentation to the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it agreed with the Chinese proposal to add a new Paragraph, and hoped that the activities related to the Olympics would be taking place outside the property.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the construction of the Olympics-related facilities was planned in the adjoining Sochi National Park, which was not part of the World Heritage property.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** indicated being against the deletion of Paragraphs 5f) and 5g), as proposed by Cuba.

The **Rapporteur** read an additional proposal by Israel on Paragraph 5h) to add “Welcomes the report of the State party concerning the relocation of some of the facilities”.

The Delegation of **Cuba** clarified its earlier proposals for amendments, but then withdrew them for lack of support.

Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 5 was adopted.

Decision **32 COM 7B.25** was adopted, as amended.

Natural System of “Wrangell Island” Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.26**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported having received no new information.

The Delegation of **Canada** called for clarification from the State Party on the status of the management plan.

The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** reported that the management plan was to be completed by the end of the year and would be provided to the World Heritage Centre.

Citing the constrained budget of the World Heritage Fund, the Delegation of **Kenya**, supported by the Delegation of **Canada**, asked if a mission to the property, for the purposes of reviewing a management plan, was in fact necessary; this would imply deleting Paragraph 5 of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed 2009 as a more suitable date for a report than 2010 in Paragraph 6.

IUCN noted that, at the time of inscription in 2004, a mission had been requested to evaluate progress on implementing management activities, as well as the potential extension of the marine component.

Decision **32 COM 7B.26** was adopted, as amended.

Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.27**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported having received no new information.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision: Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 remained unchanged. In Paragraph 5, Israel proposed to change the date to 1 February 2010.

Decision **32 COM 7B.27** was adopted, as amended.

Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom) (N 369)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.28**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that the National Trust, in charge of managing the property, had recently invested a six-million pound grant to build a visitor centre, which was expected to open in 2011.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision: Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 remained unchanged. In Paragraph 5, Israel proposed to change the date to 1 February 2010.

Decision **32 COM 7B.28** was adopted, as amended.

Yellowstone National Park (United States of America) (N 28)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.29**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that it had received no new information.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision:

- Paragraphs 1 and 2 remained unchanged
- Paragraph 3, Spain proposed to add "National Environment Policy" before Act
- Paragraph 4a), Spain proposed to replace the beginning by "Accelerate the adaptive management changes under the Bison..."
- Paragraph 4b)i), Spain proposed to replace the current statement and insert "carry out a scientific review of the programme..."
- Paragraph 5a), Spain proposed to delete the current statement and replace it by "Implement a sustainability programme to reduce the impacts of visitation"
- Paragraph 6, Spain also proposed to delete it in its entirety
- Paragraph 7, Spain proposed to replace the date of the mission to 2011 instead of 2010
- Paragraph 8, Spain proposed to replace the date 2009 by 2010.

The Delegation of **Spain** recommended reporting in 2010 and a mission in 2011.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed additional amendments relating to the date and the order of paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Spain** noted that changes were proposed on account of the electoral process in the United States of America.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the changes, and proposed that the decision be adopted.

Decision **32 COM 7B.29** was adopted, as amended.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Belize Barrier Reef System (Belize) (N 764)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.33**

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that it received a letter from the State Party on 10 June indicating that on 17 May, the Deputy-Prime Minister and the Minister of Natural Resources and the Environment had suspended all mangrove cutting and dredging licences for an initial period of 9 months.

The Delegation of **Barbados** suggested that the Committee should invite the State Party of Belize to present updated information, if any.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that it was preparing some proposals for amendment.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Delegation of Belize was absent. She summarized the proposed amendments and noted that there were no objections.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision: Paragraphs 1, 3 and 5 remained unchanged; in Paragraph 2, it is proposed to delete “the potential inclusion of the property...” until the end of the sentence; in Paragraph 4, the mission should be in 2008-2009; and in Paragraph 6, it is proposed to add “with a view to considering the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger”.

Decision **32COM 7B.33** was adopted as amended.

Alexander von Humboldt National Park (Cuba) (N 839 rev)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.36**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that there was no new information to present.

The Delegation of **Israel**, citing paragraph 5 of the draft decision, which stated “open mining development...is incompatible with its conservation objectives and its World Heritage status,” requested the State Party of Cuba to provide information on whether mining was still taking place or not.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that it had received information from its experts suggesting that management at the property had improved since its inscription, that the work was being undertaken in a coordinated manner and that the staff was very determined to implement the management plan. It asked to hear from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Cuba** recalled Decision **31 COM 7B.37** which had requested a State of Conservation report, and confirmed that such a report had been sent by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre. It added that there had never been any problem with mining, but with exploration, even before the property had been inscribed, and that there had been no developments in that area since 2006. It stressed that the ministries in charge of the property were working together in addressing that issue. They were doing very good work, with 160 hectares now protected areas and an increasing number of species populations. They had received a special prize for their achievements.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it was preparing a proposal for amendment.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that Paragraph 5 was too broad and that, in Paragraph 7, the term “property” should be used instead of “core zone”.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported Australia on the latter proposal.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegation of **Barbados**, said that, as Cuba had stated, that actual mining had not taken place, but that the lease was only for exploration purposes, paragraphs 4 and 5 were therefore no longer relevant.

The Delegation of **Spain** asked to hear from the State Party of Cuba, adding that, since the report had been provided, Paragraph 3 of the draft decision should be deleted.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the latter suggestion by Spain.

The Delegation of **Barbados** repeated its request to delete Paragraph 5.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** pointed out that the information given in the report and that just provided by the State Party was contradictory, and requested explanation from IUCN or the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that, since mining was not actually taking place, the decision need not mention the open mining development, and found Paragraph 5 irrelevant.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed removing paragraphs 4 and 5, which were irrelevant after the explanation given by the State party.

The Delegation of **Brazil** reiterated its proposal to delete paragraphs 4 and 5, as the role of the Committee was not to speculate.

In response to the question asked by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, **IUCN** stated that no firm commitment had been made by the State Party to refrain from carrying out exploration or exploitation activities in the property and noted that mining companies were refusing to work in the area, in accordance with the “no-go” commitment made by the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision: Paragraphs 1, 2, 6 and 8 remained unchanged; Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 are proposed for deletion. If not, there are some proposals on those paragraphs which could be reviewed at a later stage; in Paragraph 7, it is proposed to change “core zone” into “property”.

Decision **32 COM 7B.36** was adopted, as amended.

AFRICA

Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Decision: **32 COM 7B.1**

The **World Heritage Centre** said it had no new information to report.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked why there was a reference to a mission in Paragraph 6, if the purpose of the mission was merely to assess the condition of the fence.

The **World Heritage Centre** replied that it was because a mission had never been able to visit the site and it was important to assess developments in the field.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** considère qu'il serait très intéressant de pouvoir écouter l'Etat partie.

La délégation du **Maroc** indique que dans le chapitre « Principales menaces identifiées dans les rapports précédents » du rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien, il est mentionné un « conflit entre la nature et la faune » et souhaite avoir des précisions sur la nature de ce conflit.

The Delegation of **Kenya** acknowledged the delay in the management plan, and explained that it had been due to the need for an environmental impact assessment. It pointed out that much progress had been made in management and conservation. It also stressed the need for the fence, which was critical to protect the people from elephants.

Decision **32 COM 7B.1** was adopted.

Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.2**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that there was no further information to report, except a correction of the dates of the mission conducted.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed the draft decision: Paragraphs 1, 2, 4 and 5 remained unchanged, Paragraph 3d) was proposed to be deleted.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed to delete Paragraph 3d), because the level of pollution did not relate to the reason why the site had been inscribed (geological values).

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested to hear from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Barbados** said that the purpose of Paragraph 4 was to make an effort for "efficient management".

La délégation du **Maroc** demande des précisions sur le Point 3b), à savoir la qualité des eaux et la nappe phréatique.

The Delegation of **Australia** clarified its position, saying it would not insist if its proposal was not retained, and would go along with the consensus.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the comment by the Delegation of Morocco regarding Paragraph 3d).

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Australia, that the level of pollution was not related to the reason why the property was inscribed. It stated however that it would follow Australia's position if it withdrew its amendment.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested "urging" the State Party to take action on the decision.

Decision **32 COM 7B.2** was adopted, as amended.

Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 7B.3**

The **World Heritage Centre** said there was no new information to report.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested the State Party to explain why the problems had not been solved for many years.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stressed that the property, which comprised parts in both the United Republic of Tanzania and Mozambique, was an important corridor for wildlife. In that context, it was important to hear from both States Parties. It stressed the importance of coordination between the two States Parties.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** said it regretted not having submitted a State of Conservation report as requested, and pledged to do so, so that it could be discussed at the 33rd session of the Committee. It added that an environmental impact assessment would be carried out before conducting any mining, and that mining was prohibited in any protected areas, including forest reserves, and the property in question was one of them.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Delegation of Mozambique was not present.

Decision **32 COM 7B.3** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of the properties listed for discussion under Agenda item 7B.

The **World Heritage Centre** read out the list of the State of Conservation reports of properties for noting by the Committee:

- Mosi-Oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe) (N 509)
- Wadi-Al-Hitan (Whale Valley) (Egypt) (N 1186)
- Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)
- Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N 8)
- Purnululu National Park (Australia) (N 1094)
- Macquarie Island (Australia) (N 629 rev)
- The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798)
- Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083)
- Kaniranga National Park (India) (N 337)

- Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)
- Shiretoko (Japan) (N 1193)
- Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590)
- Isole Aeole (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908)
- Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland) (N 33 bis)
- Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)
- Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765 bis)
- Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)
- Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76)
- Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303)
- Iguaçú National Park (Brazil) (N 355)
- Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 1083)
- Talamanca Range - La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica/Panama) (N 205 bis)
- Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 250)
- Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)
- Manu National Park (Peru) (N 402)
- Pitons Management Area (Saint-Lucia) (N 1161)

Decisions **32 COM 7B.4, 32 COM 7B.5, 32 COM 7B.6, 32 COM 7B.7, 32 COM 7B.8, 32 COM 7B.9, 32 COM 7B.10, 32 COM 7B.11, 32 COM 7B.12, 32 COM 7B.15, 32 COM 7B.16, 32 COM 7B.17, 32 COM 7B.18, 32 COM 7B.20, 32 COM 7B.22, 32 COM 7B.23, 32 COM 7B.24, 32 COM 7B.30, 32 COM 7B.31, 32 COM 7B.32, 32 COM 7B.34, 32 COM 7B.35, 32 COM 7B.37, 32 COM 7B.38, 32 COM 7B.39** and **32 COM 7B.40** were adopted.

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON STATE OF CONSERVATION

Document: N/A

Decision: **32 COM 7B.129 (distributed in the Room)**

The **Chairperson** explained that a thirty-minute period had been set aside for an open discussion on State of Conservation, to exchange opinions and to reflect upon them.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commented that, while the listing of sites was not enough for conservation, the positive side of listing should be recognized. It stressed the need to look at context and situation when examining properties. All countries were requested to conserve heritage properties, but a single standard could not be applied to all. It also pointed to the need for proper follow-up activities, and to empower States Parties financially so that they could implement them. Regarding the List of World Heritage in Danger, an understanding of the List should be promoted because it was often seen as a punishment.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its concerns about the issue of historic urban landscapes. Urban development plans impacted on the integrity and authenticity of the heritage property. The fact that it was proposed that five historic urban landscapes should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger was a serious matter. The guiding documents, such as the new recommendation under preparation, should be given priority.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** souhaite faire quelques réflexions à propos de la valeur des paysages culturels en milieux ruraux. Au cours de l'examen des rapports sur l'état de conservation, elle a noté une pression de plus en plus pressante des populations sur les zones classées (vallée du Rhin, Dresde, etc...). Elle ajoute que des efforts restent à faire

pour tenir compte de cette situation pour concilier le besoin de développement et la conservation des sites avec leurs valeurs; valeurs du passé et valeurs du présent, mais aussi du présent et du futur. Elle souhaite engager une réflexion pour trouver des solutions.

La Délégation du **Maroc** rappelle le besoin de lignes directrices claires dans ce débat sur l'état de conservation des biens. Elle soulève le problème de la conservation *ex-situ* des espèces animales (tortues, rhinocéros, etc...) et d'extermination d'autres (rats, lapins, etc...); Elle soulève le problème de la langue au niveau local, problème devant être pris en compte afin de revoir les sites de façon plus équitable.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it recognized the importance of the State of Conservation reports as a tool in order to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of heritage properties. The process should be improved, as there were updated materials coming in at the last minute. The report should clearly describe positive and negative aspects so that the States Parties could use it effectively. The report often requested actions of States Parties, but not of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. There were also complexities to be clarified in the vocabulary used in the discussion, such as reactive monitoring mission, Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism and other terms. A "lexicon" of actions was needed and sanctions and compliance should be indicated. It stressed that the financial implications of the latter should be considered. It also suggested that a Report on State of Conservation in the world in a number of areas should be produced. This discussion should be followed by a draft decision for adoption.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that State of Conservation reporting was critical to ensure the credibility of the Convention and the conservation of properties. It regretted that Danger Listing was regarded as a sanction rather than as an opportunity to improve, despite the fact that the Convention stated as much. It was very important that the requirements for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value of particular sites were recognized at the time of nomination. It also considered that the historic urban landscape issue required further work.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that there had been no inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the current session, which was a rather positive trend. The newly-established mechanism of selecting reports for discussion had not proved useful in terms of time-saving, and there might be need for a working group on the question of time management for State of Conservation reports. It suggested that, if a mission was requested, the report should indicate all the relevant details, such as the expertise required, the scope of the mission and so on. It concluded by pointing out that there had been 35 cases reviewed which spoke to the issue of the visual impact of urban landscapes making this a critical issue for World Heritage. It stated that criteria had still to be found to evaluate the impact of urban development on the Outstanding Universal Value of a property.

The Delegation of **Brazil** drew attention to the increasing number of SOCs which must be examined and the perceived link between Reinforced Monitoring missions and listing of World Heritage in Danger. It was concerned that the results of the meeting in Olinda had not so far filtered into the report and would propose a change to give recognition to its outcomes.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted the difference in cultural perception about expectations in relation to management plans and basic requirements, and the need for standards or criteria for assessing State of Conservation, in two areas in particular: (1) for the management system/plan Environmental Impact Assessments, and (2) cultural impact studies or assessment regarding the impact of new construction, such as high-rise buildings, on Outstanding Universal Value. Examples or a check-list would be useful.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed the need to take into account the local context and to send qualified experts who could properly review the property. It also suggested establishing local / regional cooperation to enable States Parties to gain experience. In that regard, it announced Egypt's intention to establish a centre for restoration in Cairo for the Arab States. Finally, it considered that the Committee should advocate conservation and not talk only about threats and negative aspects in respect of sites in danger.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that a major issue was the analysis of the reports before the Committee in order to identify emerging trends. It would be helpful if the text of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property in question was shown on screen before the Committee examined it. It remarked that there was a need to give conscious consideration to the activities taking place in the buffer zone (such as tourism) and their impact on the Outstanding Universal Value which required a cautious approach. While the Committee should not prescribe how missions take place it could nevertheless hold the Centre accountable for the content of its reports. It concluded by requesting a summary record of the current discussion.

The Delegation of **Australia**, commenting on the procedural aspects of the discussion, remarked that the discussions revolved mostly around policy aspects rather than the sites themselves or the substance of monitoring reports. It observed that approximately 50% of the State of Conservation reports had not been discussed. The Committee faced a lack of framework to make decisions, and needed to develop guidelines on how the Committee examines impacts on Outstanding Universal Value. It also pointed out that sometimes it was not clear whether a certain piece of information came from the report of the State Party, that of the Advisory Bodies, or from a local authority or other source. It proposed to prepare a draft decision for the Committee to consider and adopt on the issue, under item 10. It also suggested using more visual aids for effective communication, and reviewing the reports by theme rather than by region.

The Delegation of **Spain** recalled that the essence of the Convention and the basis of the Committee sessions was the analysis of the State of Conservation reports, and that it was also important to mention good news on how to mitigate threats and conserve properties, not only threats affecting the properties. It recognised the enormous efforts being made by States Parties to reduce their impact on sites which was not necessarily recognized in the reports. It wondered whether the Committee had had enough time to properly discuss all the State of Conservation reports. It concluded by saying that the Committee should launch an initiative to redefine the Outstanding Universal Value of properties for which it had not previously been defined in order to delimit action in relation to the Convention.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** indique que ces heures passées à examiner les rapports sur l'état de conservation ont représenté une promenade naturelle et culturelle à travers le monde. Elle ajoute que demander un rapport sur l'état de conservation, c'est demander aux Organisations consultatives de faire un diagnostic, conforme ou non, selon leurs capacités et compétences. Elle rappelle l'importance de prendre en considération le dynamisme des choses *in situ*. Elle fait part de son souhait de parler plutôt de « gestion / conservation » plutôt que de conservation seule. Elle conclut en indiquant qu'il est indispensable de prendre en compte la philosophie; que conserver un monument, ce n'est pas le fossiliser, mais lui donner l'opportunité de s'épanouir, et de permettre « aux hommes de se faire féconder ».

The Delegation of **Barbados** commented that it also saw the State of Conservation reports as being important for the credibility of the Convention. However, it considered that production of the reports had become an "industry", and that consequently fewer people were asked to draft them, and they were overburdened. It was necessary to find a way to ensure that development and conservation complemented each other, and that new buildings be brought within the consideration of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stressed the importance of the State of Conservation reports, adding that there should be a link between the mission and the State Party so that the report included the obstacles faced by the State Party and should not focus only on negative aspects. It was important to inform the State Party of the results of the mission in a timely manner to enable it to submit follow-up reports.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to the draft decision proposed by Israel. The main points were: 1) to request the World Heritage Centre, with the Chairperson of the Committee, to produce a summary report of the discussion and to publicize it by 1 November 2008 for discussion at the Committee's 33rd session in 2009; 2) to prepare a lexicon of terms and their application in the State of Conservation reports; 3) to send State of Conservation reports to States Parties prior to the Committee sessions, and 4) to identify priority issues with the Advisory Bodies to be discussed as an agenda item on the Global strategy.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** inquired about the time-frame of the suggested review.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, thanking Israel for the proposal, commented that it seemed to concern changes in methodology, and wondered about the feasibility of the changes, such as the suggested deadline, how to obtain the Committee's approval during the intersessional period, and what was meant by making the requested summary report public.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** commented that the time-frame was not realistic and suggested a longer cycle, such as to present the report at the next session in 2009. He also suggested putting it into the regular cycle.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that the World Heritage Centre needed to give careful consideration to the process.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that a working group be formed.

The Delegations of the **United States of America**, the **Republic of Korea**, **Australia** and **Kenya** volunteered to join the proposed working group.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it wondered whether the draft decision was the result of the latest discussions or not. All ideas and proposals should be taken into consideration.

The **Chairperson** suspended the discussion and invited the working group to formulate the draft decision.

ITEM 9 DISCUSSION ON OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/9

Decision: **32 COM 9**

The **Chairperson** briefly explained the background to the item.

ICOMOS and **IUCN** respectively made presentations on "Outstanding Universal Value: Compendium on Standards for the Inscription of Cultural ("Natural" for IUCN) Properties to the World Heritage List", on the basis of the full reports contained in Document *WHC-08/32.COM 9*.

The Delegation of **China** stated that Outstanding Universal Value was a fundamental topic, yet it was not very clear how to analyse it, since peoples had different values. It recalled that the States Parties ought to attach great importance to 5 Strategic objectives. It stressed that diversity should be fully taken into account when assessing Outstanding Universal Value, and the importance of efficient and repeated communication.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** commended the Advisory Bodies for their efforts and hard work. It considered that the reports were still at a preliminary stage. The reports were descriptive, but not enough analysis was presented. Some analysis would help States Parties, which often struggled in dealing with this concept. It suggested that case studies should be drafted and published by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Spain** thanked IUCN and ICOMOS for their presentations. The Advisory Bodies should make sure that a clear Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was present for every property, including all the long-standing properties. Management plans should also clearly relate to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It suggested that a manual be developed on how to redefine Outstanding Universal Value in order to help States Parties and those managing the properties.

The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their commendable work, adding that there was still a long way to go. It stressed the importance of peoples' involvement in the issue and said that values evolved. It reminded the Committee that it needed to identify differences and commonalities among different heritage properties, which was the spirit of the Global Strategy. The Committee needed to ask itself if it had succeeded in doing so. The Committee members should further consider the issue of the growing number of listed properties.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** tient à remercier les Organisations consultatives pour ce travail remarquable. L'évolution du concept de valeur universelle exceptionnelle est irrémédiable et le Comité est condamné à la suivre. Elle ajoute qu'il est important de bien définir l'espace dans lequel s'exprime la valeur universelle exceptionnelle (zone centrale, zone tampon ou bien les deux?). Beaucoup de biens sont évalués sur des critères qui n'existaient pas lors de leur inscription sur la Liste.

The Delegation of **Canada** acknowledged the work done by the Advisory Bodies. It made two suggestions: 1) to include a table, based on a table on page 19 of the IUCN report, that covered three landmark cases, with an explanation as to why Outstanding Universal Value was met or not met in those cases and 2) to produce an executive summary regarding thresholds of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Israel**, joining other delegations in commending the Advisory Bodies, pointed out that Outstanding Universal Value was based on the cultural values of people around the world, and aimed to represent cultural and natural diversity. A comprehensive analysis was necessary, taking into account universal and local values of properties. It was important to synthesize the work of the two Bodies, taking them together. In the pyramid of Outstanding Universal Value in the IUCN report, the position of those properties on the Tentative List should be included. It added that the studies should be used as a building block for the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that, with those studies now completed, the next step should be to undertake a quantifying analysis using a non-parametric method, in order to avoid any further confusion about Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation du **Maroc** remercie les Organisations consultatives pour le travail en cours et l'excellente qualité des documents. Elle ajoute que ce travail est capital et doit être achevé pour que le Comité y voie plus clair. Elle pose ensuite la question de l'application évolutive

des critères, notamment pour les biens inscrits il y a deux ou trois décennies. Elle demande enfin s'il existe des critères pour évaluer la perte de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et comment faire pour distinguer les éléments mobiles et les éléments stables qui représentent cette valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it joined other delegations in thanking and commending the Advisory Bodies and echoed the suggestions made. It noted that further work was needed and said that more practical guidelines should be produced on how to develop a comparative analysis. It suggested harmonizing the two reports, as well as the reports of evaluations of new nominations.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the Committee was and should remain a very important scientific body and should detach itself from any political considerations.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that the presentations should be repeated at the General Assembly in 2009, so that all States Parties could share the helpful information provided. The section of the IUCN report which referred to properties which did not meet the threshold of Outstanding Universal Value was useful, and the Delegation wished ICOMOS could do likewise. Outstanding Universal Value has evolving characteristics (such as cultural landscapes, historical urban landscapes, etc...), which could be taken into account in the second Compendium. It appreciated the chapter which referred to indigenous people, but expressed concern that they were described as stakeholders, rather than inherent.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** called attention to intangible aspects and associated value in respect of Outstanding Universal Value. It recalled the fifth "C" of the Strategic objectives, "Community", stressing that the role of communities should be highlighted. It also suggested that the issues regarding the credibility of the World Heritage List should be addressed at the General Assembly in 2009.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** considère qu'il y a des valeurs universelles, mais indique son inquiétude face à l'« exceptionnel » qui est relatif et subjectif. Elle se déclare inquiète car elle n'a pas eu connaissance d'une définition aussi large que possible. Elle ajoute enfin qu'il n'y a pas d'absolu pour les Hommes. Elle conclut en demandant ce qu'il va advenir des sites qui n'ont pas été retenus sur ce critère de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported the comments made by the Delegation of Kenya regarding the involvement of people. Outstanding Universal Value was a reflection of how people saw themselves, and was of an evolving nature.

The **Chairperson** suspended the discussion until the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 01.00 p.m.

FIFTH DAY – SUNDAY, 6 July 2008

NINTH MEETING

02.30 p.m. – 06.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

ITEM 9 DISCUSSION ON OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE (continued)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/9

Decision: **32 COM 9**

The **Chairperson** re-opened the debate and gave the floor to Observers.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** said that different cultures could apply criteria for the justification of Outstanding Universal Value differently according to their individual cultural expressions of admiration and emotion and how those feelings were translated into physical expression. In some cultures, value was sometimes minimized in terms of physical embodiment. The Delegation proposed that the Advisory Bodies undertake a study on the application of the criteria in the different regions and cultures of the world.

The Observer Delegation of **India** agreed with the comments made by the Delegation of Japan and thanked the Advisory Bodies. It recalled the attention given to the thematic study undertaken for the Pacific and the importance of the concept of privacy and of living traditions. Experts sent to such sites should be culturally sensitive. It thanked IUCN and ICOMOS for its very interesting presentations and suggested they be disseminated widely, particularly in regions which don't have many sites, particularly the South Pacific.

La délégation de la **Hongrie** (observateur) souligne les différences entre l'approche culturelle et naturelle, et précise qu'il faut en tenir compte.

The **Chairperson** closed the debate, waiting for a document to be ready for discussion. She asked if the Working Group on the general discussion on 7B was finished (on the State of Conservation).

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it is meeting and concluding between the two sessions.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Advisory Bodies for clarifications concerning the debate which had just concluded on the Outstanding Universal Value.

IUCN stated that more resources were needed, mainly for the preparation of the nominations. The project has gone over the budget and resources were needed for further work on resource manuals, one of which is for the preparation of nominations. It commented that cross references would be useful between the tasks assigned by previous Committee decisions and future tasks assigned from revised decisions.

ICOMOS said the Delegate of the United States had asked ICOMOS about an enlarged document with case studies. ICOMOS explained that the studies would be printed and Committee members will be informed when it's on the web site.

The **Chairperson** said this brought the discussions to the draft decision on **32 COM 9**.

The **Rapporteur** said that amendments to the draft decision had been received, from Israel, Canada and Brazil.

- Paragraph 1 would remain unchanged;
- Paragraph 2 would request ICOMOS and IUCN to harmonize their reports;
- A new paragraph was proposed for insertion between current paragraphs 1 and 2, *“Recognizing that Outstanding Universal Value is based on the values as interpreted by people of the world, representing natural and cultural diversity, takes note of the discussion at the 32nd session of the wh committee”*;
- Paragraph 3 would be proposed to be deleted and replaced with *“Welcomes with appreciation the work of the Advisory Bodies to prepare the compendiums on standards for the inscription of natural and cultural properties on the World Heritage List”*; while Australia proposed to thank the Advisory Bodies for completing their reports, regretting that this task had not been completed in the way requested by the World Heritage Committee.
- Canada proposed adding a new Paragraph 4, requesting the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS to complete the compendium by including an executive summary clearly presenting high-level conclusions about the threshold for Outstanding Universal Value related to each criterion and further implication for the Committee of conclusions arising from the report, and a table summarising up to three landmark cases explaining why the Outstanding Universal Value criteria was or was not:
- Israel proposed replacing Paragraph 4 with *“Requests the World Heritage Centre to prepare a single comprehensive document with an integrated introduction for publication in the World Heritage Paper Series, including an executive summary and conclusions”*;
- At the same time, Australia proposed replacing Paragraph 4 with *“Requests ICOMOS and IUCN, when appropriate, to collaborate on the evaluation of properties so as to produce single evaluation reports on properties”*;
- A new Paragraph 7 was proposed by Brazil, to request the World Heritage Centre to seek extrabudgetary funds to help finance the conclusions of this work;
- Australia also proposed that the current Paragraph 4 be retained, and that a new Paragraph be added as follows: *“Recognizing the critical importance of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value to all aspects of World Heritage, further requests that State of Conservation decisions and nominations be accompanied by the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, as the fundamental foundations against which decisions should be made”*;
- An additional Paragraph 7 was also proposed : *“Reinforces the rigorous application of the 3 key tests as set out in the Operational Guidelines: one or more of the 10 criteria must meet the conditions of authenticity and/or integrity, adequate protection or management system to ensure its safeguarding”*;

The **Chairperson**, supported by the Delegation of **Australia**, suggested suspending the discussion on the draft decision in order to produce a coherent and comprehensive text to be submitted to the Committee for adoption.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested these would be put into one decision, rather than a series of options.

ITEM 10B POINT OF INFORMATION ON THE PREPARATION OF SERIAL TRANSNATIONAL NOMINATIONS

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/10B
Decision: **32 COM 10B**

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for discussion on item 10B on the preparation of serial transnational nominations, and recalled the meaning of the serial properties category, as described in Paragraphs 137 and 138 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The **World Heritage Centre** made a presentation, explaining that serial nominations were a growing trend, as could be seen from the Annex to the document. It underlined the difficulty in developing large, complex transnational nominations, the demands in terms of human and financial resources and the increasing difficulty for the Advisory Bodies to evaluate such properties. The World Heritage Centre invited the Committee to focus its attention on the following questions:

- How should serial nominations be presented on Tentative Lists?
- How should the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value be identified?
- The need to determine overall criteria, common to all elements;
- The need for a management system or mechanisms for ensuring the coordinated management of the separate components;
- The need to demonstrate functional links across serial properties;
- The effective collaboration between participating State Parties;
- What is the justification for the serial approach?
- Are the separate components of the property functionally linked?
- Is there an overall management framework for all the components?

The World Heritage Centre drew attention to the work being done by the Advisory Bodies to produce a resource manual on nominations in order to provide guidance on the matter.

The Delegation of **Sweden** commended the report and requested additional comments on paragraph 12 (b) of the document. It expressed concern about the possible deletion of the whole serial nomination should the Outstanding Universal Value of one part of a serial nomination be lost.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stressed the importance of the document and of the serial property category in connecting peoples and cultures through heritage, and fostering an understanding of differences. It requested additional information from the Advisory Bodies on paragraph 12 (b) of the document.

The Delegation of **China** reported that substantial progress had been made on the transnational nomination of the Silk Road.

The Delegation of **Canada** thanked the World Heritage Centre for this very important document. It said that the Committee had to be clear on a number of issues: do all parts of a serial nomination need to have Outstanding Universal Value? In its view, a serial transnational nomination is a serial World Heritage site and therefore, there has to be one integrated management plan and one report. What happens if the property is placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger? Finally, it alerted the Committee to the possible conflicts of interest and the time-frame for extensions.

The Delegation of **Israel** commended the document as an essential reflection of the spirit of the *Convention*. It raised the issue of how to coordinate action between existing sites on the World Heritage List and new parts, and how to coordinate responsibilities. It supported the process of nomination of rock art of the deserts of Egypt, Israel and Jordan.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted the evolution and sophistication of the serial nomination process and remained concerned about the fact that no substantial discussion had as yet taken place on how to justify the contributions of each part to the property's overall Outstanding Universal Value. It thanked Germany for organizing a meeting on that topic in November 2008.

The Delegation of **Brazil** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the useful document and expressed the Delegation's reservation concerning Paragraph 12 (b) and the list of suggested serial nominations appearing in the annex.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** recalled the importance of serial national nominations while remaining concerned about their management. It expressed some reservations with the proposed nomination of Moravian heritage.

The Delegation of **Spain** said it was concerned about difficulties in harmonizing nomination files in the case of transnational nominations and expressed the wish that the best practices be published as demonstrative case studies in order to support State Parties in developing that kind of nomination. It also referred to the need for better coordination of management issues, while stressing the need for national management plans.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** underscored the importance of improving cooperation between countries and the need to evaluate human, financial and administrative resources in terms of cost-benefit. More clarifications were needed on how to apply Outstanding Universal Value. It wished to have the analysis and reflect on this before the Committee embarked on any changes to the Operational Guidelines.

La délégation du **Maroc** considère que toutes les questions posées révèlent la qualité du document et que ce dernier reflète toutes les discussions depuis l'existence du Comité. En revanche, la délégation s'interroge sur le besoin de changer les *Orientations*, soulignant que ce processus comporte 3 étapes importantes : la proposition, l'évaluation, et ce qui succède à l'inscription. La délégation suggère que la réflexion sur cette question soit prolongée, notamment en ce qui concerne le processus de négociation pour l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et sa disposition à y contribuer.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked the team that had prepared the document and added its voice to those of Spain, the Republic of Korea and Morocco regarding the possible difficulties. It considered that there might indeed be obstacles, notably in the regions where there were clashes, ethnic difficulties and so on, and stressed the need to avoid entering into political issues concerning sovereignty that were beyond the mandate of the World Heritage Convention.

La délégation de **Madagascar** a noté que ce point reflétait l'évolution de la *Convention*, et qu'il s'agissait d'une chose positive. La délégation souhaite faire quelques remarques, liées à celles exprimées par la Corée, notamment sur le problème de coût, lequel est surestimé. Elle donne l'exemple de la Vallée du Rift, pour laquelle l'approche pourrait avoir une autre allure et insiste sur la nécessité de travailler sur des sites existants, de partir des expériences qui seront très valeureuses, celles des aires protégées transfrontalières. Elle cite l'exemple du Parc W sur 3 pays, pour lequel il y a eu une tentative de proposition d'inscription qui a rencontré toutes sortes de difficultés.

The Delegation of **Peru**, praising the document, informed the Committee that it was preparing, with five other countries, a nomination for the Andean Road / *Qhapaq Ñan* and facing many difficulties in the process. Binational problems could be solved in terms of collective solidarity, and it encouraged States Parties to undertake a transnational process as a way of fostering increased subregional cooperation and integration. It recalled that the Qhapaq Nan was not just a road: all the monuments, archaeological remains, ethnographic elements, villages, etc. were to be taken into account. The Delegation expressed its confidence that progress would be made and was sure that the World Heritage Committee would find innovative, modern and imaginative solutions.

The Delegation of **Canada** wanted to inform Committee members that Canada was not associated with the Moravian heritage network, as mentioned in the Annex of the document.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Observers.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** informed the Committee of the decision of the Federal Government to organize a meeting to discuss methodologies for current serial nominations in order to contribute to developing guidance and putting the draft decision into effect in close collaboration with the Advisory Bodies. It similarly expressed reservations on the proposed Moravian Heritage network.

Due to the number of amendments proposed by Canada to the draft decision, the **Rapporteur** indicated that a paper copy would also be distributed to Committee members:

- Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remained unchanged;
- Proposed by Israel, a new Paragraph would be inserted after current Paragraph 3 regarding the cost and time-consuming preparation of nomination dossiers, not being a guarantee of a successful nomination and inscription of the site by the Committee;
- Proposed deletion of Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, which would be replaced by 1) a request to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to consult States Parties for the amendment of Paragraph 137 of the *Operational Guidelines* through a Circular letter; 2) a request to the World Heritage Centre with the Advisory Bodies to organize an expert meeting to reflect on current and future practice and strategies for serial transnational nominations, detailing the issues which should be addressed by the meeting ; 3) a request to World Heritage Centre, with the Advisory Bodies, to prepare an information document providing the list of all existing and the known potential future serial nominations; and 4) a request to the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to propose amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* for the nomination of serial national and transnational properties;
- Paragraph 5 : Australia proposed to take into account the outcomes of this expert meeting;
- Paragraph 7 : Canada proposed to add a request to the World Heritage Centre to give priority to seeking extrabudgetary funds to support this meeting; while Australia proposed “*Recognizing that an expert meeting is proposed in November 2008, which will reflect on current and future practice strategies for nomination and management of serial transnational World Heritage properties...*” Brazil suggested starting this paragraph with “*Takes note that an expert meeting will take place...*”

The **Chairperson** clarified that there were two separate meetings in the proposed draft decision: one requested by the Committee and another one to be held in Germany.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegations of **Peru** and **Egypt**, considered that the proposed new paragraph regarding the cost and time-consuming preparation of such nomination should be deleted and this issue addressed in Paragraph 4.

Following this debate, the Delegation of **Israel** withdrew its proposal for this new paragraph.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegation of **Morocco**, indicated that, in Paragraph 3, the elements regarding policy guidance such as having a common management plan or promotional strategies for the different components of a serial nomination should be left aside in this decision.

The Delegation of **Canada** clarified that the examination of alternatives could offer some interesting examples, such as the Rift Valley, and which might deserve to be examined by the Committee, but agreed to withdraw this text.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested clarification on the timeline for the meetings mentioned.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested the addition, after “World Heritage Centre”, of “in consultation with the Advisory Bodies” in the Paragraph 7, and requested adding “existing” in the proposed new paragraph regarding the information document providing the list of all potential future serial nominations.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested deleting “give priority” in the paragraph proposed by Australia regarding the seeking of extrabudgetary funds.

Decision **32 COM 10B** was adopted, as amended.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (continued)

ITEM 8A TENTATIVE LISTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES AS OF 15 MAY 2008, IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8A

Decision: **32 COM 8A**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8A* on the establishment of the World Heritage List and of the List of World Heritage in Danger, and drew attention to the new procedures for producing Tentative Lists.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that Part II.c of the document clarified the process for technical analysis. In the past, the Centre had undertaken the task of checking the completeness of the information since the Centre had no mandate to evaluate it. He described the different steps in the process: completeness analysis, checking of consistency, clarifications - if any - from the State Party, and a final statement on whether the information was satisfactory or not.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed an objection to the paragraph to be modified in the *Operational Guidelines*, stating that it was a very important and sensitive issue. It considered that one single person could not be responsible for taking the decision about inconsistency or incompleteness and stressed that it should be for the World Heritage Committee to take such decisions. The Delegation indicated that it had prepared a proposal concerning the amendment to the *Operational Guidelines* that was presented.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** stated that it was not clear what was understood by “inconsistencies with already inscribed properties”. It wished to know which elements of inconsistency was the World Heritage Centre referring to in the document for discussion?

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the idea of organizing a meeting and producing a study on the matter so as to ensure a broader role for the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation was in favour of amending the *Operational Guidelines* accordingly in respect of Paragraphs 64, 66 and 68.

The Delegation of **Spain** welcomed the opportunity to reflect on the Tentative Lists and on their role in the whole process of identification. It underlined the evolution of the Convention

and the role of Tentative Lists. In the Delegation's view, the text posed a number of problems. The role of the Chairperson was exaggerated and there was some uncertainty, notably as to what happened if a country could not submit a nomination because the process was halted. Noting that some delegations were working on an amendment, it suggested postponing the discussion until the next day.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed its support for the comment made by the Delegation of Jordan.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** indique qu'elle pense que lorsqu'un état propose un site, le Centre du patrimoine mondial n'a pas le droit de faire de modifications, et s'interroge sur les modalités à suivre lorsqu'il s'agit de sites contestés. La délégation soutient l'amendement de la Jordanie.

The Delegation of **Cuba** noted that its concern had been raised by others and agreed with the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, considering that it was necessary to define the criteria for defining elements of "inconsistency".

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with the Delegation of the Republic of Korea: it was a complex issue and a better definition of the components of the process was needed so as not to erode the mandate of the States Parties. The Delegation requested information on the costs and workload of the World Heritage Centre for that new duty.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it was necessary to amend the *Operational Guidelines*. It considered that the States Parties should decide on the matter.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the Delegation of the Republic of Korea and requested more time to prepare a comprehensive draft decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed that more time was needed to examine the procedure critically and likewise requested postponement of the discussion of the draft decision.

La délégation du **Maroc** indique que c'est une question qui a été longuement débattue et que les propositions ne sont toujours pas claires. La délégation se rallie donc à la proposition de l'Espagne et propose la création d'un groupe de travail sur cette question.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee of the constitution of a working group on the draft decision composed of the Delegations of Spain, Jordan, Sweden, the Republic of Korea, Israel and Australia.

The **Chairperson** suspended the discussion.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/8B
WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Corr
WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add2
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B1
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B1.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B1.Add2
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B2
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B3.Rev

Decisions: **32 COM 8B.1 to 32 COM 8B.103**

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the order of the discussion on item 8B and recalled that letters from Canada, India, Japan, Ukraine and the United Kingdom were considered letters concerning factual errors, and had been translated and distributed in the room.

The factual error letters were noted.

CHANGES TO NAMES OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The **World Heritage Centre** read out the list of the proposed changes to names of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:

Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco

Decision **32 COM 8B.1** was adopted.

iSimangaliso Wetland Park

Decision **32 COM 8B.2** was adopted.

High Coast / Kvarken Archipelago

Decision **32 COM 8B.3** was adopted.

Swiss Alps Jungfrau-Aletsch

Decision **32 COM 8B.4** was adopted.

NOMINATIONS WITHDRAWN AT THE REQUEST OF STATES PARTIES

The **Chairperson** read out the list of the nominations withdrawn at the request of the States Parties of Bolivia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia and Italy.

She then informed the Committee about the case of Buenos Aires, in Argentina, and recalled that 47 nominations were being presented to the Committee, which meant that, in the light of the withdrawals and the Cairns-Suzhou decision on consideration of nominations within the limit of 45, the two nominations of Majuli (India) and Buenos Aires (Argentina) could be examined at the current session of the Committee.

Referring to the Bureau meeting, she informed the Committee that it was required to take a decision concerning the request from Argentina to postpone examination of that property.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said that the situation raised the question of a vacuum in the procedures. The procedures concerning the “waiting list” needed to be clarified in order for the Committee to be able to take appropriate decisions in the future. The Delegation considered that the request of the Delegation of Argentina was legitimate.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that it was a matter of interpretation by the Committee and that withdrawals opened the way for “standbys” might be unfair to the States Parties concerned. He wished to interpret this as an optional clause.

The Delegation of **Peru** proposed to ask the Delegation of Argentina if it wished the nomination of the Cultural Landscape of Buenos Aires to be submitted for examination by the Committee during the current session.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** inquired whether this process would be automatic.

The **Chairperson** sought the advice of the Legal Adviser.

The **Legal Adviser** explained that the Committee interpreted its guidelines and that the Secretariat could record the interpretation either as ad hoc or as a standard rule.

The **Chairperson** inquired whether the Committee wished that practice to be followed.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that it would set a precedent and that no separate decision should be taken.

The **Legal Adviser** explained that the Committee could decide how it wishes to proceed but that future members might not remember that decision.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** stated that it would be useful to have the procedures written out with clear deadlines, including what happened after the completeness assessment and the preparation of a waiting list of the standby nominations. It recommended that a letter then be sent in advance to the States Parties concerned to inquire whether they wished the property concerned to be discussed if a place became available.

The Delegations of **Australia** and **Brazil** agreed with the Republic of Korea and considered that no precedent should be set.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** inquired about the ramifications of such a decision.

The **Chairperson** likewise raised that question and sought the opinion of the Legal Adviser.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the case under consideration was a special case and was in favour of not setting a precedent and losing time.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the Republic of Korea concerning the need for clear timetables and deadlines as well as information to the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Barbados** agreed that a full understanding of the waiting list and of the expectations of States Parties was required.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked whether the list for 2009 had been established.

The **Secretariat** referred to the list established in document INF 32 COM 8 B3 rev with 35 complete nominations.

The Delegations of **Australia** and the **United States of America** noted that there might be sites referred from 2008.

The Delegations of **Brazil** and the **Republic of Korea** recalled the solution proposed by the latter.

The **Chairperson** noted that that did not solve the current issue.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** proposed to treat the case as exceptional.

The Delegation of **Australia** inquired what would constitute an exceptional case.

The **Legal Adviser** suggested that the rules of the *Operational Guidelines* could be waived.

La délégation de la **Tunisie**, en appuyant la proposition de la République de **Corée**, souligne qu'il faut avoir de la souplesse afin de pouvoir innover.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that there was a legal void.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to suspend the agenda item on Buenos Aires as a procedural option.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked what the range of possibilities would be.

The **Legal Adviser** reviewed the options as (a) referral or deferral of the matter, which would not be advisable as being against the wish of the State Party and (b) interpretation of the *Operational Guidelines* as suggested by Brazil.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, referring to paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines*, asked for the ad hoc decision to be recorded.

The **Chairperson** asked both States Parties whether they wished to have their sites discussed.

The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** informed the Committee that it did not wish to have its nomination discussed.

The Observer Delegation of **India** confirmed its wish for its nomination to be considered.

Examination of nominations of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the World Heritage List

The **Chairperson** recalled the *Operational Guidelines*, drawing attention in particular to the four possibilities of inscription, non-inscription, deferral and referral, and the deadlines for resubmission.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that there had not been enough time to study document 8B.Add which had been issued late, and suggested that the relevant discussion be deferred until the end of the debate.

The Committee so agreed.

The **Chairperson** presented the regional order for consideration of the nominations.

ICOMOS gave a powerpoint presentation, drawing attention to its rigorous scientific approach, highlighting thematic studies and procedures, and pointing out in particular that no information received after 28 February could be considered. It also reported that in 2008, in addition to the nominations, numerous boundary revisions and statements of Outstanding Universal Value had been received.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested sharing the ICOMOS presentation with States Parties during the next General Assembly and noted the problems identified by ICOMOS, requesting ICOMOS to clarify how to deal with those issues.

Cultural properties

AFRICA

Property	Le Morne Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	1259
State Party	Mauritius
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(vi)

ICOMOS made a presentation on the property, highlighting also the potential consideration of natural criterion (vii).

IUCN informed the Committee that it had carried out a desk review of six cultural landscapes and that the process of reviewing them with ICOMOS had been greatly improved as ICOMOS' evaluations have reflected IUCN's inputs. Concerning criterion (vii), it stated that further reflection and consultations with ICOMOS would be required.

The Delegation of **China** endorsed inscription of the site as being of exceptional significance for the history of the slaves and their fight for freedom.

The Delegation of **Cuba** underlined that the Outstanding Universal Value of the site was clearly presented as a testimony to maroonage or resistance to slavery.

The Delegation of **Jordan** said it supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Israel** likewise supported inscription, requesting clarification of paragraph 4(c) of the draft decision on boundaries.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred, pointing out that justice was done to the memory of the people who had suffered and particularly of their descendants: the Creole. The Delegation would like to see the Creole engrained in this particular document.

La délégation du **Maroc** félicite l'Etat Partie pour cette proposition d'inscription. La délégation relève le critère (vi) en référence à la valeur universelle exceptionnelle liée à la lutte des esclaves pour la liberté, un témoignage intangible inhérent à ce lieu.

La délégation de **Madagascar** remercie l'ICOMOS et l'Etat Partie. La délégation souligne que c'est un lieu symbolique chargé d'âme qui représente concrètement la Liberté. La délégation confirme la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle qui est en rapport direct avec la naissance du peuple créole à cet endroit géographique.

The Delegation of **Australia** wondered whether criterion (vi) could be applied for the association of the Creole people.

The Delegation of **Barbados** endorsed inscription, since the Slave Route was of extreme significance for the world, and the connections to the Maroons in Jamaica needed to be made. The true Outstanding Universal Value of the Slave Route was still waiting to be honoured.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed with inscription and emphasized the spiritual values and the landscape qualities of the property. It submitted an amendment to the Rapporteur.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** souligne, en l'appuyant, qu'elle a été touchée par l'intervention de Madagascar. La délégation salue l'initiative de proposer ce site, symbole de la genèse d'un peuple.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Peru** endorsed the inscription, which represented a contribution to the Slave Route project.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** noted that the buffer zone and the property were one unit and the environmental planning and policy guidelines were in place. The people of Mauritius would never let anything happen to a site that was of such importance to them.

ICOMOS noted that the buffer zone was considered and that the visual image of the mountain was powerful. The property needed to be managed as a whole.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to paragraphs 3 (vi) and 4(b).

The Delegation of **Brazil** said it did not consider the amendment concerning the buffer zone to be appropriate.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** withdrew the amendment.

The Delegation of **Kenya** endorsed the withdrawal.

Decision **32 COM 8B.18** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** made the following statement:

First of all, I would like on behalf of the government of Mauritius and Member of the Mauritian Delegation and on my own behalf as Minister of Arts and Culture to thank the ICOMOS for having favourably recommended the nomination Dossier of Le Morne for inscription on the World Heritage List. I would also like to thank the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Mrs. Cameron, and the Committee Members for the excellent work they are undertaking during this 32nd Session of the Committee.

At this stage, I would like to reaffirm UNESCO's engagement in describing Slavery as "Crime against Humanity". Such a description is vividly symbolised in the inscription of the Le Morne Cultural Landscape- Thus immortalising the human suffering, resistance, sacrifices and the price for freedom.

The inscription of Le Morne on the WHL will adjust this imbalance and pays tribute to the determination and resistance of Slaves to oppose oppression of human by human.

The Government of Mauritius is working on the UNESCO's Slave Route Project- I once again thank the entire team of the WHC and am happy to inform that now Mauritius has got two World Heritage Sites: Aapravasi Ghat and Le Morne Cultural Landscape.

Thank You.

ARAB STATES

Property	Al-Hijr Archaeological Site (Madâin Sâlih)
Id. N°	1293
State Party	Saudi Arabia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)

ICOMOS made a presentation on the property.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that the nomination completed a series, with a similar property already inscribed. The site corresponded to all criteria proposed, and the management and conservation plans had been established, and the management unit created. The Delegation disagreed with referral of the nomination and asked if the State Party could explain whether the management plan implementation timetable had already been prepared. The Delegation endorsed the inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it supported inscription: it was one of the unique archaeological sites in the world, one of the few pre-Islamic sites. The State Party had taken all the necessary steps. The Delegation also informed the Committee about the Department of restoration at the University of Riyadh.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that this would be the first site for Saudi Arabia and that the 1971 Law for Antiquities already protected the site and legal protection was enforced and a management unit existed.

The Delegation of **Jordan** thanked ICOMOS for the report but stated that it agreed with inscription and was astonished about the proposed referral, since the plan was being implemented.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it was a major site and noted inconsistencies in ICOMOS reports, in particular concerning the application of standards for management plans for all sites.

The Delegation of **Brazil** congratulated the State Party on its first nomination and agreed with the Delegation of the United States of America on the inconsistencies in the application of the standards.

La délégation du **Maroc** remercie et félicite l'Etat Partie pour avoir présenté cette unique et première demande. La délégation souligne que le site répond à l'ensemble des critères choisis. La délégation fait part de sa stupéfaction concernant la recommandation de l'ICOMOS qui est en désaccord avec l'évaluation du site. La délégation souligne que conformément au paragraphe 132 des *Orientations*, des garanties de la mise en œuvre effective du plan de gestion ou tout autre système de gestion sont attendus de la part de l'Etat Partie. La délégation appuie l'inscription du site.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** se dit émerveillée par ce premier site proposé par l'Etat Partie. La délégation souligne que ce site, mentionné dans le Coran, contribue à l'enrichissement de la pensée arabe et, qu'avec son inscription, il pourrait devenir un site emblématique semblable à l'Acropole d'Athènes en Grèce. La délégation propose d'inscrire ce site cette année car l'Etat Partie a réalisé des travaux colossaux depuis la mission d'évaluation de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Sweden** said that there was unquestionable Outstanding Universal Value and strongly supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the State Party for its work and ICOMOS for the report. It supported inscription.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of Saudi Arabia to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Saudi Arabia** thanked those delegations which had expressed their appreciation and ICOMOS for the report. The Delegation affirmed that the management plan was being implemented, the special management unit, with 20 national specialists, had been established, the management mechanism was operational, and substantial financial resources were available for the management of the buffer zones. The Direction of Antiquities was the owner of 90% of the property.

L'ICOMOS confirme que la Plan de gestion a été reçu le 28 février 2008.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** reiterated its comment about the inconsistency of ICOMOS' different treatment of incomplete management plans, which would also affect forthcoming cases.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to subparagraphs 2(b) and 5(b) submitted by the Delegation of Bahrain and the proposal by the Delegation of Barbados to replace "tourist facilities" by "reception facilities".

At the request of the **Chairperson**, **ICOMOS** read out the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

Decision **32 COM 8B.19** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Saudi Arabia** made the following statement:

Au nom du Dieu le clément et le miséricordieux

Au nom du Gouvernement de mon pays le Royaume d'Arabie Saoudite, au nom de son Altesse Royale le secrétaire général de la commission générale de tourisme et d'archéologie, j'ai le plaisir d'exprimer en cet instant historique de l'inscription du site archéologique de Al-Hijr (Madaïn Salih) sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, mes sincères remerciements ainsi que ma profonde gratitude à Madame la Présidente du Comité du patrimoine mondial, et à Monsieur le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial.

Mes remerciements vont également à tous les membres de l'organisation et du centre ICOMOS, à leurs excellences Messieurs les ambassadeurs et les représentants des pays membres de ce comité international, pour leur commentaires et interventions constructifs afin d'appuyer notre demande d'inscrire le site archéologique de Al-Hijr (Madaïn Salih) sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Il est certain que l'inscription de ce site par le gouvernement saoudien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, et au regard de tous les sites des pays voisins déjà inscrits sur cette liste, témoigne de la valeur historique de la péninsule arabe, berceau de toutes les civilisations, et point de jonction historique du dialogue des civilisations orientales et occidentales pré et post-islamiques : c'est la consécration de la diversité culturelle dont on souhaite la pérennité.

Je voudrais également rappeler les efforts permanents fournis par le personnel de la commission générale saoudienne de tourisme et d'archéologie, sous la supervision de son Altesse Royale le Prince Sultan Ben Salman Ben Abdelaziz : secrétaire général de la commission de tourisme et

d'archéologie et sous la direction et le suivi du Dr Ali Al Gaban et ses collègues dans un seul but de restaurer et réhabiliter ce site afin de le présenter au Comité.

Mes remerciements vont également à mes collègues de la délégation d'Arabie Saoudite auprès de l'UNESCO et aux responsables de la commission nationale saoudienne pour l'éducation, la science et la culture.

Encore une fois merci à vous Messieurs les décideurs, membres de la commission du patrimoine mondial.

Faisons de l'Education, de la Culture, et de la Science un outil commun afin d'élever les citadelles de la paix dans la mémoire des vivants.

Que le salut soit sur vous.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Property	Fujian Tulou
Id. N°	1113
State Party	China
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(v)

ICOMOS made a presentation on the nomination of the property..

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that the nomination related to specific building traditions. Paragraph 4(d) addressed the issue of landscape setting and the Delegation raised the question of the surrounding cultural landscape, and queried whether the property could have been inscribed as such.

La délégation du **Maroc** félicite l'Etat Partie pour la qualité du dossier et souligne que le site répond aux critères proposés. La délégation exprime son émerveillement pour l'architecture en terre de ce site. La délégation souligne la possibilité d'une coopération entre la Chine et le Maroc en matière de conservation de l'architecture en terre. La délégation demande si l'Etat Partie a développé des techniques spécifiques dans ce domaine.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated China for highlighting the links between tangible and intangible value, between the environment and the community and the development of knowledge systems similar to those in Africa.

The Delegation of **Jordan** endorsed the inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the property represented a unique place in a great nation.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite l'Etat Partie et appuie la proposition de la délégation du **Maroc** concernant la coopération dans le domaine de conservation de l'architecture de terre.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** said that there was always much to be learned from the Chinese people.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated the State Party for the excellent nomination and wondered about the context and the comparative analysis. It queried whether the State Party would be nominating other Tulou.

ICOMOS stated that the buildings were in a landscape context but that the site was not a unique landscape.

The **Chairperson** wished to know from the State Party whether more components would be considered.

The Delegation of **China** stated that that might be considered in the future but not for the time being, and that it was willing to share preservation techniques.

Decision **32 COM 8B.20** was adopted.

The Delegation of **China** made the following statement:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

On behalf of the Chinese Delegation, and particularly the local people living in Tulou buildings in Fujian Province, please allow me to extend, at this exciting and joyful moment, our heartfelt thanks to the Committee, the Centre, the Advisory Bodies and all the other friends who have helped us with this nomination. Tulou buildings are unique and extraordinary, lying in the scenic mountains. Tulou inhabitants are openhearted and hospitable, welcoming friends to their beautiful villages. A visit to this cultural landscape will be an unforgettable experience in your lifetime. The inscription of Fujian Tulou on the World Heritage List does mean honour and international recognition of our conservation efforts in the past, but moreover, the further commitment and heavy responsibility to sustain this new World Heritage site. We shall do our best to protect this cultural heritage site in accordance with the Committee's recommendations.

Thank you.

The **Chairperson** said that the discussion would be resumed at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 06.30 p.m.

FIFTH DAY- SUNDAY, 6 July 2008

TENTH MEETING

19.00 p.m. – 8.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Property	Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong
Id. N°	1278
State Party	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decisions: **32 COM 8B21**

ICOMOS présente les caractéristiques du bien. Les critères d'intégrité et d'analyse comparative ne sont pas remplis selon lui. Il recommande de différer l'examen de nomination afin de permettre à l'Etat partie de répondre aux questions posées.

The Chairperson noted the recommendation as deferral and invited the State Party to clarify different issues.

The Delegation of **Korea** took the floor and explained that its intervention would be in two parts. First it drew the attention of the Committee to factual errors found in the maps of the nomination dossier found on page 4 and 5 of the document regarding the demarking of the territorial boundaries of the DPRK and said that it would like this to be reflected in the records.

La délégation de la **République de Corée** prend la parole pour présenter le site qui se situe dans le DPRK, expliquant que son pays et le DPRK ont vécu les même faits historiques pendant 5000 ans, et ce jusqu'à ces 60 dernières années. Elle souligne que les deux pays partagent la même racine culturelle et insiste sur le fait que ce site représente un élément fondamental de l'histoire culturelle de la Corée toute entière. La délégation se dit satisfaite par l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS sur l'authenticité et la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce site. Elle souligne que l'inscription de ce site sur la liste du Patrimoine Mondial rendrait la liste plus crédible car plus riche. La délégation de la **République de Corée** espère qu'une fois que l'Etat partie aura répondu à toutes les recommandations, le Comité prendra une décision favorable.

The Chairperson, noting that there had been no objections to the draft decision, said she took it that the nomination was deferred.

Decision **32 COM 8B.21** was adopted.

Property	Cultural Landscape of Bali Province
Id. N°	1194
State Party	Indonesia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(v)(vi) + CL

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decisions: **32 COM 8B22**

ICOMOS presented the serial nomination of nine monuments and recommended deferral.

The Chairperson asked if there were any objections to deferral.

The Delegation of **Australia** praised the extraordinary cultural landscape nominated, but wondered, in the light of ICOMOS' comparative analysis, if it was unique. The State Party should be asked to provide additional information.

The Delegation of **Kenya** endorsed the comments made by the Delegation of Australia, said that the property was of Outstanding Universal Value and requested the State Party to make a statement on issues raised by ICOMOS. It wished to know about the involvement of communities in the process.

The Delegation of **China** said there had been a lack of communication between the relevant parties. Six field visits had already taken place. The State Party should be asked to report on corrective measures taken.

La délégation de **Madagascar** informe que des biens semblables se trouvent sur son territoire où la question de la gestion de l'eau est importante. Elle considère plus judicieux de considérer ce bien comme « temple » tout court au lieu de « temple de l'eau ». Elle demande à l'ICOMOS s'il est possible de considérer le dossier sous cet angle afin de remplir le critère d'intégrité. Elle ajoute que d'autres critères justifient l'inscription du site sur la Liste.

La délégation du **Maroc** estime que ce bien possède une valeur universelle exceptionnelle et qu'il est possible d'améliorer le Plan de Gestion.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite l'ICOMOS pour le travail accompli. Elle soutient la proposition de la délégation d'Australie. Elle se déclare favorable à l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked the State Party whether in light of ICOMOS' recommendation it would be in a position to reconsider the choice of sites.

The Delegation of **Korea** seconded the question asked by the Delegation of Australia and indicated that it would like to ask the State Party why the whole site had not been included in the nomination dossier.

The **Chairperson** asked if and when the State Party would be interested in renominating the property with different boundaries.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** said that the process of establishing Indonesia's nomination file had taken over seven years and that the proposed property was threatened by activities which would negatively affect it. 1600 hectares of rice terraces were involved and immediate action was needed to save the situation. The Indonesian Government would comply with ICOMOS' request for additional information.

ICOMOS stressed the importance of two types of temples in Bali: royal temples and water temples. Water temples were part of the Subak system and very important. Royal temples were different.

The Chairperson referred to the field visits undertaken.

ICOMOS informed the meeting that the field visits had not been undertaken by ICOMOS, but had been UNESCO staff visits.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if were possible to defer the nomination until the following year.

The **Chairperson** said that referral to the *Operational Guidelines* would be necessary if adding and subtracting parts of the proposed property was to be envisaged. The State Party was willing to follow the recommendations of ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Kenya.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** was of the opinion that deferral was the only option.

The Delegation of **Australia** said it was a very disappointing outcome but would like it to be on record that the State Party is ready to provide bilateral assistance.

Decision **32 COM 8B.2** was adopted.

Property	The Armenian Monastic Ensembles in Iranian Azarbayjan
Id. N°	1262
State Party	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Rev

Decisions: **32 COM 8B23**

ICOMOS présente les caractéristiques du bien.

La délégation du **Maroc** soutient la présentation de l'ICOMOS mais note que la principale menace est d'ordre sismique. Elle demande donc à l'ICOMOS quelles sont les mesures considérées comme nécessaires.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for clarifications from ICOMOS about the possibility of a serial nomination, like others in the area.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite l'Etat partie pour la qualité de son dossier tout en soulignant le caractère symbolique du dialogue interreligieux inhérent au bien.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said it supported the nomination and pointed out that the ICOMOS report mentioned that the nomination demonstrated Byzantine, Orthodox, Syrian, Persian and Muslim symbols.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with the State Parties and with the Delegation of Tunisia. With regard to the question asked by the Delegation of Canada, the nomination could be extended to Armenian Churches in Armenia.

The Delegation of **Kenya** seconded the question of Brazil and congratulated ICOMOS on its good work.

ICOMOS déclare que cet ensemble se situe dans une zone à risque sismique, tout en soulignant qu'il ne s'agit pas d'une critique mais d'un constat. Il ajoute qu'il est possible d'envisager l'inscription comme un bien en série mais l'Etat partie n'a pas soumis le dossier dans cet objectif.

The Rapporteur said that paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft decision remained unchanged, whereas amendments had been proposed to paragraphs 3 and 4(b).

The Chairperson noted that there were no objections to the minor revisions.

Decision **32 COM 8B.23 Rev** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** made the following statement:

"Madame Chair,

On behalf of my Government and all the Iranian people, I would like to thank all Committee members and States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, as well as the experts and institutions related to the World Heritage Centre, such as ICOMOS and ICCROM, and all the institutions concerned during the procedure of the inscription of the Armenian Monastic Ensembles of Iran on the World Heritage List. I would also like to thank the Delegation of the Republic of Azerbaijan for its comprehension and cooperation.

It goes without saying that, considering its age and historical and cultural value, this site represents an important example of world heritage, not only as historical heritage, but also as cultural heritage, as it is the manifestation of inter-cultural and inter-religious dialogue in Iran.

I hope that UNESCO will continue in this direction and in the inscription of sites which represent the States' contribution to cultural diversity."

Property	Hiraizumi - Cultural Landscape Associated with Pure Land Buddhist Cosmology
Id. N°	1277
State Party	Japan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(v)(vi) + CL

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.24**

ICOMOS introduced the property – a serial nomination of nine sites and cultural landscape – and recommended deferral.

The Delegation of **Australia** pointed out that it was an administrative, military and spiritual property. It had two questions to ask the State Party with regard to ICOMOS recommendations: Would the State Party consider renominating certain parts of the proposed nomination, and secondly provide further information in relations to issues raised regarding comparative analysis.

La délégation du **Maroc** se dit perplexe : selon l'ICOMOS tout est à refaire. Elle ajoute qu'elle n'est pas de cet avis. Elle souhaite que l'on demande à l'Etat partie s'il est d'accord pour changer les critères contestés par l'ICOMOS et s'il est prêt à renoncer à la question de la délimitation du bien.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the property had great value, with an appreciable combination of human and natural elements. Assistance was needed in order for the site to be listed.

La délégation de **Madagascar** souhaite que l'on pose la question déjà posée par les délégations de l'Australie et du Maroc.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** s'interroge sur la méthode d'application de critères à des paysages. Tout comme la Délégation du Kenya, elle considère ce bien comme un symbole de dialogue et de paix. Elle finit son intervention en se déclarant moins sévère que l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **China** stressed that the proposed property played an important social and pacific role within the community. Regarding the Pure Land Gardens, a further comparative study was necessary for the clarification of the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation concurred with the Delegations of Australia and Morocco.

The Delegation of **Peru** requested ICOMOS to specify what it meant by further comparative analysis. It considered that the property deserved to be inscribed on the List.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** pointed out that there were discrepancies in the nomination file and that the State Party should be asked why it was nominating the property as a cultural landscape. The **Republic of Korea** is ready to assist in the comparative analysis for the site.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that the weaknesses had been identified by ICOMOS and that had prompted the State Party to make a quick nomination, which did not do justice to the site.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it was in favour of inscription.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Morocco to explain its question regarding the criteria.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande à l'Etat partie si les critères 4 et 5 ne sont pas remplis et s'il est prêt à abandonner ces critères.

The **Chairperson** summed up the debate by posing a number of questions to the State Party: Whether there were parts of the site that the State Party would like to renominate; Why was it being nominated as a cultural landscape and whether the State Party was prepared to undertake a comparative analysis.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** said that all nine components of the nomination developed over 3 generations of the Fujiwara family constituted a whole and that no part could be removed. With regard to a comparative analysis, it had provided substantial documentation. ICOMOS had asked for further information on the Gardens, which could be provided immediately. The landscape, with its nine Buddhist elements, was specially combined - like a body. That being said, the State Party was flexible.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft decision, which, like the Bali case, pointed to the need for revision of the nomination and asked if there were any objections to the proposal.

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated a slight amendment to paragraph 2(a), with the deletion of the second part.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** demande à l'ICOMOS de préciser la notion de paysage culturel.

ICOMOS read out the definition of the concept of cultural landscape in the *Operational Guidelines* and described the site, pointing out that the linkages between the landscape components fell within the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with the Canadian and Australian proposal. It said that the order of paragraphs A and B should be reversed and should look at the Comparative analysis. Referring to the ICOMOS text, it asked what was meant by "etc." in the phrase "China, Korea, etc" and continued that paragraph B could be more general and should include elements of the Cultural Landscape values.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the State Party wanted the nine properties to be treated as one and based on this a suggestion had been put forward that paragraph 2(a) be removed and that paragraph 4 cannot be in place as the boundaries question does not come in paragraph 2(a). It also opined that paragraph 4 should be moved. In addition it recommended that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body assist the State Party to ensure a proper nomination be made in paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its agreement with the proposal made by the Delegations of Australia and Canada to amend the text of the decision for it to be deferred and to eliminate paragraph 2(a) so as to allow the State Party of Japan to represent to the Committee the nomination as a Cultural Landscape.

La délégation du **Pérou** a interrogé l'ICOMOS sur les études comparatives mais, étant donné que la délégation du Japon a répondu, elle se joint aux autre pays pour que la nomination soit référée.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** concurred with the Delegations of Canada and Spain.

In response to a question by the **Chairperson**, the Delegations of **Australia** and **Egypt** indicated that changes were proposed with regard to certain paragraphs of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that the second half of the paragraph 2(a) should be deleted and also proposed that the suggestion made by the Chair regarding revising the boundary should be added and that paragraph 4 should remain.

The Delegation of **Egypt** seconded the Delegation of Australia and said that either paragraph 2(a) should be deleted or paragraph 4 to be amended as proposed by the Delegation **Kenya**.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested further clarifications.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that if the proposal by the Delegation of Australia was adopted then its suggestion would become paragraph 5 and that this paragraph was inbuilt as it referred to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies helping State parties to prepare nomination files.

The Chairperson pointed out that the Advisory Bodies should not assist in nominations.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with the Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Kenya** insisted that the State parties needed assistance from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and said that they should not be judges but should on the other hand assist in preparing the nominations.

The Delegation of **Australia** referred to its close relationship with the State Party of Japan and offered bilateral assistance if need be.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** requested clarifications from ICOMOS in-case the nomination was deferred would there not be a field mission automatically.

ICOMOS confirmed that there would be a mission.

The Chairperson then indicated that Decision **32 COM 8B.24** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 08.35 p.m.

**SIXTH DAY - MONDAY, 7 JULY 2008
ELEVENTH MEETING**

9.00 am – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/8B
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B1

Decisions: **32 COM 8B.25 to 32 COM 8B37.**

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Property	Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca: Melaka and George Town
Id. N°	1223
State Party	Malaysia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.25**

L'ICOMOS présente brièvement le site. Mentionnant certaines lacunes dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription comme l'établissement d'un plan de gestion, il recommande que la proposition d'inscription soit référée.

The Delegation of **Brazil** thanked ICOMOS for its thorough presentation, congratulated Malaysia for its nomination and expressed the view that the information provided demonstrated that the site met the necessary criteria of Outstanding Universal Value; the Delegation recommended its inscription.

The Delegation of **Australia**, congratulating the Delegation of Malaysia, raised the question of the possible revision of the property boundaries and asked whether, in its comparative analysis, ICOMOS had considered a comparison with other colonial towns, for example in Australia.

The Delegation of **Spain** said it considered that the site should be inscribed on the World Heritage List, given that the problems mentioned in the ICOMOS evaluation were only minor ones. It assumed that the State Party would be able to meet ICOMOS' recommendations within a short time. The Delegation also requested that the floor be given to the State Party.

Congratulating Malaysia for bringing forward a good property and ICOMOS for its excellent evaluation, and drawing attention to the strategic importance of the property, the Delegation of **China** referred to the property as a symbol of where "East meets West", and stated that the tangible and the intangible aspects of the property had been kept intact and that its Outstanding Universal Value was clear. It wished to know, however, if the management

body to coordinate the two cities had been set up and if the State Party had agreed to revise the name.

The **Chairperson** invited the delegation of the State Party to respond to those questions.

The Observer Delegation of **Malaysia** explained that a management committee had been set up and the boundaries of the property extended. The name had also been changed to provide a more accurate reflection of the property nominated.

Congratulating the Delegation of Malaysia and ICOMOS for the work well done, the Delegation of **Kenya** said it had noted that the ICOMOS requirements concerning the property could be met in the process of managing the property, and it therefore called for the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it was satisfied with the response given by the State Party and supported inscription of the property.

La délégation de **Madagascar** se prononce en faveur de l'inscription.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee needed to see a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

ICOMOS responded that a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had already been drafted.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that for technical reasons the Committee should have a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value before it when examining a site, that there might be other points of comparison, and that hasty decisions should be avoided. It expressed support for the nomination.

La délégation du **Maroc** pense que le terme "colonial" utilisé à plusieurs reprises dans l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS n'est pas approprié, et suggère qu'il soit remplacé par un terme moins politique.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed changes to the text of the draft decision.

Se prononçant en faveur de l'inscription du site, la délégation de la **Tunisie** souhaite que le terme de « culture unique » utilisé dans l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS, et qui lui semble inapproprié, soit remplacé par « culture splendide ».

The Delegation of **Brazil** sought confirmation of the decision taken concerning the name change.

Congratulating the Delegation of Malaysia and ICOMOS, the Delegation of **Egypt** observed that the minor issues concerning traffic and the monitoring and conservation of the site should not hinder the nomination; Egypt supported the inscription of the property.

Decision **32 COM 8B.25** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of **Malaysia** made the following statement:

Thank you Madam Chair,

We are delighted and greatly relieved. On behalf on the Government of Malaysia and our Minister of Unity, Culture, Arts and Heritage, our very warm thanks to the World Heritage Committee which spoke in support of our inscription, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. Madam Chair, we

appreciate your hard work and stewardship. Our thanks also go to the Government of Canada and the City of Quebec for welcoming us at a special time in its history.

This is a significant decision for Malaysia because it is our first cultural property to be listed. Melaka and George Town are historic cosmopolitan ports in the Straits of Malacca which for more than 500 years saw the influence of civilizations to the East and West of the Straits.

Inscription is just the beginning and we are committed to protecting this property and to implementing the conservation plans as recommended by the Committee - so serious are we about this inscription that the Chief Minister of Melaka is here and he is committed to conserving Melaka, especially after seeing the beautiful heritage city of Quebec.

It is now night time in Malaysia. Malaysians will awake to the news that they have long been waiting for. A warm thank you to all who have made this possible.

Property	Kuk Early Agricultural Site
Id. N°	887
State Party	Papua New Guinea
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(v) + CL

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.26**

ICOMOS present the Kuk Early Agriculture Site (Papua New Guinea) and proposed that the site be considered for inscription under criteria (iii) and (iv); it also considered criterion (v) to be appropriate.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it was a significant site that would enhance nominations in the Pacific region. The Delegation informed the Committee that the Delegation of Papua New Guinea was unfortunately unable to attend the Committee's 32nd session, but reported that Papua New Guinea was in the process of developing a management plan for the property.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the Delegation of Australia about the significance of the site and thanked ICOMOS for its positive and constructive recommendations.

Se référant à la phrase « protection coutumière doit y être confirmée » utilisée dans l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS (p142, en français) la Délégation de **Madagascar** demande à ce que le terme protection coutumière soit clarifié par l'ICOMOS.

La délégation du **Maroc** soutient cette candidature car elle contribuerait, entre autres, à renforcer la représentativité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. En effet, il s'agit de la catégorie « paysages culturels » et ce serait le premier bien inscrit de la Papouasie-Nouvelle-Guinée.

ICOMOS further informed the Committee that the site was protected as a natural and cultural property under the Organic Law and would also be protected under the national protection regulations.

Decision **32 COM 8B.26** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

Property	Chief Roi Mata's Domain
Id. N°	1280
State Party	Vanuatu
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(vi) + CL

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.27**

In its presentation of the site, **ICOMOS** proposed that the site be inscribed under criteria (iii), (v) and (vi). It went on to inform the Committee that it considered that the commercial leases were a threat to the property and to its management, and that there was a need for legal protection and for revocation of existing agricultural leases. **ICOMOS** asked the Committee to defer the inscription of the site, because of boundaries issues and a management plan that needs to be reviewed.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated ICOMOS on its evaluation. The nomination was a welcome development and the Australian Government had been assisting in the development of the property. The Delegation asked whether all the areas concerned were included in the nomination.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, congratulating Vanuatu and commending the ICOMOS evaluation, requested Vanuatu to put the management plan and other measures into effect.

Congratulating the State Party, the Delegation of **China** observed that Vanuatu did not as yet have a site on the World Heritage List and proposed that a paragraph be added to the draft decision referring to what the State Party had been able to accomplish.

La délégation de **Madagascar** estime que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site est démontrée. Ayant suivi de près la préparation du dossier d'inscription, elle souligne que l'Etat partie a déjà été réceptif aux recommandations de l'ICOMOS en prenant en compte un grand nombre des mesures demandées. Elle invite l'Etat partie à informer le Comité sur la situation de la concession de l'île d'Artok.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it was moved by the nomination and the spirit of the island. Outstanding Universal Value had been determined in other such properties before; in the case under consideration, a matter of particular concern to the Committee was how the serial property would be managed.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that the small islands should be included in the nomination and needed legal protection. It wished to know if the new zoning plan had been completed, if the lease of Artok Island had been revoked; and if the revocation had been gazetted.

Thanking Australia for assisting Vanuatu in the nomination process, the Delegation of **Kenya** said it had no objection to the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** asked if the State Party could explain how it intended to resolve the three points raised earlier by the Delegation of Bahrain.

In response, the Observer Delegation of **Vanuatu** said that the management issues had been addressed and that a copy of the relevant materials was available. All of the property and its buffer zones were protected under a Vanuatu law passed on 14 June 2008. The marine areas that connected the three islands were also protected under a law passed on 3

March 2008. Vanuatu was committed to the protection of the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS if there were points of wider application concerning the property and whether the challenges involved were surmountable.

ICOMOS said that it saw the nomination in a wider context and viewed the serial nomination challenges as surmountable.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that it fully empathized with the spirit of the site and wished to know more about the justification of its Outstanding Universal Value, the tourism development on Artok Island and the time required to develop such a site.

ICOMOS confirmed that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property had been evaluated.

The **Chairperson** requested the State Party to comment on the question of tourism development.

In response, the Observer Delegation of **Vanuatu** said that the lease given for tourism development on Artok Island had been revoked on 3 March 2008.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider whether the site should or should not be inscribed on the basis of all the presentations.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that, following the discussions on the property, it proposed that the property be referred and not deferred.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that Vanuatu had put considerable efforts into preparing the site for nomination, and felt that the site should be inscribed, even if under some conditions.

La délégation de **Madagascar** s'associe aux remarques de la délégation du Kenya et félicite l'Etat partie pour tous les efforts déjà entrepris, ainsi que l'Australie pour son soutien à la préparation de cette proposition d'inscription. Elle souligne que l'Etat partie a réagi extrêmement rapidement aux remarques de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, endorsing the comments made by Kenya and Australia, said that the goal was to achieve a balance in the sites inscribed on the List. The question remained whether the site's Outstanding Universal Value was to be determined by the State Party or the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation asked if the State Party had agreed that the nomination could be referred back for further improvement.

The Delegations of **Mauritius** and **Bahrain** expressed support for the comments made by the Delegation of Kenya, and were in favour of inscription.

While recognizing that Vanuatu had put efforts into the nomination, the Delegation of the **United States of America** said that there were areas of Outstanding Universal Value not yet put in place and it consequently supported referral.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it supported the position of United States of America and Egypt.

The **Chairperson** outlined the implications of the referral process, with the nomination being re-submitted for consideration the following year, and invited the Observer Delegation of Vanuatu to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Vanuatu** said that it preferred the property to be inscribed, and proposed that, if ICOMOS so agreed, it might work together with the State Party for the necessary improvements.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said it changed its earlier appraisal to support for the site's inscription.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** se prononce en faveur de l'inscription du site.

La délégation du **Maroc** s'associe à la délégation de la **Tunisie**. Elle estime que la délimitation du site incombe à l'Etat partie, et voudrait avoir des clarifications sur les lignes directrices en vigueur pour les sites de superficie modeste.

The Delegation of **Sweden**, congratulating the Delegation of Vanuatu for the nomination, said, however, that in the light of ICOMOS' evaluation, Sweden recommended referral for the property.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** said it welcomed the efforts made by the Delegation of Vanuatu and therefore supported inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that it endorsed the nomination of the property.

The **Chairperson** stressed the importance of working on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Australia**, welcoming the endorsements of the nomination, said that it would work on an amended text of the draft decision.

The **Chairperson** suggested suspending the discussion pending the drafting of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

Property	Kalka Shimla Railway (extension to Mountain Railways of India)
Id. N°	944 Ter
State Party	India
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.28**

L'**ICOMOS** présente brièvement le site, recommandant l'extension du bien.

La délégation du **Maroc** approuve l'extension et félicite l'Etat partie. Elle lui demande cependant de fournir au Comité des clarifications sur les recommandations de l'ICOMOS, notamment concernant le plan de gestion, l'empiètement foncier, la coopération locale et la sensibilisation aux valeurs patrimoniales.

The Delegation of **Israel** said from its own experience in railways that the proposed extension, which it supported, would be a significant addition to the Mountain Railways of India property.

Decision **32 COM 8B.28** was adopted, and the property was extended.

The Observer Delegation of **India** made the following statement:

On behalf of the people and the Government of India, I wish to thank the Members of the World Heritage Committee, its Chairperson, the Secretariat, and the Advisory Bodies for inscribing the Kalka Shimla railway as a World Heritage Site as an extension in continuation of earlier nominations of the unique mountain railways of India. It is unique not only because of the amazing century old technology that created the railway, but also the technology that today keeps it active and running. What was a part of British Indian past has been embraced by modern India and made its own. The inscription of this priceless heritage will spur us to continue our efforts to preserve the treasure trove of natural and cultural heritage sites of Outstanding Universal Value that exist in our land.

The people of India, especially those in the mountainous region through which this railway passes, and those who run the railway, have been waiting for this inscription in recognition of its outstanding value. I would like to assure the Committee that India is firmly committed to preserving its heritage and regards this inscription as one more example of the encouragement it receives from this Committee in that effort. Thank you once again.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Delegation of India for the extension of the property to include the Kalka Shimla Railway site.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Property	The Stari Grad Plain
Id. N°	1240
State Party	Croatia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(v) + CL

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.29**

L'**ICOMOS** présente brièvement le site. Relevant certaines lacunes du dossier comme l'absence d'un plan de gestion et des problèmes de délimitation du bien, il propose que le site soit référé pour permettre à l'Etat partie de répondre aux demandes soulevées dans l'évaluation.

The Delegation of **Spain** noted that the Committee has already been confronted with such a situation during the current session, i.e. ICOMOS recognized the property's Outstanding Universal Value and the accuracy of the criteria suggested, while highlighting some minor problems such as lack of a management plan and delimitation of the boundaries. If the State Party could assure the Committee that it would meet ICOMOS' requests, the Delegation would support the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** said that the site represented a great culture and expressed appreciation of the work accomplished by the State Party. It asked if Croatia had been able to prepare a conservation plan following the recommendations by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Sweden** stated that both ICOMOS and the authorities of Croatia had done excellent work and supported the inscription of the site.

La délégation du **Maroc** s'associe aux Membres du Comité en faveur de l'inscription, soulignant qu'il s'agit d'un site important du point de vue culturel et archéologique. Les problèmes présentés par l'ICOMOS sont d'ordre mineur, et ne devrait pas empêcher l'inscription.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Croatia.

The Observer Delegation of **Croatia** expressed gratitude for the efficient work done by ICOMOS and said that the State Party had fulfilled all ICOMOS' recommendations. The boundaries had been reduced as proposed and had been approved by the Ministries of Culture, Environment and others, and a new agency had been established as well as a museum.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** se prononce en faveur de l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it would feel guilty if the property was not inscribed, and that the authorities and the local people supported the nomination. Kenya believed that the Stari Grad Plain was a remarkable site, and insisted on its inscription on the List.

The Delegation of **Jordan** said it considered that the site met all conditions of Outstanding Universal Value and supported inscription.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections by the members of the Committee to the inscription of the property and asked ICOMOS if there was agreement on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

L'**ICOMOS** lit la déclaration de valeur universelle du bien.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft decision as amended and noted that the property was being proposed for inscription under criteria (ii), (iii) and (v), with the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as read out by ICOMOS; further guidance was, however, needed from the Advisory Body.

L'**ICOMOS** demande à avoir le temps de vérifier les termes des amendements lus par le Rapporteur, dans un processus d'évaluation conformément à la Convention et son application.

Decision **32 COM 8B.29** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of **Croatia** made the following statement:

Madame Chair, distinguished members of the Committee,

On behalf of the Croatian Government, the Croatian Ministry of Culture and the local community of Stari Grad on the island of Hvar, we are expressing our gratitude to the Chairperson, to the members of the Committee, to UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to all those who recognized the absolute value of the Stari Grad plain as a unique cultural landscape which has remained intact in continuous agricultural use during the last 2400 years, as it was when Greek colonizers from the island of Paros established polis and chora there.

We want to congratulate the host country of Canada and the city of Quebec, too, for the warm welcome and most efficient organization of the Meeting. We congratulate all State Parties on their efforts regarding proper protection and conservation of their cultural and natural properties. The Republic of Croatia will continue to follow the principles of the 1972 Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, and all other legal instruments provided and supervised by UNESCO.

Property	Spa of Luhačovice – area with a collection of historic spa buildings and spa-related facilities
Id. N°	1271
State Party	Czech Republic
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.30**

L'**ICOMOS** présente brièvement le site. Déclarant que la valeur universelle du site proposé pour inscription n'est pas démontrée, et qu'une analyse comparative sur les stations thermales reste à faire, il recommande que l'inscription du site soit déferée.

While appreciating the nomination as a category not yet represented on the World Heritage List, the Delegation of **Spain** invited ICOMOS and the State Party to clarify issues concerning the property's Outstanding Universal Value and the criteria under which it might be inscribed. It wondered if the completion of the comparative study would justify the inscription. If not, it was in favour of deferral.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it thought that the site deserved referral rather than deferral.

Agreeing with Egypt on deferral, the Delegation of **Canada** also wished to know who would carry out the studies proposed.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed referral in view of the evidence of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it supported deferral and requested clarification from ICOMOS on the proposed thematic study.

La délégation du **Maroc** fait part de son intérêt pour ce site, soulignant que le Maroc dispose aussi de stations thermales qui seront peut-être un jour proposées pour inscription. Elle pense que des doutes subsistent quant à la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site, et que l'étude comparative doit être effectuée. Il serait préférable de déferer l'inscription pour permettre à l'Etat partie de retravailler le dossier.

L'**ICOMOS** pense que toutes ces questions sont étroitement liées. Il confirme que c'est bien la valeur universelle exceptionnelle qui fait problème, et qu'une analyse globale sur le thermalisme est absolument nécessaire. Quant à savoir qui doit la mener, la question reste ouverte.

The **Chairperson** requested information on the time-line for the comparative study.

In response, the Observer Delegation of the **Czech Republic** said that it could be provided by February 2010, and that the State Party would assume that task. It took due note of the statement made by the Delegation of Morocco.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that it would agree to a referral of the nomination if the comparative studies could be carried out within a short period of time.

The Delegation of **Peru** seconded Spain and recommended referral of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested further clarification of the terminology, specifically the distinction between “referral” and “deferral”.

Referring to the relevant paragraphs of the *Operational Guidelines*, the **Chairperson** read out and clarified the definitions of “referral” and “deferral”;

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that, in the light of those clarifications, it favoured deferral for the property, and further referred to the Global Strategy.

The **Chairperson** said that, as a rule, nominated properties whose Outstanding Universal Value had not been demonstrated warranted deferral.

The **Rapporteur** said that the studies mentioned by the United States of America would be referred to in paragraph 2 of the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 8B.30** was adopted as amended, and the nomination was deferred.

Property	The Work of Vauban
Id. N°	1283
State Party	France
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.31**

Suite à la présentation du dossier par l'**ICOMOS** se prononçant en faveur de l'inscription du site, la délégation du **Maroc** félicite l'Etat partie pour l'excellente qualité du dossier de proposition d'inscription et l'ICOMOS pour la présentation du bien proposé pour inscription et son évaluation. Elle rappelle qu'Essaouira, ancienne Mogador, a été conçue par un architecte français profondément influencé par le travail de Vauban à Saint-Malo. Elle demande à l'ICOMOS si le critère (vi) ne serait pas aussi concevable et demande à la France si elle envisage de travailler à des propositions transfrontalières.

The Delegations of **Israel** and **Kenya** congratulated the State Party for the excellent work accomplished, but shared the same concern about the proposed name of the property. Was the Committee being asked to inscribe an architect or his buildings? Moreover, could ICOMOS clarify whether the conditions of protection and management were just satisfactory or actually good?

La délégation de **Madagascar**, tout en soulignant l'excellente qualité du dossier et l'importance de l'influence de Vauban sur l'architecture militaire entre les XVII et XVIII siècles, demande à l'ICOMOS de clarifier quel est le site parmi les 14 proposés qui n'a pas été retenu et demande à la France comment elle envisage d'étendre le bien pour y inclure un site à l'étranger tel que suggéré dans l'évaluation et dans le projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that the focus of the nomination was the person of Vauban. Was the nomination meant to recognize an individual or a series of buildings? If it was the individual, perhaps criterion (vi) would be appropriate. That, however, would raise a number of problems since there were many individuals throughout the various regions of the world and over time who were responsible for exceptional cultural achievements. Would the State Party consider an extension to the property? And could it provide information regarding the media reports concerning the alleged sale of one of the nominated properties?

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it strongly supported the nomination.

The Delegation of **China** suggested that the property be extended in the future as a transboundary site.

L'**ICOMOS**, répondant à la question posée par la délégation de Madagascar, précise que c'est le site de la citadelle du Palais qui n'a pas été retenu par manque d'authenticité, tout en rappelant que l'authenticité et l'intégrité doivent être évaluées par rapport à l'ensemble de la série et non pas par rapport à un seul des objets qui la composent. Elle précise que le site du château de Bazoches soulève des problèmes d'authenticité car si l'aile ouest a été construite par Vauban pour y vivre, il est aussi vrai que d'importants travaux de restauration et de transformation ont eu lieu après 1830. Quant au critère (vi), l'influence de l'œuvre de Vauban dépasse les principes de l'architecture et l'ingénierie militaires et il a été considéré suffisamment justifié pour le retenir. Elle clarifie, en outre, que la suggestion formulée à l'égard de l'Etat partie pour qu'il étende le bien se réfère à la citadelle de Lille ainsi qu'à une proposition en série en dehors de la France. Elle confirme enfin que l'objet de la série qui n'a pas été retenu est bien la citadelle du Palais.

La **Présidente du Comité du patrimoine mondial** demande à l'Etat partie de répondre aux questions précises qui lui ont été posées, quant à l'éventualité d'un changement de nom pour l'ensemble des fortifications ; à la mise en vente d'un des objets qui composent la série et à une extension du bien à l'étranger.

La délégation de la **France** (observateur) réaffirme son consentement face au changement du nom, tout en rappelant le contexte qui a inspiré la préparation du dossier d'inscription, qui veut consacrer non seulement l'œuvre d'un homme mais le précurseur des lumières incarné par Vauban. Quant à la vente d'un des objets, les villes de Besançon et Arras ont décidé de procéder aux acquisitions. En ce qui concerne l'extension suggérée par l'ICOMOS, il était difficile pour la France de préparer un dossier transfrontalier qui reflète 3 siècles d'histoire mais elle précise que le dossier se veut le chef de file d'un réseau de biens plus large.

The **Chairperson** asked members of the Committee whether they had any amendments to propose to the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that there were many other sites outside France which had been influenced by the work of Vauban. It considered that the relevance of criterion (vi) had not been demonstrated and suggested removing the Palace from the property to be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its concerns about the explanations provided by the State Party with regard to the scope of the nomination. If the nomination was about a person and his legacy, then the Committee was moving into uncharted territory where it had agreed not to go.

The **Chairperson** noted that the amendment proposed by Israel addressed that concern.

The **Rapporteur** read out the two amendments proposed by the Delegation of Israel concerning the name change and the exclusion of the Palace from the nominated property, as well as other amendments suggesting a possible extension of the site as a transnational property.

Decision **32 COM 8B.31** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

La délégation de la **France** (observateur) a fait la déclaration suivante :

Mme la Présidente

C'est au nom de la France que je vous remercie.

Au nom de la France toute entière car les 12 sites sont répartis dans toutes ses régions et sur tout le pourtour de l'hexagone.

Votre décision était attendue du nord au sud, de l'est à l'ouest, le long de nos frontières et de nos rivages.

Elle a mobilisé beaucoup d'énergies et d'enthousiasmes qui sont ainsi récompensés.

L'inscription intervient à un heureux moment : les célébrations du troisième centenaire de la mort de Vauban viennent de s'achever et c'est un couronnement exceptionnel.

Un acteur essentiel de cette candidature, M Jean Louis Fousseret, le maire de Besançon, président du réseau Vauban va vous dire encore mieux que moi les espoirs confortés et la responsabilité ressentie par tous ceux qui vont continuer à animer le réseau.

Je lui passe la parole.

Madame la Présidente,

Mesdames et Messieurs les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial,

Mesdames et Messieurs les ambassadeurs des Etats parties,

Mesdames et Messieurs les membres d'ICOMOS,

C'est un grand honneur pour le maire de Besançon et celui de Briançon, président du réseau des sites majeurs de Vauban, de vous exprimer avec une immense émotion ses sincères remerciements au nom des 14 villes de notre réseau (dont les plus petites sont des villages de moins de 100 habitants).

Je voudrais vous exprimer tous mes remerciements.

Nous mesurons l'extrême honneur que nous fait votre comité mais aussi les très grandes responsabilités et les devoirs qui désormais sont les nôtres.

Tout d'abord pour appliquer vos recommandations en proposant dans les années à venir les extensions souhaitées

Responsabilités aussi de veiller au maintien et au développement rigoureux et exigeant des plans de gestion et de protection de nos sites.

Volonté enfin de mettre en place à Besançon, ville natale de Victor Hugo, un centre international de ressources et d'échanges sur les bonnes pratiques et les techniques de conservation et de restauration du patrimoine fortifié, ouvert à tous les continents.

En vous remerciant encore avec émotion et biensûr le Canada et la ville de Québec, je prends l'engagement de considérer cette inscription non pas comme une fin en soi mais comme le début d'une grande et fructueuse coopération entre nos peuples.

Property	Housing Estates in the Berlin Modern Style
Id. N°	1239
State Party	Germany
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.32**

ICOMOS presented the nomination and recommended inscribing the property under criteria (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested clarification of the scope of the comparative analysis carried out. It further noted that heritage from the modern movement existed in various parts of the world.

The Delegation of **Barbados** agreed with the previous speaker on the need to broaden the comparative analysis for properties of that type.

The Delegation of **Jordan** congratulated ICOMOS and the State Party, noting the importance of the property and its very good state of conservation.

ICOMOS clarified that, at its request, the State Party had provided complementary information on the comparative analysis which appeared to be fully satisfactory.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party whether it would accept the change of name for the property which had been proposed.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** agreed to the name change.

The **Rapporteur** said that there were no amendments proposed to the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 8B.32** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

*The Observer Delegation of **Germany** expressed its appreciation to the Committee for recognizing the value of the property and assured it of its continued efforts with a view to maintaining the heritage values of the property. It also declared that no walls or bridges would be ever constructed through or above the site; however, the State Party would be happy to build a symbolic bridge to connect it with other properties representing the same cultural phenomenon in other parts of the world.*

Property	Triple-arch Gate at Dan
Id. N°	1105
State Party	Israel
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.34**

ICOMOS gave a presentation of the proposed nomination.

The Delegation of **Jordan** raised three issues concerning the nomination: its location, legal status and ownership. Noting that the name of the property did not correspond to its original name, used by the communities who had lived there, it stated that the buffer zone of the nominated area extended into occupied territory while ownership of the land belonged to the former villagers who were now refugees. The Delegation also noted that the State Party of Israel was conducting archaeological excavations in occupied Syrian territory, which was against international law. By virtue of Article 11.3 of the *World Heritage Convention*, stipulating that States Parties could only nominate properties "situated in their territory", the Delegation opposed the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

Following a request by the **Chairperson** for legal advice, the **Legal Adviser** explained that it was the responsibility of the Committee member that raised objections concerning a nomination to provide to the Committee the documentation substantiating its stated assertions so that the Committee could examine and consider it.

The Delegation of **Israel** stated that it had made a commitment not to nominate any property located beyond the so-called "green line". In preparing the nomination under consideration, the relevant documentation related to the various agreements had been carefully checked and the State Party was confident that the proposed property and its buffer zone were entirely within Israeli territory. The State Party, on the other hand, had not received any written notice concerning a possible problem with the nomination and considered that raising this issue at the present stage was a sign of bad faith. As to the name of the property, it was the name most commonly attributed to the area by the various communities who lived there. Finally, the State Party recalled the second part of Article 11.3, which the Delegation of Jordan had not cited, stipulating that "the inclusion of a property situated in a territory, sovereignty or jurisdiction over which is claimed by more than one State shall in no way prejudice the rights of the parties to the dispute".

In response to a question, the **Legal Adviser** confirmed that the second sentence of Article 11.3 of the *Convention* made it possible for the Committee to decide in favour of inscription even in cases where a territory, sovereignty or jurisdiction was claimed by more than one State, it being understood that the inscription "shall in no way prejudice the rights of the parties to the dispute".

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked the Chairperson whether there was any point in discussing the merit of the nomination, given the nature of the issue raised by the Delegation of Jordan.

The **Chairperson** asked the advice of Committee members on that point.

The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Bahrain** supported the views expressed by the Delegation of Jordan, pointing out that changing the names of locations was against international law.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the inscription of the property considering that no written information had been provided to the Committee regarding the issue raised by the Delegation of Jordan.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** déclare que lorsqu'il y a une contestation sur une zone du territoire, il vaudrait mieux s'abstenir de prendre une décision, et suggère que le Comité se donne le temps de bien vérifier et qu'il prenne toutes les précautions nécessaires.

La délégation du **Maroc** concourt avec les propos exprimés par la délégation de la Tunisie.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the suggested establishment of a working group, noting that it was important to avoid debating political issues within the Committee.

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegations of Jordan, Israel, the United States of America, Brazil and Morocco to be part of the working group concerning the property of the Triple-arch Gate at Dan (Israel). She designated the Delegation of Brazil as Chair of the working group and asked that the Legal Adviser also take part in the group.

Property	Mantua and Sabbioneta
Id. N°	1287
State Party	Italy
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.35**

ICOMOS presented the proposed nomination for which it proposed the site to be inscribed. In reply to a question from the Delegation of **Canada**, it clarified that at the time of finalizing its evaluation the 2006 Management Plan had yet to be implemented.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it did not object to the inscription of the property, but would have appreciated more clarity on the justification of its Outstanding Universal Value, with respect to the phrasing used in the text of the draft decision.

L'**ICOMOS** précise que le critère (iii) a été retenu car Mantoue et Sabbioneta sont les témoignages exceptionnels de l'urbanisme, de l'architecture et des beaux-arts de la Renaissance. En particulier, c'est la grande influence de l'humanisme à Mantoue et auprès de la cour des Gonzague sur l'histoire de l'art du monde entier qui a été reconnue et justifie l'utilisation du critère (iii). En réponse à la question posée par la délégation de l'Australie l'ICOMOS rappelle en outre qu'il avait invité l'Etat partie à élargir l'analyse comparative à d'autres cas en dehors de l'Italie mais que les intégrations fournies par la suite ont été considérées satisfaisantes.

The Delegation of **Kenya** acknowledged that the recommendation prepared by ICOMOS appeared to lack substance, but considered that the property deserved inscription and suggested proceeding along those lines.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed to move forward with the inscription but wished it to be placed on record that it considered the clarifications provided by ICOMOS unsatisfactory.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it supported the inscription of the property.

Decision **32 COM 8B.35** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

La délégation de l'Italie (observateur) remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial aussi au nom des maires de Mantoue et Sabbioneta présents dans la salle. Elle exprime la satisfaction de l'Italie toute entière ainsi que de la société civile, et remercie le Comité. Elle rappelle que l'Italie est dépositaire de l'incalculable patrimoine de l'architecture et des arts de la Renaissance et qu'elle désire le partager en mettant à disposition les meilleures pratiques de gestion. Elle conclut en remerciant les autorités canadiennes pour l'organisation du Comité et pour la chaleureuse hospitalité et félicite la ville de Québec pour son 400e anniversaire de fondation.

Property	San Marino Historic Centre and Mount Titano
Id. N°	1245
State Party	San Marino
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.36**

ICOMOS presented the nomination concerning the property and recommended referring it back to the State Party to enable it to complete and implement the management plan, in order to address concerns related to new developments associated with tourist and commercial activities.

The Delegation of **Australia**, supporting the recommendation made by ICOMOS, asked the State Party what measures it intended taking to address those concerns.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted that it was the first nomination submitted by the State Party and supported inscription. The State Party had made a remarkable effort to put together the nomination and could perhaps provide updated information concerning the status of the management plan and monitoring system.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party to comment on the management issues raised.

La délégation de **Saint-Marin** (observateur) confirme que le plan de gestion est tout à fait opérationnel, comme il est d'ailleurs rappelé dans l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS. Elle précise que l'informatisation de l'ensemble du bien proposé a été achevée, permettant ainsi un contrôle de tous les bâtiments ainsi que des espaces verts, dans la limite des 42 hectares de bien appartenant au territoire de Saint-Marin et dans le respect des lois.

La délégation du **Madagascar**, à la lumière des engagements fournis par l'Etat partie, se prononce en faveur de l'inscription du bien.

La délégation du **Maroc** se dit satisfaite par la réponse de l'Etat partie en ce qui concerne l'Etat partie. Elle affirme en outre que le dossier remplit toutes les conditions et cite le paragraphe 132 des *Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention*, qui demande l'existence d'un plan de gestion approprié mais qui ne requiert pas sa mise en œuvre. Elle conclut en se prononçant en faveur de l'inscription du bien à la lumière des garanties fournies par l'Etat partie quant à la mise en œuvre du plan de gestion.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, taking into account the additional information provided by the State Party, supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** was in favour of referral, considering also that the comparative analysis seemed limited to European sites. That raised doubts as to the Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property.

The Delegation of **China**, supporting inscription, asked the State Party to provide information concerning measures to control pressure from visitors.

The Delegation of **Peru** said that, after having heard the State Party, it supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested a clarification on the status of the management plan. The report stated that its implementation was foreseen between 2008 and 2010. Now, however, it appeared that the plan was already being implemented.

La délégation de **Saint-Marin** (observateur) précise que pour faire face à la pression touristique une loi très détaillée, datée de 1995 et figurant dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription, dispose de tous les moyens juridiques pour protéger le bien et soumet la gestion du site à l'autorité de quatre ministères différents.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that it would be happy to support the inscription of the property, but shared the concerns expressed by the Delegation of the United States of America about the breadth of the comparative analysis. There seemed to be a need for guidance on how to develop comparative analyses.

ICOMOS, noting that it would be difficult to establish a methodology for carrying out comparative analyses, clarified that the focus of the nomination was on the idea of democracy as reflected in small city states. That particular phenomenon had taken place especially in the European context, which was why the comparative analysis had concentrated on European sites.

The Delegation of **Australia** said it did not accept that it would be difficult to establish a methodology for carrying out comparative analyses. On the contrary, such a methodology was urgently needed. It expressed concern about the way this process was being applied.

La **Présidente** demande à l'Etat partie de fournir une réponse précise aux questions qui lui ont été posées concernant l'approbation, la finalisation et la mise en œuvre du plan de gestion.

La délégation de **Saint-Marin** (observateur) confirme que le plan de gestion a bien été approuvé et qu'il est d'ors et déjà opérationnel et qu'il sera complété au plus vite.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Spain** said it considered that the questions raised by ICOMOS had been answered by the State Party and it therefore supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed concern about the credibility of the Committee. The Advisory Bodies were expected to prepare reasonable recommendations. Why were they proposing to refer the nomination back to the State Party if all the conditions were in place for inscription?

The **Chairperson** reminded the Delegation of Kenya that the Advisory Bodies had been asked by the Committee to disregard any information submitted to them after 28 February, according to the Committee's own rules.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that management plans were not documents cast in stone. On the contrary, they were by definition a work in progress, so it did not see any problem in that respect. The Delegation agreed, however, that a stronger comparative analysis would have been useful.

La délégation du **Maroc** rappelle les réponses très claires fournies par l'Etat partie, affirme que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est clairement démontrée et ajoute que le critère (vi) aurait aussi pu être retenu. Elle questionne enfin l'utilité d'une étude sur l'impact du tourisme.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there was any objection to inscribing the property and adopting a modified decision by adding the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to be prepared by the Advisory Body.

ICOMOS read out a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value concerning criterion (iii) which it had prepared beforehand.

The Delegation of **Israel** raised a question of procedure. How could the Committee adopt a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which it had not seen? It would have been better to suspend the debate, allow some time for ICOMOS to distribute its draft text, and then resume the discussion. The Delegation also noted that the fact that ICOMOS could not take into consideration information submitted after 28 February posed a problem.

The **Chairperson** asked the members of the Committee whether they wished to continue the debate and, noting that it was the case, asked the Rapporteur to read out any proposed amendments.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments suggesting inscription of the property, with a request to ICOMOS to integrate in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value consideration of the need to address tourism pressure and the development of an adequate monitoring system.

Decision **32 COM 8B.36** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

La délégation de **Saint-Marin** a fait la déclaration suivante :

Saint-Marin, État partie, se réjouit de son inscription. Au nom du Gouvernement et des citoyens de Saint-Marin, nous remercions vivement les éminents membres du Comité, ICOMOS pour l'analyse historique très approfondie et le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Merci à notre Pays hôte, et particulièrement à la ville de Québec avec qui nous avons eu le plaisir de partager les festivités du 400^{ème} anniversaire.

Saint-Marin et le Mont Titano témoignent de la continuité d'une République libre qui perdure depuis le Moyen-âge. En ce sens, le Centre historique de Saint-Marin constitue un cas exceptionnel au niveau international. Les liens tangibles et intangibles de notre tradition culturelle vivante sont restés largement intacts durant les 700 dernières années. Nous sommes honorés que ces caractéristiques si particulières aient été reconnues par le Comité. Nous restons très attachés aux valeurs de la Convention et soutiendrons toujours le Comité et ses actions.

Property	Wooden Churches of the Slovak part of Carpathian Mountain Area
Id. N°	1273
State Party	Slovakia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.37**

L'**ICOMOS** présente la proposition d'inscription du site.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it supported the inscription of the property, noting that the wooden churches were extraordinary also from the technological point of view. It requested ICOMOS to elaborate on the theme of the wooden churches. Should they be looked at within the context of the Carpathian Mountains, or as a broader European phenomenon?

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked whether the “common Management Plan” referred to in the report had been prepared and was in place.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported the inscription of the property, but asked that the comparative analysis for that type of heritage be broadened to include consideration, for example, of the Caribbean region, which possessed many wooden churches.

ICOMOS explained that its approach in conducting comparative analyses was the one suggested in its recent publication on “filling the gaps”, which established a three-tiered methodology based on thematic, typological and chronological frameworks. It further clarified that in its recommendations it had suggested that existing management plans for the individual churches be combined into a single comprehensive plan.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested further clarifications on the comparative analysis carried out in the particular case before the Committee. With which specific sites had the nominated property been compared ?

L'**ICOMOS** précise que l'analyse comparative menée par l'Etat partie portait sur l'architecture en bois en Europe, et qu'elle a donc demandé d'élargir l'étude, se concentrant particulièrement sur l'architecture religieuse en bois. Il précise en outre que l'ICOMOS a consulté son Conseil scientifique ainsi que d'autres organisations scientifiques.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that no common management plan was in place and yet ICOMOS was recommending inscription. That appeared inconsistent with recommendations made by ICOMOS concerning other properties.

The Delegation of **Barbados** stated that it was not satisfied with the explanations provided by ICOMOS concerning the approach it had adopted for the comparative analysis.

Decision **32 COM 8B.37** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of **Slovakia** made the following statement:

Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Committee and Members of ICOMOS,

I would like to thank you very much for the inscription of the Wooden Churches of the Slovak Park of the Carpathian Mountain Area to the World Heritage List. I would like to thank you for the kind multilateral support for our proposal during the process of inscription of this property. The Slovak Republic is prepared to do all the best for the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The State Party will profoundly implement the management system and through permanent monitoring it will follow all property changes, and consequences, and will adopt adequate measures for property preservation, immediately. Once more, allow me cordially to thank you very much for your trust.

In conclusion I would like to invite you to visit the Slovak Republic, a beautiful Central European country. During such a pleasant stay, you can appreciate personally the uniqueness of the wooden

churches and consequently you can yourselves estimate or evaluate their state of preservation. Thank you once more all of you!

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

SIXTH DAY – MONDAY, 7 July 2008

TWELFTH MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

**Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron
then replaced by Mr Michael Turner**

**ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF
WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/8B
WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Corr
WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add2
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B1
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B1.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B1.Add2
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B2
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B3.Rev

Decisions: **32 COM 8B.1 to 32 COM 8B.102**

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Property	Sacred Temple of Preah Vihear
Id. N°	1224
State Party	Cambodia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add2

Decision: **32 COM 8B.102**

ICOMOS présente son évaluation du bien.

The **Chairperson** read out the draft decision which she presented personally, reminding the Committee of its decision at the 31st session affirming the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. She stressed the importance of inscribing the property at the current session. Since the previous year and bearing in mind the concerns of Thailand, Cambodia had revised its nomination. She also drew attention to the need to consider the recommendation of ICOMOS. She finally invited the Committee to adopt the proposed draft decision without discussion.

Decision **32 COM 8B.102** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of **Cambodia** made the following statement:

Madame Chairperson,

The inscription of the Sacred Temple of Preah Vihear on the World Heritage List is a matter very dear to the hearts of all Cambodians as the Temple represents one of the great triumphs of Khmer civilization.

The road to inscription has been long and—not without difficulties. Many people have contributed to overcoming these difficulties and I would like to take this opportunity to express to them on behalf of my government and on behalf of the Cambodian people, our gratitude.

Last year in Christchurch, I spoke to the Committee with thanks to two great ladies. Let me do so again today, but this time I speak of three great ladies.

First, I would like to thank Her Excellency Madame Françoise Rivière, Assistant Director General for Culture of UNESCO. She has generously devoted many hours of her precious time to listening to all sides involved in the process and to finding the right path to inscription. Her exceptional diplomatic skills have been at times tested to the full and without her devotion and dedication, inscription might not have been achieved today. We thank her with all our heart.

Second, I would like to mention Her Excellency Ambassador Louise Oliver, United States Permanent Delegate to UNESCO. She too has lent her great diplomatic skills and brilliant mind to the cause of the inscription of the Sacred Temple of Preah Vihear. Her Excellency has taken the time to visit personally the Sacred Site of the Temple and thus knows at first hand why it is so worthy of inscription and why it is so dear to the heart of all Cambodians.

With her at this session has been His Excellency Gerald C. Anderson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the United States Department of State. He also has worked tirelessly to find a way to overcome the difficulties we have encountered and deserves much personal credit for today's happy outcome.

The people of Cambodia will be forever in their debt.

Third among the great ladies, Madame President, I wish to acknowledge your exceptional contribution to the outcome of today's decision. The Cambodian Delegation is most grateful to you for your wise counsel and for your commitment to the achievement of a favourable outcome. You, also, have the eternal gratitude of the Cambodian people.

As I have said, Madame President, many people have given their time and skills to the cause of inscription. The State Party of Cambodia expresses its gratitude to the governments of Belgium, the United States of America, France and India for providing support for the work of experts who assisted in the preparation of the progress report and to the governments of China and Japan, as well as to ICCROM, for providing valuable input to this process. Of course, we express our thanks to each of those experts as well as to Her Excellency Ambassador Aziza Bennani, Permanent Delegate of Morocco to UNESCO and Her Excellency Ambassador Irène Rabenoro, Permanent Delegate of Madagascar to UNESCO.

Finally, Madame President, the Royal Government of Cambodia thanks the members of the World Heritage Committee for having decided today to inscribe the Sacred Temple of Preah Vihear on the World Heritage List.

I would also like to reiterate the Royal Government of Cambodia's long-standing position that the inscription of the Temple will not affect nor prejudice the rights of Cambodia and Thailand on the demarcation work of the Joint Commission for Land Boundary of the two countries.

Though Cambodia and Thailand may have had some differences of views regarding the listing of the Temple, this issue has not in any way affected the long-standing ties of friendship and co-operation between our two Kingdoms and peoples. Cambodia will therefore continue to co-operate with Thailand on all aspects of our rich relationship.

The Royal Government of Cambodia wishes to assure the Committee that it will make every reasonable effort to ensure that the Management Plan for the Sacred Temple of Preah Vihear will continue to be prepared in conformity with the international conservation standards and with a view to maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

We dedicate ourselves to this objective with renewed vigor, inspired by the Decision of the Committee today.

Let me conclude by expressing the congratulation of the people of Cambodia to the people of Quebec on the auspicious occasion of Quebec's 400th Anniversary.

Thank you Madame President.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** read two statements:

First statement:

*Madame Chairperson,
Distinguished Members of the World Heritage Committee,
Ladies and Gentlemen,*

It is my great honour to lead the Thai Delegation to attend the 32nd Session of the World Heritage Committee in this beautiful Quebec City.

With regard to the decision just adopted by the Committee, Thailand wishes to put on record her objection and the following observations and reservations, based on the drawbacks and shortcomings of the various qualifications necessary for the complete status of the World Heritage Site as appeared in the ICOMOS' evaluations of the cultural properties.

In addition to the unresolved border disputes of the area surrounding the Temple of Preah Vihear, Thailand cannot support the decision. Thailand wishes to point out that the decision is not practical because any subsequent action or measure to be taken by Cambodia or any third party in the area adjacent to the Temple of Preah Vihear which is Thai territory cannot be carried out without Thailand's consent. As a State Party to the 1972 World Heritage Convention, Thailand reaffirms her full rights to apply the article 11 (3) which stipulates that the inclusion of a property situated in a territory, sovereignty or jurisdiction over which is claimed by more than one state will in no way prejudice the rights of the party to the dispute. Thailand reaffirms her protest and objection to any document submitted by Cambodia for the inscription of the Temple of Preah Vihear as a World Heritage site, particularly the Experts Technical Report and the flawed Progress Report in which Thailand was not fully engaged and from which was compelled to dissociate herself. Thailand wants to note to the World Heritage Committee that a practical management plan of the Temple of Preah Vihear will not be complete without Thailand's cooperation.

Thailand regrets that the World Heritage Committee has overlooked the fact that she is a major stakeholder and ignored the possibility for her to nominate the surrounding areas with features pertinent to the Outstanding Universal Value of Preah Vihear Temple as a World Heritage site so that the full values of this property and its landscape setting can be realised. Therefore, Thailand reiterates her intention to nominate other features of the Temple located in her territory for World Heritage status so that the values of this property and its landscape setting can be fully realized. In this connection, we ask the Committee for its favourable consideration of Thailand's intention.

In short, Thailand is obliged to object the decision to inscribe the Temple of Preah Vihear on the World Heritage List, as unilaterally proposed by Cambodia and on the basis of incomplete integrity.

On behalf of the Thai Delegation, I wish to reassure the World Heritage Committee that this inscription issue is but a single issue in the overall relations between Thailand and Cambodia. The Government of Thailand will continue to work closely with the Government of Cambodia to further their cooperation for the mutual benefit of the two countries and peoples.

Madame Chairperson,
Distinguished Members of the World Heritage Committee,
In the end, I wish to reaffirm Thailand's reservations of her rights as contained in the Note dated 6 July 1962 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Thailand to the Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations. The inscription of the Temple of Preah Vihear on the World Heritage List shall in no way prejudice Thailand's rights regarding her territorial integrity and sovereignty as well as the survey and demarcation of land boundary in the area and Thailand's legal position.
Thank you.

Second statement:

Madame Chair,
May I, as the Chairman of the National World Heritage Committee of Thailand, first request that the statement I am about to make be officially included in the record of the Committee meeting.

Madame Chair,
Thailand fully recognizes that the World Heritage Convention is about international cooperation for the conservation of World Heritage, for mutual appreciation and respect, and peace.
Out of this recognition, Thailand has repeatedly appealed for her participation in a joint nomination of Preah Vihear, an eleventh century Hindu Temple, situated on top of a cliff of a mountain that forms a border between Cambodia and Thailand, and area which is still being disputed by the parties concerned.

We are strongly disappointed that our appeal for the joint nomination has been repeatedly denied, and now Preah Vihear Temple has been exceptionally allowed to be listed as a World Heritage Property on the basis of criterion (i) alone, without the proper buffer zones, and without the necessary cultural and natural landscapes on all sides that would have given the dignity and the integrity of the Temple as it rightly deserves. For that reason, we are unable to accept the unilateral inscription of Preah Vihear on only one criterion. We would have liked to postpone the inscription until the two State Parties concerned have resolved the differences and come up with a joint nomination that would be acceptable to both parties. We also protest the use of any accompanied geographic plan or map of the property that it might lead to further dispute and unfriendly actions between the communities in the surrounding region in the future.

However, Thailand fully respects the Committee's decision, and we are thankful to you and all parties concerned for the hard work done outside the meeting room both before and during the Committee meeting.

May I also put on record our appreciation for ICOMOS' professionalism as reflected in the evaluations document, particularly their frank and to-the-point comments, their conclusions and recommendations, which are strictly in line with the principle of Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity.

In ICOMOS' conclusion, it "considers that the full value of the Temple of Preah Vihear is inextricably linked to the surrounding landscape and that the planning and orientation of the Temple, facing north, is quite different from other Khmer temples."

May I explain that the northern orientation of the Temple signifies that it faces the area in Thailand where streams running from the watershed at the top of the cliff feed into a pond, considered to be a part of the sacred landscape, subsequently flows in to the Moon River in

Thailand, a tributary of the Mekong. Around this are traces of ancient communities as well as several ruins of Hindu monuments that can still be discerned.

Madam Chair,

The World Heritage Convention is also about the promotion of public awareness and involvement, including the role of the communities, in support for the World Heritage.

The communities on the north of the Temple in the territory of Thailand has long been, for hundreds of years, able to visit and worship at the Temple, the indigenous communities were given the responsibility of looking after the Temple.

As suggested by ICOMOS, an extension of boundaries in the future should be jointly submitted to reflect the full value of Preah Vihear. This I fully agree, as it would also allow the communities in the northern as well as southern lower plains to be able to participate in the conservation and in the cultural activities at the Temple as they had been able to do in the past.

The inscription of Preah Vihear should be further extended with the cooperation of Thailand and should be developed into a model case of transboundary nomination, and even a mixed cultural and natural nomination, that could pave the way for enhanced mutual respect, friendship, and peaceful cooperation between the two neighbouring States concerned, and between the local communities on both sides.

We are happy that the Committee, in its decision taken just now, has encouraged Cambodia and Thailand to collaborate for the safeguarding of the values of the property.

*We are thankful that the Committee has agreed that it would be desirable in the future to have additional inscription to capture criteria (iii) and (iv). To do this, I strongly believe, the cultural and natural landscapes on the northern part of the Temple which lie in Thai territory, and which have already been identified and registered under the Thai Preservation Law as being significantly related to the Temple of Preah Vihear in the ancient time, must be taken into due and fair consideration. Our Delegation has already submitted informally to the World Heritage Centre the necessary documents which have been prepared for additional and possible transboundary inscription for preliminary comments and future assistance. We hope to continue the collaboration with all agencies concerned in the immediate future.
Thank you.*

The Delegation of **Bahrain** regretted that it had not been given the opportunity to react on the matter.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** thanked the Deputy Prime Minister of Cambodia and said that the site deserved to be inscribed. It nevertheless understood the concerns of Thailand following a visit to the site and wished to stress the opportunity represented by a potential future extension of the property.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** se déclare heureuse de la décision d'inscrire le bien sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial et formule le vœu que le Cambodge et la Thaïlande puissent travailler ensemble à l'avenir à la préservation de ce bien.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Property	Rhaetian Railway in the Albula / Bernina Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	1276
State Party	Switzerland / Italy

Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iv)
----------------------------------	-------------

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.38**

ICOMOS présente son évaluation du bien.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it supported the nomination and asked whether the cultural landscape aspect was still considered and, if not, why.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it fully supported inscription and was impressed by the buffer zone concept which foresaw three levels of protection and could be applied to other properties. The Delegation commended the States Parties for such a professional nomination.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS about the cultural landscape issue raised by Israel.

L'**ICOMOS** répond à la question sur le caractère culturel du paysage. Il a été suggéré aux Etats parties de revoir leur proposition initiale, mais les Etats parties ont retiré cette option.

The **Chairperson**, having asked whether the Committee wished to consider inscription under a new name, noted that there were no further comments.

Decision **32 COM 8B.38** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** (observateur) a fait la déclaration suivante:

Merci Madame la Présidente,

La Suisse remercie le Comité d'avoir inscrit Les Chemins de fer rhétiques dans les paysages de l'Albula et de la Bernina sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Notre reconnaissance s'adresse aussi à l'ICOMOS et au Centre du patrimoine mondial.

La ligne ferroviaire de l'Albula et de la Bernina fonctionne selon un horaire continu et sans interruption depuis plus de 100 ans. Techniquement extraordinaire, se déroulant dans un paysage exceptionnel, cette ligne reste un important moyen de transport public qui relie deux pays, trois régions linguistiques ainsi que le Sud et le Nord des Alpes. Dès aujourd'hui, elle est un bien du patrimoine mondial. Les voyageurs de passage, et les populations locales, au quotidien, partageront les valeurs liées à ce nouveau statut, ce qui est pour nous un des plus grands succès en faveur de la préservation du bien et le développement de la région. La présence de M. le Conseiller d'État Hansjorg Trachsel, à ma droite, ici à Québec souligne la motivation avec laquelle le Gouvernement du Canton de Grisons entend mener une politique active dans ce but.

Madame la Présidente,

Comme il s'agit d'une inscription transnationale, je voudrais vous demander d'autoriser également mon collègue italien, M. l'Ambassadeur Giuseppe Moscato, à s'adresser au Comité. Je vous remercie.

La délégation de l'Italie (observateur) remercie l'Ambassadeur de la Suisse auprès de l'UNESCO pour l'inscription des Chemins de fer rhétiques, reliant les Alpes suisses à la Bernina italienne, après un parcours spectaculaire et un ensemble d'ouvrages audacieux. Elle ajoute que cette inscription représente une nouvelle occasion de coopération entre l'Italie et la Suisse.

Property	Palaeolithic Cave Art of Northern Spain (extension to Altamira Cave)
Id. N°	310 Bis
State Party	Spain
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(iii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.39**

ICOMOS présente l'évaluation du bien proposé.

The Delegation of **Jordan**, stating that the property was of extraordinary Outstanding Universal Value, endorsed its inscription.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with Jordan, noting that the property was outstanding and should be recognized as such, and congratulated Spain.

The Delegation of **Canada** congratulated the State Party and also ICOMOS for its evaluation and the report to the Committee. The property raised the matter of serial nominations. It also raised the issue of inscription under criterion (iv) and gave cause for thought that a possible extension would allow consideration of that criterion.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated the State Party on the excellent nomination. It proposed small amendments relating to the context of the site and was ready to provide explanations regarding those proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it joined previous speakers in supporting the inscription of the site and wished to learn more about the experience gained by the State Party in the field of conservation of that particular type of heritage.

La délégation du **Maroc** soutient cette demande d'extension du site tout en remarquant la gestion durable du bien. Elle voudrait en savoir davantage sur les mesures prises par l'Etat partie pour lutter contre les menaces d'humidité.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite l'Etat partie et se prononce en faveur de l'inscription du site.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the State Party and supported inscription, adding that the site was one of the most extraordinary sites in the prehistory of the world.

The Delegation of **Brazil** also expressed support for inscription. Taking up Australia's comment about criterion (iv), it asked the Legal Adviser whether the State Party could add criterion (iv) and apply it to the part already inscribed. It also thought that several similar inscriptions on the List could lead to interesting thematic studies.

The **Legal Adviser** said that the issue relating to criterion (iv) was not specifically addressed in the *Operational Guidelines*. He suggested asking the World Heritage Centre whether there was any practice on the subject.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that the issue was of a more technical than legal nature.

The **Chairperson** reiterated the question to the State Party.

La délégation de l'**Espagne** énumère les mesures prises pour lutter contre les menaces d'humidité : une surveillance et un suivi constants, contrôle d'hygrométrie, vérification des contours, etc. et se déclare prête à partager son expertise dans ce domaine.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed some amendments to address the comments made about the issue relating to criterion (iv).

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments.

The Delegation of **Brazil** thanked Canada and referred to the amendment dealing with a potential review of Outstanding Universal Value, expressing support for Spain if it wished to go through the process.

The **Chairperson** said that it was up to the Committee to decide.

ICOMOS répond que l'extension du bien est une question contenant des éléments correspondant aux critères d'inscription, par conséquent, les enlever risquerait de compromettre ces critères.

The **Chairperson** said that it was a methodological issue which went beyond the specific site. She asked whether there were any questions or objections.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that the answers given by the Legal Adviser and the World Heritage Centre were not satisfactory but that the proposal of Canada went in the right direction.

Decision **32 COM 8B.39** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

La délégation de l'**Espagne** fait la déclaration suivante :

La Delegación española quiere dar las gracias al Comité y a todos los técnicos que han trabajado en la evaluación de este dossier.

*En 1985 el Comité de Patrimonio Mundial reconocía el valor universal de la Cueva de Altamira, en tanto que testimonio excepcional del arte rupestre siendo un referente cien años después de su descubrimiento, Altamira sigue siendo un referente científico y cultural. Pero solo puede ser comprendida como parte de un fenómeno cultural más amplio que explica su origen y en el que encuentra su verdadera significación: **Arte Rupestre Paleolítico de la Cornisa Cantábrica**. Tal y como ha reconocido el Comité, los 17 yacimientos hoy declarados Patrimonio Mundial ilustran, junto con Altamira, la aparición y florecimiento del arte a lo largo del Paleolítico Superior.*

Nuestro país se siente especialmente satisfecho por este reconocimiento internacional después de 20 años de la declaración de Altamira. Nos complace además que esta declaración haya sido resultado del esfuerzo continuado y conjunto del gobierno de España y de los gobiernos de tres Comunidades Autónomas: Cantabria, Asturias y el País Vasco, cuyos representantes están presentes hoy aquí para compartir este momento con el Comité. En un momento en que la coordinación en la gestión es cada vez más necesaria para asegurar la conservación, creemos que este trabajo nos permitirá contribuir al esfuerzo global en esta área.

Somos también conscientes de la responsabilidad que implica contar con más propiedades en la Lista de Patrimonio Mundial, y asumimos dicha responsabilidad con la seguridad de que el trabajo conjunto de todos los países, y, dentro de nuestro país, de las diversas regiones, hará posible el mantenimiento y mejora del valor universal excepcional de este obra maestra del arte rupestre paleolítico mundial.

Property	The Antonine Wall (extension to the Frontiers of the Roman Empire)
Id. N°	430 Ter
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.40**

ICOMOS présente son évaluation du bien.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that it was a very important site, to be considered as a reference for others.

Decision **32 COM 8B.40** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** made the following statement:

Madam Chair, Your excellencies, ladies and gentlemen

On behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom, I should like to thank the World Heritage Committee for extending the transnational Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site by the inscription of the Antonine Wall in Scotland. We would like to recognize and thank the State Party of Germany for their support and collaboration in developing the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site. We are also particularly grateful to the Scottish Government and the 5 local authorities along the line of the Antonine Wall – Falkirk, Glasgow, North Lanarkshire, East and West Dunbartonshire – for their active support in bringing this nomination to fruition.

This current extension of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site will give great encouragement to other countries in Europe, North Africa and the Middle East which contain elements of Roman frontiers and who are interested in joining this significant multinational project. The idea of creating transnational World Heritage sites is an excellent way of aiding international understanding and co-operation, of celebrating our shared common heritage and developing linked protection and management frameworks. Although frontiers usually divide, this particular frontier seeks to break down barriers.

Finally may I congratulate the City of Quebec on its 400th anniversary and you yourself on your calm and exemplary chairing of this meeting and also congratulate you on having the support of your wonderful rapporteur.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Property	Cultural Landscape of Buenos Aires
Id. N°	1296
State Party	Argentina
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(vi) + CL

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.41**

The **Chairperson** introduced the nomination of the Cultural Landscape of Buenos Aires and drew attention to the relevant draft decision.

In response to a question by the Delegation of **Kenya** about paragraph 5, the **Chairperson** read out the amendment.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that it would have preferred the question of the nomination to be reflected in the summary records of the meeting but did not oppose its being recorded in a decision.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed that, in order not to introduce a new term with legal implications, the word “postpone” should be deleted and replaced by “examine the nomination at its 33rd session”.

The **Chairperson** endorsed the proposal of Bahrain.

The **Legal Adviser** remarked that if the order of paragraphs 3 and 4 were reversed, there would be a problem of wording and meaning, since paragraph 4 referred to paragraph 3.

The **Chairperson** noted that Brazil had withdrawn its proposal.

Decision **32 COM 8B.41** was adopted as amended, and the nomination was re-scheduled for consideration at the 33rd session in 2009.

Property	São Francisco Square in the city of São Cristóvão
Id. N°	1272
State Party	Brazil
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.42**

ICOMOS presented the nomination recommending the deferral of the site.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it was an interesting case of an important site where various ceremonies took place. It also noted that the site had authenticity and that the state of conservation was adequate. It felt, however, that integrity was not well enough explained and seemed to be absent.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested clarification from the State Party.

La délégation de l'**Espagne** souligne l'aspect historique du bien proposé. Il a été construit sur le modèle « philippin » typique des colonies espagnoles mais dans une colonie portugaise. De ce fait, il s'agit d'un cas unique et exceptionnel dans le monde.

La délégation du **Pérou** soutient la proposition de l'Espagne. On devrait retenir cette particularité comme étant exceptionnelle.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS about the absence of integrity.

ICOMOS responded that the nomination dossier included a short paragraph about authenticity and integrity. ICOMOS considered that it was an interesting case but that the site should be of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the relevant features and processes. As a town constructed according to Spanish codes, it was insufficient to nominate only the square and surrounding buildings.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party whether it could deal with the requests put forward in the evaluation and in what timeframe.

The Delegation of **Brazil** replied that the nomination concerned a square and not a town but that the recommendations of ICOMOS would be taken into account, namely to review the boundaries and other elements, and that the additional information would be ready for the next session

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments proposed by Spain and Barbados.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked whether, given the numbers of paragraphs, the nomination could be referred back to the State Party.

The **Chairperson**, responding to that question, read out paragraph 159 of the *Operational Guidelines* concerning referral.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked the Advisory Body about potential for Outstanding Universal Value in the documentation received.

ICOMOS said it considered that there was potential for Outstanding Universal Value which was why deferral was recommended.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its preference for referral rather than deferral.

Decision **32 COM 8B.42** was adopted as amended, and the nomination was referred back to the State Party.

Property	Historic Centre of Camagüey
Id. N°	1270
State Party	Cuba
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(v)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.43**

L'**ICOMOS** présente l'évaluation du bien.

Decision **32 COM 8B.43** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

The Delegation of **Cuba** made the following statement:

Señora Presidenta;

En nombre de Cuba, quiero agradecer al Comité del Patrimonio mundial, al ICOMOS, la inscripción del Centro histórico de Camaguey en la Lista del Patrimonio mundial.

La evolución histórica tan particular y el inmenzo legado patrimonial de este Centro histórico, sus expresiones culturales surgidas en el fragon del extraordinario intercambio que tubo como escenario el Caribe aon un alcance universsal.

Cuba aprovecha, para ratificar su compromiso con la Convención y este Comité. Como hoy celebramos los 400 años de la hermosa ciudad de Quebec que nos acoje, nos da mucha alegría celebrar dentro de poco tiempo los 500 años de la ciudad de Camaguey, compartiendo su legado con la humanidad toda.

Property	Protective town of San Miguel and the Sanctuary of Jesús de Nazareno de Atotonilco
Id. N°	1274
State Party	Mexico
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.44**

ICOMOS presented the property, its integrity and authenticity, and stated that its Outstanding Universal Value was justified by criteria (ii) and (iv). It recommended the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** commended the methodology used for the comparative analysis of the nomination.

Decision **32 COM 8B.44** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** made the following statement:

Distinguida Señora Presidenta del comité del Patrimonio Mundial,

Señores representantes de los estados parte de la convención del patrimonio mundial
Queremos agradecer al Comité Patrimonio Mundial su generosa aceptación de la candidatura de San Miguel de Allende y el santuario de Jesús Nazareno de Atotonilco, como nuevo bien en la lista del patrimonio mundial.

Asimismo **reconocemos** el trabajo fundamental realizado por el ICOMOS internacional y el de su presidente, Michael Petzet, a quien deseamos todo los parabienes en su futuro y profesional personal.

México como miembro fundador de la UNESCO, ha mantenido una activa participación en los trabajos de la convención, y hemos acompañado la evolución de esta herramienta privilegiada para la preservación del patrimonio de toda la humanidad.

México ratifica hoy este compromiso y destaca los principios de cooperación que inspiran la política exterior de nuestro país. Asimismo, sabemos que la inscripción de este bien proyecta la diversidad de las ciudades del continente Americano en la lista del Patrimonio Mundial. Verbigracia esta en la que hoy estamos: muchas gracias Quebec por su hospitalidad.

Jose Alfredo Jimenez, el gran compositor Mexicano de música popular vernácula, en El Rey decía <<Que no hay que llegar primero, pero hay que saber llegar...>>

San Miguel de Allende y el Santuario de Jesus Nazareno de Atotonilco, bastión de la Independencia de nuestro país han llegado –como León Felipe afirmaba- <<Con todos y a tiempo>> Gracia a todos.

Ustedes al merecido reconocimiento por parte de la UNESCO.

En estas breves palabras, permítanme reconocer principalmente a los habitantes de San Miguel de Allende y de Atotonilco, que a lo largo del tiempo han sabido conservar con esmero, pero sobre todo con gran cariño, amor, coraje y respeto, su vasta herencia monumental, fruto del mestizaje cultural de 466 Ason de vida.

El Gobierno de México y la sociedad de San Miguel Asumen con gran responsabilidad este reconocimiento para seguir trabajando en el rescate, conservación y salvaguardia de nuestro común Patrimonio Cultural.

Agradezco las observaciones que vertieron aquí algunos miembros del comité sobre nuestra candidatura, mismas que tendremos siempre en cuenta como parte de nuestro compromiso con ustedes y el mundo entero.

Jorge Luis Borges escribió que “La gratitud es la memoria del corazón.” San Miguel de Allende, el Corazón de México da las gracias a todos los que conformaron el expediente técnico con que se sustentó nuestra candidatura.

Gracias a la UNESCO, al Comité del Patrimonio Mundial y a ICOMOS Internacional por su trabajo en pro de la preservación del Patrimonio Mundial.

En San Miguel de Allende conspiramos por la libertad y contra la esclavitud cuando fraguamos la independencia de México. En la víspera del segundo centenario de esta gesta heroica, deseo invitar a los presentes a que no visiten. Tengan la seguridad de que habremos de esperarlos con los brazos y el corazón abiertos, para que juntos conspiramos en proteger, para las siguientes generaciones, el patrimonio que nos fue heredado.

Muchas gracias.

Property	León Cathedral
Id. N°	1236
State Party	Nicaragua
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v)(vi)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.45**

ICOMOS presented the property, its integrity and authenticity, and outlined legal and management issues. With regard to criterion (v), the Cathedral was the main reference in the urban landscape, yet ICOMOS considered that it did not reflect, by itself, all the features of traditional urban settlements and that that criterion had not therefore been justified. Concerning criterion (vi), although the property was unquestionably important at the national and regional levels, it was not of universal significance. That criterion had not been justified. It recommended that the nomination of León Cathedral be referred back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Jordan** asked if the State Party could inform the Committee if there was any plan or not and why it had not sent the information requested.

The **Chairperson** noted that the delegation of the State Party was not present in the room.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested including the words “for as long a period as possible” in paragraph 2(a) of the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 8B.45** was adopted as amended, and the nomination was referred back to the State Party.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Property	Socotra Archipelago
Id. N°	1263
State Party	Yemen
Criteria proposed by State Party	(x)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.5**

IUCN explained the extensive external review methodology and the guiding principles for examining sites once a site had been evaluated in the field in order to identify Outstanding Universal Value, and presented the site. It recommended to inscribe the site on the World Heritage list.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** thanked the Advisory Bodies for the evaluation of what was a very important site. The Delegation strongly supported inscription of the property as being a biodiversity hotspot and a key site for bio-safety, on account of the high levels of endemism and the reinforced protection established by the State Party to face the pressures coming from companies using genetic material.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the State Party for the nomination of a unique property.

La délégation du **Maroc** félicite le Yemen pour la présentation de ce site extraordinaire du point de vue de la biodiversité, de la richesse des espèces. Elle félicite UICN pour son excellent travail et demande des précisions concernant le point 5, paragraphe c) de la décision, au sujet des zones tampon.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported inscription since sustainable measures were in place.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** congratulated Yemen and queried whether sustainable financing was in place or being secured

IUCN stated that during the mission consensus had been reached on the definition of a buffer zone, and not designating the entire island as a core area. Regulations for the buffer zone were consistent with the Management Plan for the property, as reflected in paragraph 5(c) of the draft decision.

La délégation du **Madagascar** demande des clarifications sur la zone tampon et ses limites par rapport à la réserve de biosphère.

IUCN underlined the need to invite the State Party to ensure proper funding at governmental level and to identify international donors, as stated in the IUCN report.

The **Rapporteur** reviewed paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 as amended. A new paragraph was included to acknowledge the efforts made by the State Party.

Decision **32 COM 8B.5** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** intervient au nom du Yémen qui l'a investie de cette tâche et lit la déclaration suivante :

Au nom du Gouvernement de la République du Yémen et au nom de Son Excellence Monsieur Abdul Rahman AL ERYANI/Ministre du Patrimoine Mondial pour le choix judicieux qu'il a effectué en classant l'Archipel de Socotra dans la liste du Patrimoine Naturel de l'Humanité.

L'aspect unique et singulier de la faune et de la flore de cet archipel mérite bien un intérêt particulier de la Communauté Internationale et cette proclamation en est la preuve.

Le Gouvernement du Yémen a travaillé en collaboration avec des pays donateurs depuis plusieurs années pour la planification, les recherches, la conservation et la sensibilisation de la communauté locale à l'importance du patrimoine de l'archipel.

Cette proclamation est dédiée à la communauté locale de Socotra dont la préservation et la sauvegarde de ce patrimoine lui incombe dans les années à venir pour que l'Humanité puisse en tirer bénéfice.

A cette occasion, nous remercions en premier chef le Directeur General de l'UNESCO, Monsieur Koichiro MATSUURA qui s'est rendu l'an dernier, personnellement, dans l'archipel pour admirer cette merveille de l'Humanité. A cet effet, Monsieur le Directeur General a soutenu la candidature de cet archipel et insisté pour que l'UNESCO prenne les mesures nécessaires afin de classer ce site dans la liste du Patrimoine Mondial.

Nous remercions aussi le Centre du Patrimoine Mondial en la personne de Monsieur Francisco BANDARI et de son équipe sérieuse et performante. C'est grâce au suivi tout particulier de cette équipe que le dossier de candidature a été préparé convenablement.

Nous voulons mentionner l'assistance toute particulière du Gouvernement italien qui s'est manifestée dans plusieurs domaines, notamment à l'égard du Patrimoine du Yémen. Cette aide précieuse nous a permis de vous transmettre un dossier aussi complet et précis. Nous le remercions vivement.

Enfin, Le Gouvernement du Yémen est honoré de cette proclamation et s'engage à tout mettre en œuvre pour assurer un développement durable qui respecte scrupuleusement les normes internationales en matière de protection du patrimoine.

Nous félicitons les autres pays qui ont eu leurs patrimoines classés dans cette liste prestigieuse et nous souhaitons à tous réussite et succès.

De nouveau, nous vous remercions Madame La Présidente ainsi que les Membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Property	Mount Sanqingshan National Park
Id. N°	1292
State Party	China
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(viii)(ix)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.6**

IUCN presented the site recommending the inscription of the site.

La délégation du **Maroc** déclare que ce bien, d'une dimension impressionnante, est d'une beauté extraordinaire. Le dossier est très bien présenté comme de coutume avec la Chine. Elle a trois questions pour l'UICN : 1) le paragraphe 4 recommande à l'Etat partie d'élaborer un « plan de gestion des visiteurs sous forme de sous-plan du Plan de gestion et de conservation », quel est le sous-plan dans le plan ? La 2^e question concerne les dimensions (22.950 ha) : vue la population de la Chine est-ce réaliste de demander que le nombre de visiteurs soit réduit ? La 3^e question s'adresse directement à l'Etat partie : a-t-on réfléchi à la possibilité de faire une proposition en série ?

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked about the effect of the increased number of visitors on the Management Plan.

La délégation de **Madagascar** a également une question pour l'UICN concernant la division du bien en zone protégée (22 950 ha) comprenant elle-même deux zones, et la zone tampon (16 000 ha).

IUCN stated that the increased number of visitors was the key challenge and that significant development in infrastructure had been undertaken in that connection. The property was currently being managed properly in terms of staff and budget. Only one buffer zone was in place but it was managed in an integrated manner with the property.

The **Chairperson** asked about the feasibility of a serial nomination.

The Delegation of **China** said that a serial nomination could be envisaged in the future.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to the draft decision proposed by Canada: paragraphs 1 and 2 were unchanged; in paragraph 3, under criterion (vii), the sentence reading "The closest.....glaciation" would be deleted.

Decision **32 COM 8B.6** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

The Delegation of **China** made the following statement:

Madame Chairperson,

On behalf of the Chinese Delegation and 6.7 million residents of Shangrao city, I would like to express my most sincere gratitude towards all the delegates of the World Heritage Committee and its Advisory Bodies for the inscription. We are grateful and proud of the decision made by the Committee today.

The local and central government of China will be guided by the World Heritage Committee and follow the advice provided by its Advisory Bodies. We assure you that we are fully

committed to providing the highest level of protection and management of this beautiful and unique mountain property.

Madame Chairperson,

Please allow me to extend my warmest welcome to you and all our friends here to visit Mount Sanqingshan National Park of China.

Thank you very much.

Property	Hovsgol Lake and its Watershed
Id. N°	1082
State Party	Mongolia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(viii)(ix)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.7**

IUCN presented the site recommending no to inscribe the site.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed some concerns about the nomination. From the Republic of Korea's experience of UNESCO-EABRN, it could appreciate the efforts made by the State Party. IUCN's evaluation recognized that the lake was the most oligotropic in the world, of a highly unusual and unique type, since all the fresh-water lakes in the world were undergoing ever-increasing eutrophication. Judging from current trends in global limnology, there would be less and less anthropogenically undisturbed candidates for future natural heritage applications. The Delegation suggested that the lake should be considered unique in terms of oligotrophy, there being no comparable lakes in the world. The Republic of Korea understood the Advisory Bodies' evaluation of the property, yet highlighted the future potential of the property in question. There was potential for Outstanding Universal Value related to oligotrophy and associated faunal and floral communities.

Decision **32 COM 8B.7** was adopted, and the property was not inscribed.

Property	Saryarka - Steppe and Lakes of Northern Kazakhstan
Id. N°	1102 Rev
State Party	Kazakhstan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ix)(x)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.8**

IUCN presented the site recommending not to inscribe the site.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed strong support for the very clearly focused nomination, with effective identification of the appropriate values.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** commended the evaluation undertaken by IUCN.

The **Rapporteur**, reviewing the draft decision, said that paragraphs 1 and 2 would remain unchanged, and in paragraph 3, under criterion (ix), the wording in the last sentence, "...that is currently poorly represented on the World Heritage List", would be deleted according to the amendment received from Canada.

Decision **32 COM 8B.8** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

Mr. Turner (Israel) took the Chair.

Property	The Joggins Fossil Cliffs
Id. N°	1285
State Party	Canada
Criteria proposed by State Party	(viii)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.9**

IUCN presented the property and recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe it on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (viii).

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it supported inscription.

Decision **32 COM 8B.9** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State party on behalf of the Committee and invited the Delegation of **Canada** to respond.

The Delegation of **Canada** made the following statement:

On behalf of the Joggins Fossil institute Association Board of Directors and the government of the Province of Nova Scotia I would like to extend our sincerest appreciation for the consideration of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee for inscription of the Joggins Cliffs on the World Heritage List.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the International Union for the Conservation of Nature for the professional and constructive evaluation and subsequent reporting.

Many individuals from around the world, who, in a spirit of truly united nations, contributed to the nomination of the Joggins Fossil Cliffs. In particular I would like to note the work of my colleagues, Dr. John Calder, Jenna Boon and staff members of Parks Canada. Their work was made possible through the collaboration of the people of Joggins, who have a long and proud history of stewardship, as 'Keepers of the Cliffs'.

We are, indeed, pleased that the Advisory Body and World Heritage Committee recognized the quality of the nomination documentation and the process of community engagement especially since our work has been coordinated by a non-governmental organization.

The Joggins Fossil Cliffs record a key branch in the tree of life for humankind and accordingly opens a window to our collective past while equally helping inform us of our future on planet Earth.

We remain committed to the continued long-term protection, promotion and presentation of the Outstanding Universal Values of the Joggins Fossil Cliffs and would like to extend a warm and open invitation to the Committee and States Parties to experience the Fossil Cliffs with us.

Property	Lagoons of New Caledonia: Reef Diversity and Associated Ecosystems
Id. N°	1115
State Party	France
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(viii)(ix)(x)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.10**

Ms. Cameron resumed the Chair.

IUCN presented the site and recommended the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it strongly supported the inscription of the site and wished to ask the State Party about the impact from climate change.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed strong support for the inscription of the site, and particularly commended the role of the local communities. It proposed an amendment to that effect.

Chairperson invited the State party to respond to the question raised.

La délégation de la **France** (observateur) déclare qu'il n'y a actuellement pas de blanchiment de coraux. Elle observe que les recommandations de l'UICN sont importantes, notamment la nécessité de protéger les poissons herbivores ; ceux-ci permettant aux coraux de se résilier plus rapidement en cas de montée de la température des eaux, mais confirme qu'actuellement, il n'y a pas de cas de blanchiment des coraux.

The **Rapporteur**, reviewing the draft decision, said that paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remained unchanged. Paragraph 4 would include a reference to "the Government of New Caledonia".

Decision **32 COM 8B.10** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

La délégation de la **France** (observateur) fait la déclaration suivante :

Merci Madame la Présidente,

La France est particulièrement heureuse de l'inscription des lagons de Nouvelle-Calédonie au Patrimoine mondial.

C'est un magnifique dossier, dont nous sommes tous fiers parce qu'il est le premier dossier français de l'Outre-Mer, et aussi parce qu'il a été unanimement porté par toutes les collectivités de Nouvelle-Calédonie.

Je vous adresse donc nos vifs remerciements et je rends hommage à l'engagement constructif des élus et représentants de Nouvelle-Calédonie, ceux qui sont ici autour de moi et ceux qui, restés dans le Pacifique, partagent la même joie.

La France s'attachera, naturellement, à accompagner les autorités locales dans la poursuite de leurs efforts pour concilier le développement du territoire – marqué par une activité minière ancienne – et la conservation d'un patrimoine naturel exceptionnel, et de la biodiversité.

Je remercie l'Union Mondiale pour la Nature de l'assistance qu'elle nous apportera dans la poursuite de cette ambition.

Et je souhaite donner la parole pour conclure à Madame la Vice-présidente du Gouvernement de Nouvelle-Calédonie.

Intervention de Mme Gorodey

Au nom de la Nouvelle-Calédonie, je voudrais, à mon tour, vous remercier ainsi que les Etats membres de votre éminent Comité, d'inscrire les lagons dans leur diversité récifale et avec leurs écosystèmes associés au patrimoine mondial de l'humanité, suivant les critères de valeur universelle exceptionnelle que vous avez reconnu.

Nous sommes en effet ici dans une forte délégation composée de nos plus hauts responsables politiques et coutumiers ainsi que d'experts qui ont porté ce dossier dans une démarche participative avec les scientifiques et les associations. La population de notre pays a été pleinement associée au travail de terrain lié à ce dossier.

Cet engagement a déjà abouti à la mise en place de nos premiers comités de gestion participative de ce bien. Elle précède celle d'un futur Conservatoire des Espaces Naturels, dans les mois qui viennent et le projet d'accueillir, à cet effet, en 2010, une deuxième mission de l'UICN en Nouvelle-Calédonie.

Je vous remercie.

Property	Surtsey
Id. N°	1267
State Party	Iceland
Criteria proposed by State Party	(viii)(ix)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.11**

IUCN presented the nominated property and recommended its inscription on the basis of criterion (ix).

The Delegation of **Sweden** said it supported inscription under criterion (ix) and requested clarification from IUCN regarding the feasibility of a serial nomination with the same or different criteria.

IUCN explained that the inscription had potential for a serial nomination but stated that it was important, in the event of a further nomination, to clarify what would happen if a new part of the series were to be inscribed in the future under some of the cultural criteria as well.

Decision **32 COM 8B.11** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of **Iceland** made the following statement:

Madame Chair,

Iceland wishes to express its gratitude to the World Heritage Committee for this decision. We consider it an honour to be graduated to World Heritage status for Surtsey based on criterion (ix).

Inscription based on this criterion recognizes and honours the protection measures taken by the Icelandic Government as early as 1965 in order to retain the integrity and the pristine nature of the newly created island. It acknowledges the importance of limitation of access to the island for scientific and monitoring purposes and further emphasizes the significance of retaining limited access and human influence on the island in the future.

We had certainly hoped that the geological features of Surtsey, along with the recorded eruption history and geomorphological features of the island would be recognized and also lead to a listing under criterion (viii). However, we highly value and understand the findings and suggestions of IUCN in this regard and we will certainly consider these suggestions in the future.

We would like to use the opportunity to thank the field mission evaluator (Chris Woods) and all of IUCN's reviewers for the excellent work. Finally, Madame Chair, Iceland would like to thank you and the World Heritage Committee for this decision.

Thank you, madam Chair.

Property	“The Putorana Plateau” Nature Complex
Id. N°	1234
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(viii)(ix)(x)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.13**

IUCN presented the site along with the recommendation to defer examination of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** asked for any comments or amendments.

Decision **32 COM 8B.13** was adopted, and the nomination was deferred.

Property	Swiss Tectonic Arena Sardona
Id. N°	1179
State Party	Switzerland
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(viii)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.14**

IUCN presented the nominated property and recommended its inscription on the basis of criterion (viii).

The **Rapporteur**, reviewing the draft decision with amendments proposed by Canada, **said** that paragraphs 1 and 2 would remain unchanged. In paragraph 3, under the heading “Values”, the last sentence would be deleted, and under criterion (viii) the sentence: “The property is one... appreciated by visitors” would also be deleted.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, the Delegation of **Canada** explained that the deletions concerned wording was unnecessary.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the title was correct.

IUCN explained that the title had been changed after discussion with the State Party during the evaluation mission.

Decision **32 COM 8B.11** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

La délégation de la **Suisse** (observateur) fait la déclaration suivante:

Merci Madame la Présidente,

Au nom de la population de la région, la délégation Suisse est très heureuse de la décision du Comité de faire figurer ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et l'en remercie vivement. Nous adressons également notre reconnaissance à l'UICN.

Pour la Suisse, cette nomination représente avant tout la reconnaissance de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce bien. Mais elle marque aussi la réussite d'un long processus, le succès d'une candidature initiée et portée par les populations des 19

communes entourant le Pic Sardona et réunissant les trois Cantons de Glaris, des Grisons et de Saint-Gall.

Tout au long de ce processus, même dans la situation délicate du retrait du dossier, la volonté de la région est restée intacte, considérant ce défi comme une chance. Les améliorations demandées ont contribué à mieux relever les valeurs de ce bien, notamment par une étude comparative menée sur le thème de la formation des montagnes et de la tectonique. Ces informations vont contribuer significativement à la sensibilisation du public, élément central du plan de gestion du site.

Finalement, j'aimerais assurer le Comité que les autorités suisses, à tout les niveaux, prennent très à cœur la responsabilité de sauvegarder ce bien jusqu'ici faiblement touché par l'activité humaine et que nous sommes disposés à mettre notre expérience en matière de processus participatifs au bénéfice de tous les Etats.

Je suis personnellement fier de cette inscription car je suis né dans l'une des 19 communes, Flums, mais je ne sais pas si je fais maintenant aussi partie du patrimoine mondial...

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Property	Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve
Id. N°	1290
State Party	Mexico
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(x)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B

Decision: **32 COM 8B.17**

IUCN presented the nomination with the recommendation to defer it.

La délégation de **Madagascar** constate que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle a été vérifiée et demande si elle a été définie. Les problèmes d'exploitation touchent-ils la valeur universelle exceptionnelle? Elle interroge l'Etat partie sur les mesures prises en matière de gestion.

La délégation du **Maroc** indique que ce site, qui est également une Réserve de Biosphère, représente un phénomène fabuleux. Elle relève le plan de protection et les efforts financiers importants effectués par l'Etat partie comme un signe évident de son intention de protéger ce site, site également représenté dans la littérature légendaire autochtone. Ce bien contribue à protéger la Terre d'un holocauste biologique. La délégation soutient l'inscription, qui représenterait un cadeau pour les enfants du Mexique, mais aussi pour tous les enfants du monde. Le problème principal reste la gestion de l'exploitation forestière et la façon dont les bénéfices sont partagés avec les communautés locales.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it welcomed the nomination of superlative natural phenomena.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that the IUCN report was in contradiction with the recommendation, mainly with respect to paragraph 3(a) of the draft decision relating to the involvement of local communities. With reference to paragraph 3(b), the Delegation requested clarification as to whether the illegal logging took place in the property or the buffer zone and in what way the logging affected the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it was in favour of the inscription of the site and asked whether the question of funding might be the main reason for deferring its inscription.

IUCN explained that the 40 communities were within the property and not in the buffer zone, and that logging therefore took place in the property.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of **Mexico** to answer questions about financial management and logging activities.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** stated that CONANP, the “Fondo Monarca”, NGOs and Programa Pro-Arbol had established close cooperation for the purpose of preserving the forest for the benefit of the reserve. The Delegation confirmed that, thanks to those programmes, 46 communities were involved in the conservation process. Over the previous five years, 11 million trees had been planted. However, the main problems came from three communities in the south of the reserve, which were outside the butterfly gathering area. In the past, major degradation had occurred in those areas, but they were only a small part of the 43 areas in the reserve.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said it supported inscription, aware as it was of the quality of the work and of the technical staff involved.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated that its previous questions had been answered.

The Delegation of **Spain** said it supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it was in favour of inscription and raised the question of boundaries.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** confirmed its appreciation of the nomination and invited the State Party to increase its support in terms of capabilities, reforestation and resources for a proactive approach to conservation of the phenomenon.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was consensus for inscription.

IUCN explained that, in case of inscription, a mission in two years' time would be necessary.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** stated that the boundaries of the property as well as of the buffer zone had been clearly demarcated using GPS techniques.

IUCN read out the passages in the IUCN report on the Outstanding Universal Value of the site.

The **Rapporteur**, reviewing the draft decision as amended, said that paragraph 1 would remain unchanged; paragraph 2 would inscribe the site under criterion (vii), paragraph 3 would request the State Party to provide information on the existing programme and related resources for management and conservation; and a new paragraph 5 would be inserted referring to a mission in two years' time.

Decision **32 COM 8B.17** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** made the following statement:

Va a ser muy breve porque todo ocurrió tan rápido que no tenemos una cosa preparada, así que voy a hablar con el Corazón.

Queremos agradecer el apoyo de la Comisión, agradecer el trabajo de la UICN. Nosotros Mexicanos consideramos esta inscripción como un acto de confianza. Quiero también agradecer a las comunidades que son, al fin del día, los verdaderos conservacionistas. Muchas gracias.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

SIXTH DAY - Monday 7 July 2008

THIRTEENTH MEETING

9.00 a.m. - 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

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

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev)

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM 7A.Add.2
WHC-08/32.COM 7A Add.3

Decision: **32 COM 7A.18**

The **Chairperson** said that the text of the amended decision before the Committee had been agreed by consensus. The Ambassador of Canada was to be thanked for his mediating role.

Decision **32 COM 7A.18** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Property	Sacred Mijikenda Kaya Forests
Id. N°	1231 Rev
State Party	Kenya
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)(vi)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 8B.Add.

Decision: **32 COM 8B.50**

ICOMOS presented the serial nomination of sites, also nominated as a cultural landscape. At the 31st session, ICOMOS had recommended deferral of the nomination and the World Heritage Committee had referred it back to the State Party to reconsider a revised nomination. A revised nomination had been submitted by the State Party in January 2008, reducing the number of kayas from 36 to 11. A more detailed comparative analysis was needed of all the kaya sites in Kenya. The settings were not protected and there were no

buffer zones, but ICOMOS considered that they were needed. The sites should be designated as national monuments, as requested by the Committee. A management plan had been submitted but needed amending. ICOMOS recommended referring the nomination back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Spain** thanked ICOMOS for the additional information provided, pointing out that at its session the previous year the Committee had recognized the excellent attributes of the property and had asked for additional work. The Delegation wished to ask the State Party about the criteria on which it had based its selection of the sites. Finally, it considered that the Committee should support inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** observed that for Africans the word “sacred” bore great importance. Noting in particular that there was a need to “produce more detailed mapping of the kayas”, the Delegation asked that the State Party clarify that point, since without adequate information it was not possible to take a decision.

La délégation du **Maroc** précise qu’elle est très sensible à cette proposition, déjà examinée, en raison de la dimension immatérielle, qui lui rappelle le site de Sukur au Nigéria, inscrit en 1999. La délégation considère que ce site a une valeur universelle exceptionnelle et indique son souhait d’écouter l’Etat partie sur les progrès accomplis et soutient l’inscription sur la liste.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that the property was fascinating and that its spirit was very much in keeping with the *World Heritage Convention* and the Global Strategy, with the merit of ensuring a more balanced List. The Delegation wished to support its immediate inscription. It sought clarification from ICOMOS on the contradiction between the assertion in the report that the nominated kayas had been designated as national monuments and the request in the conclusion for them to be designated as such. It also asked the State Party’s opinion on whether it would be willing to withdraw Kaya Kinondo following ICOMOS’ recommendation.

The Delegation of **China** noted that the property had been referred back in 2007 and that the State Party had at the time been asked to take corrective measures. The Delegation noted that progress had been made by the State Party and that a management plan already existed. It asked the State Party in what framework the management plan would be implemented, and about the effectiveness of legal protection of the nominated sites. Those questions were directly related to ICOMOS’ recommendations.

The Delegation of **Israel** commented that there were new ideas regarding the comparative analysis that had not been in the Committee’s decision at its previous session, and that criterion (vi) ought to be added. It asked for ICOMOS’ reaction to that and joined Bahrain in its questions with a view to strengthening acceptance of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS to respond on criterion (vi).

ICOMOS said that, in its view, criterion (vi) still needed to be justified in the new nomination. With regard to the comparative analysis, such analysis should address the choice of sites, and was needed in order to justify a serial nomination.

The Chairperson invited the State Party to respond to questions raised about the nomination.

The Delegation of **Kenya** responded that (a) the choice of 11 sites, as opposed to thirty six in the previous nomination, had been made on the basis of a comparative matrix as advised by ICOMOS, at a workshop involving stakeholders. (b) On the question of mapping, it confirmed that maps existed and pointed out that Kenya had been managing the sites for

over 30 years and that, during that time, new technology had surfaced and there was a need to respond to that new technology. (c) There was no contradiction in the legislation: there were layers of protection already in place, specifically under the Forest Act and National Monuments Act, so there was no need to add another layer. (d) Finally, with regard to the Kaya Kinondo withdrawal, Kenya did not wish to withdraw it from the nomination, but if the Committee and the Advisory Body so wished, Kenya would comply.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** supported the inscription of the site and said it had submitted an amendment to the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported inscription of the site.

La délégation de **Madagascar** considère que l'inscription est vivement souhaitée, soulignant les liens très forts entre nature et culture dans les aires protégées en Afrique. Il s'agit d'un patrimoine vivant, symbole des paysages culturels. La délégation serait déçue – ébranlée – si le bien n'était pas inscrit, car c'est tout un symbole. Elle rappelle en outre qu'il existe trois niveaux de protection du bien, impliquant la population, permettant ainsi de réduire les coûts de protection.

The **Chairperson** asked whether any of the Committee members did not support the site's inscription.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said it supported inscription.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS under what criteria the property would be inscribed, since it had not identified the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

ICOMOS agreed that a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value would have to be provided to the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** read out Mauritius' amendment including the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value it proposed, and also the amendment proposed by Canada.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, **ICOMOS** read the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed that the Advisory Body be allowed to convene on the matter of Outstanding Universal Value and that the decision be taken at a later stage.

The Delegation of **Canada** endorsed that proposal.

The **Chairperson** said that that was not feasible, as the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had to be clear to the Committee and the return travel plans of the State Party delegation must be borne in mind.

La délégation de **Madagascar** est convaincue de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site et un texte est déjà au point.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS whether it could describe the two proposed criteria in a general fashion.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether a compromise could be found and whether the item could be suspended in order to allow some time for the Advisory Bodies to confer, as there was a consensus in favour of inscription.

ICOMOS noted that the Delegation of Mauritius had added criterion (vi) in its draft amendment but that it would read the justification for criteria (iii) and (v). ICOMOS noted that there was no overarching statement provided.

The **Chairperson** expressed concern that proper process was not being followed and asked that ICOMOS draft an overarching statement.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked whether there was room to accommodate criterion (vi) and asked why it was being disregarded.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, the **Rapporteur** read out the justification for criterion (vi) as drafted by the Delegation of Mauritius.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to comment.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said it supported inclusion.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that it did not necessarily disagree, but that it was difficult to reflect on the matter in such haste. It also stressed the fact that there had been no talk of the property's integrity and authenticity and that proper process was not being followed.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** pointed out that the first half of criterion (vi) was omitted from the part of the ICOMOS report that summarized the position of the State Party.

The **Chairperson** said that she had misgivings about the process. She asked whether there were any objections, and, hearing none, said she took it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision as amended. She congratulated the State Party.

Decision **32 COM 8B.50** was adopted as amended.

*The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their support. The inscription was an indicator of the Committee's will to correct the imbalance of the past. The State Party of Kenya felt greatly encouraged by the inscription and announced that it would substantially increase its contribution to the African World Heritage Fund. It extended thanks to the Chairperson and expressed gratitude to the City of Quebec for its warm hospitality.*

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Property	River Island of Majuli in midstream of Brahmaputra River in Assam
Id. N°	1206 Rev
State Party	India
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(v)(vi)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.51**

ICOMOS presented the site, also nominated as a cultural landscape. At the previous Committee session it had been referred back to the State Party for supplementary information. Majuli Island, with its 243 villages, had been the cultural centre of Assam for 500 years. ICOMOS considered that the property's Outstanding Universal Value had not yet been demonstrated or the criteria justified. It recommended that the nomination be deferred for the State Party to assemble a complete inventory of the surviving sattras, in addition to demonstrating support for the management plan.

La délégation de **Madagascar** considère que ce paysage culturel est une œuvre merveilleuse de l'homme et de la nature, cohérente, originale et appartenant à une catégorie sous-représentée de la Liste. La délégation pense que les demandes de l'ICOMOS sont excessives et que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle était déjà prouvée à Vilnius. Elle se prononce en faveur de l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the statement made by the Delegation of Madagascar. It considered that the site was of great importance and that ICOMOS was making a great mistake. It was disappointed with the way Kenya had been treated by ICOMOS and did not wish another State Party to be similarly treated unjustly. Drawing attention to the fact that ICOMOS had said in its previous evaluation that the site did indeed have Outstanding Universal Value, it said that Outstanding Universal Value could not have been lost in one year. Man and the ecosystem were in harmony in the site, which had been chosen for its totality, with its fragile ecosystem. The Delegation strongly wished to see the site inscribed on the World Heritage List and said that there seemed to be a total misunderstanding. ICOMOS appeared not to be well disposed towards some State Parties and the application of double standards ought to stop.

La délégation du **Maroc** se joint à Madagascar et au Kenya, soulignant qu'elle ressentait cela comme une grande injustice. Elle précise que Majuli est une île grande comme la Belgique traversée par un fleuve comme le Mississippi et s'étonne qu'on n'ait pas été capable de trouver sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. La délégation déplore et se dit étonnée par le fait que l'on demande toujours plus à l'Etat partie. La délégation du Maroc souhaite poser trois questions à l'Etat partie. Elle lui demande (a) s'il croit que Majuli a une valeur universelle exceptionnelle ; (b) comment il a été concrètement associé aux traditions vivantes de valeur universelle exceptionnelle ; (c) s'il a pris des mesures pour lutter à moyen terme contre l'érosion, comme l'ICOMOS l'a recommandé.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** supported the site's inscription and asked the State Party to indicate the measures it had taken to combat erosion. It failed to understand how ICOMOS could now say there was no Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **China** observed that the site was the cradle of Assam civilization and asked the State Party how tangible heritage was linked with intangible heritage in order to demonstrate the property's Outstanding Universal Value more clearly.

La délégation de **Espagne** indique qu'elle souhaitait poser les questions déjà émises par le Maroc.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that it also wished the site to be inscribed, but asked how it was possible for the Committee to come to a final decision without there having been a mission.

La délégation de **Tunisie** indique combien le matériel et l'immatériel se conjuguent dans ce site. Elle considère que l'aspect émotionnel, pourtant essentiel, n'est pas pris en compte dans le rapport. Enfin, elle précise que « Majoli » constitue une belle expression en français.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that the tenor of the discussion was disturbing. While the Committee might question ICOMOS, it must not be forgotten that ICOMOS endeavoured to uphold standards and apply the rules of the Convention. The Delegation stressed that some of what had been said was unfair. It wished to ask ICOMOS whether it had been determined that Outstanding Universal Value was there. The United States Delegation was not convinced that the site had Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that its concern was more to do with the fact that appropriate resources were not being used to assess the properties adequately, and it therefore asked ICOMOS what scientific advice it had sought when assessing the site. Finally, the Delegation said that ICOMOS might not be equipped to assess intangible universal values.

The **Chairperson**, answering the question raised by Egypt regarding a mission, said that when the site had been discussed previously at the Committee's 30th session in Vilnius the recommendation had been that the site be deferred. However, the Committee's decision had been that the site be referred. The consequence of that decision by the Committee was that no mission was required. The Chairperson went on to ask ICOMOS where it saw potential Outstanding Universal Value, and about its assessment process.

ICOMOS replied that when it had first received the nomination, it had looked at it as a sacred cultural landscape, and that it had considered the sattras very carefully. It had noted that it had potential Outstanding Universal Value and had asked the State Party for further information. However, upon receiving the additional information requested, ICOMOS had felt that the site's potential had not been realized. ICOMOS considered in its evaluation that the sattras were the repositories of a very interesting system and that intangible value lay in the sattras rather than in the landscape. The intangible values had been considered very carefully and ICOMOS would have liked to have seen further photographs and details of the site.

The **Chairperson** noted that, while there was a general tendency towards inscribing the site, the criteria for inscription were not clear. The site as nominated was the whole island, yet the Advisory Body, ICOMOS, felt that only the sattras had Outstanding Universal Value. That inevitably created an important issue.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed support for inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the procedural issues arising from the consequences of deferrals and referrals of nominations made the Committee's work very difficult. There had been no mission and, as a result, there were different views on the property's Outstanding Universal Value which put the State Party in a very awkward position. As with the previous decision, there was a need to re-examine some of the processes, as very difficult decisions had to be made in a short amount of time.

The **Chairperson** said that the point of general principle was well taken, but it did not help resolve the present situation.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it did not consider there to be a problem in the case in question and that it would be advisable to give the State Party the chance to say under what criteria it would like to nominate the site.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party of India to specify (a) under which criteria it would like to nominate the site and (b) the link between tangible and intangible heritage.

The Observer Delegation of **India** specified that it would like to see the site inscribed under criteria (ii), (iii), (v) and (vi). At the Committee's 30th session in Vilnius there had been a tendency towards acceptance of criterion (ii) and that was the reason why the latest report

provided spoke to that criterion. With regard to the Chairperson's second question, the Delegation responded that tangible and intangible heritage were linked in the composition of sattras, as indicated by ICOMOS. The Delegation then went on to describe the site.

The **Chairperson** said that the discussion would be resumed the following morning.

The meeting rose at 01.00 p.m.

SEVENTH DAY – TUESDAY, 8 JULY 2008

FOURTEENTH MEETING

9.00 a.m. – 1.00 pm

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

River Island of Majuli in midstream of Brahmaputra River in Assam (India) (N 1206 rev) (continued)

Document: WHC-08/32 8B.Add

Decision: 32 COM 8B.51

The **Chairperson** recalled that the discussion on the property at the previous meeting had been suspended and that there had been a procedural problem. The deliberations on the nomination would now be resumed.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its concern about the discussions the previous day and in particular the tendency to inscribe sites that were proposed for referral or deferral. It stressed the necessity to continue to respect the *Operational Guidelines* and the professional advice of the Advisory Bodies, as otherwise the credibility of the *Convention* was at risk.

The Delegation of **Australia**, strongly supported by the Delegations of **Canada** and **Barbados**, shared the concerns of the Delegation of Sweden and recalled the obligation for the Committee to ensure the integrity of the *Convention*. It stressed the need to be cautious and to follow the rules, and to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value was established before sites were inscribed and that inscriptions were accompanied by Statements of Outstanding Universal Value. It supported the Advisory Bodies in their work, as the credibility of the World Heritage List was dependent upon their expert advice.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** rejoint les propos des délégations de la Suède et de l'Australie. Elle insiste sur le fait que le Comité se doit de respecter les Orientations tant que ces dernières n'ont pas été modifiées de manière démocratique. Quant à l'expertise des Organisations consultatives, elle rappelle que la position de ces dernières sert à guider le Comité mais que celles-ci ne sont pas des paroles « bibliques ». Le Comité doit préserver sa souveraineté et garder le droit de ne pas respecter l'avis des Organisations consultatives.

The Delegation of **Brazil** echoed the opinion of the Delegation of Tunisia and pointed out that, although it was a new member, it had been present in Christchurch and that on several occasions the Committee had not followed the recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies. It stressed that it was the mandate of the Committee to inscribe new sites and that the Committee could also draft a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed that it was necessary to follow the rules but noted that neither the *Convention* nor the *Operational Guidelines* were cast in stone. It did not doubt the quality of the work of the Advisory Bodies but only raised the issue of consistency. It would not shy away from drawing attention to the use of double standards and stressed that no part of the world had the monopoly of knowledge of the *Convention*. The Committee should appreciate diversity.

La délégation de **Madagascar** indique que, lors de sa 30e session (Vilnius, 2006) (**30 COM 8B.40**), le Comité, reconnaissant que le bien a effectivement une valeur universelle exceptionnelle, a décidé de renvoyer le dossier à l'Etat partie, alors qu'à sa 32e session, l'évaluation propose de différer le dossier. Elle se demande si les indications du Comité sont cohérentes.

The Delegation of **Peru** endorsed the statements made by the Delegations of Brazil, Tunisia and Kenya, adding that, like the Delegation of Madagascar, it had a major concern about coherence. The Advisory Bodies should ensure that a proper assessment of a property's Outstanding Universal Value was made and they should be responsible for the preservation of heritage as well.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed with the Delegation of Tunisia, adding that the recommendations made in the particular case under consideration were not “gospel”.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with the Delegations of Sweden, Australia and Canada. It believed that the understanding of different cultures was at the heart of the matter and referred to the conclusions of the Nara meeting that more work was needed to understand authenticity. It suggested that there was a need to complete the *Operational Guidelines* in that respect and that an expert workshop to look into the matter might be needed.

La délégation du **Maroc** s'avoue très surprise par ce débat qui représente une grande perte de temps alors que le point 8B de l'ordre du jour est loin d'être achevé, et qui semble remettre en cause les responsabilités des uns et des autres. Elle ajoute que si l'on comparait les *Orientations* à une règle mathématique, alors les sessions du Comité pourraient se faire par échanges d'emails. Les sessions du Comité sont une alchimie entre les membres du Comité présents aux différentes sessions. Elle conclut en indiquant que ce débat risque de pénaliser les propositions d'inscription qui restent à examiner et appelle à continuer le point 8B dans un esprit de consensus et de cohérence.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed misgivings about moving ahead with inscription before the property's Outstanding Universal Value was established by the Advisory Bodies.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to turn to the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the different amendments, including the amendment from the Delegation of Mauritius proposing inscription.

The Delegation of **Australia** reiterated its opinion that no site should be listed unless its Outstanding Universal Value was recognized. It considered that that was not the case and therefore requested a secret ballot on the draft amendment.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** seconded the request.

The **Chairperson** invited the Legal Adviser to explain the procedure and requested clarification of the majority required.

The **Legal Adviser** explained the procedure and clarified that a two-thirds majority was needed in order to approve the amendment as proposed by Mauritius.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the Delegations of Peru and Madagascar should act as tellers.

La délégation du **Maroc** précise qu'elle ne pense pas que le Comité ait décidé de voter.

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Legal Adviser** clarified that a secret ballot was necessary if requested by at least two members of the Committee, as was the case.

The **Chairperson** suspended the debate to enable the secretariat to prepare the ballot.

Property	Sulamain-Too Sacred Mountain
Id. N°	1230 Rev
State Party	Kyrgyzstan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(vi) + CL

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.52**

ICOMOS presented the proposed nomination as a site and a cultural landscape. At the 31st session of the Committee, the property had been referred back to the State Party to complete the Management Plan, extend the buffer zone, etc. The property was situated at the crossroads of the silk roads, dominating the city of Osh. ICOMOS considered that further protection needed to be put in place and that there was an urgent need to incorporate the protected area into the town plan; the development of a tourism strategy was also important. ICOMOS recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **China** noted that it was the second time that the nomination was before the Committee for discussion and that the property's Outstanding Universal Value had been clearly established by ICOMOS. The nomination had been referred back to the State Party on the previous occasion because of management concerns, and the Delegation wished to hear from the State Party if the recommendations of ICOMOS had already been implemented and, if so, would like to propose inscription of the property on the List.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** souhaite entendre l'Etat partie sur tous les problèmes mentionnés (autoroute, aménagement urbain, etc...), problèmes qui ne peuvent pas être résolus du jour au lendemain. Elle se demande si l'Etat partie aura le temps de les résoudre si le Comité renvoie la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it appreciated that ICOMOS considered the property to be of Outstanding Universal Value, but the main issue remained the development projects threatening the property. The Governor had requested the President to issue a decree to stop the projects. The Delegation wanted to know whether that had been done.

The Delegation of **Jordan** concurred with the Delegation of Tunisia.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it wished to ask the State Party two questions, namely if the construction of the aerial ropeway and other developments had been stopped and if it was planned to include the property in the transnational silk road project.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to reply to the questions.

The Observer Delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** stated that the ropeway project had been abandoned and that Kyrgyzstan had fulfilled all the recommendations of ICOMOS, including the recommendation concerning high-rise buildings. It further clarified that, although the proposed property was associated with the Silk Road nomination, it was not planned for inclusion therein and was a separate nomination.

Decision **32 COM 8B.52** was adopted, and the property was inscribed.

Property	Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra – Towns of southern Albania, exceptional testimonies of well-preserved Ottoman settlements in the Balkan region
Id. N°	569 Bis
State Party	Albania
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.56**

ICOMOS présente la candidature. Beirat a fait beaucoup de progrès dans la mise en place d'une structure de gestion appropriée et a produit un plan de gestion adapté. ICOMOS recommande que la proposition d'inscription soit renvoyé à l'Etat partie afin de lui permettre de préciser la coordination d'un plan de gestion pour les deux villes et d'apporter des garanties sur sa mise en place.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** considered that the case was a good example of where a property's Outstanding Universal Value was already demonstrated and where it was possible for the Committee to adjust the recommendation by the Advisory Body. It wished to know from the State Party if the management structure was already established.

La délégation du **Maroc** précise que l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS est très positive. Cependant, elle ajoute que l'année précédente, la proposition de l'ICOMOS était de faire une proposition en série, ce qui nécessitait toutefois un nouveau plan de gestion. Elle rappelle ensuite la demande faite, par 15 membres du Comité lors de la 31e session, d'inscrire ce bien. Elle ajoute que le plan de gestion en question a été réalisé et indique que l'Etat partie a suivi les recommandations de l'ICOMOS. Elle demande, par conséquent, avec force l'inscription de cette ville, démonstration extraordinaire du dialogue interculturel et interreligieux.

La délégation de **Madagascar** s'exprime en faveur de l'inscription du site. Elle considère que le plan de gestion est crédible et prend en compte le tourisme.

The Delegation of **Egypt** concurred with the Delegation of the United States of America. The report from ICOMOS was not in accordance with what had already been heard.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the remarks by the Delegation of the United States of America.

The Delegation of **Brazil** voiced its uneasiness about the justification given by ICOMOS for the referral and considered that the remaining activities could be completed after inscription. It did not agree with the opinion expressed by the Delegation of the United States of America that Outstanding Universal Value had to be established by the Advisory Bodies, as it considered that to be the responsibility of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** requested the State Party to specify whether a coordination mechanism had been set up.

La délégation de l'**Albanie** tient à remercier l'ICOMOS pour l'évaluation positive qui a été effectuée sur les valeurs de Berat.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it believed the property was ready to be inscribed.

The **Chairperson** concluded that there was consensus concerning inscription and requested the Rapporteur to read out the proposed amendments.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments.

ICOMOS presented the proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

Decision **32 COM 8B.56** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

La délégation de l'**Albanie** (observateur) fait la déclaration suivante :

Madame la Présidente,

Mes chers collègues,

Je ne peux cacher mon émotion de voir, enfin, aboutir le long processus qui a conduit jusqu'à l'inscription de la ville de Berat sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, en série avec Gjirokastra.

Je tiens à remercier l'ensemble des membres du Comité, l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial, de leur approbation. Il s'agit pour l'Albanie et pour les autorités régionales et municipales d'un soutien décisif. Au-delà du prestige, l'inscription constitue, en effet, pour nous, une invitation à appliquer le mieux possible les recommandations de notre Comité, mais aussi une incitation à faire de Berat et Gjirokastra un modèle de développement culturel concerté et de solidarité tout au plan national qu'au niveau international.

Madame la Présidente,

Je voudrais également m'adresser au Centre du patrimoine mondial, aux experts de l'ICOMOS et de l'ICCROM et les assurer que notre Institut des Monuments de Culture et les Autorités communales de Berat et Gjirokastra comptent beaucoup sur leur coopération à l'avenir, en vue d'assurer la sauvegarde des valeurs universelles exceptionnelles qui ont été reconnues dans ces deux villes.

De la sorte, je réitère notre engagement envers le Comité.

Pour finir, je tiens aussi à mettre de nouveau en lumière une autre valeur fondamentale de Berat. Cette ville patrimoniale, connue pour ses trésors d'art, d'archéologie, de la coexistence, tout au long des siècles, de différentes communautés religieuses, dans l'harmonie, la sauvegarde de la spécificité culturelle de chaque communauté et l'attachement au dialogue.

Je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente, de la façon particulière dont vous conduisez les travaux de ce Comité.

Je remercie le Gouvernement canadien pour son accueil chaleureux, la délégation du Canada auprès de l'UNESCO et j'adresse mes vives félicitations au peuple canadien à l'occasion du 400^{ème} anniversaire.

Merci de votre attention.

River Island of Majuli in midstream of Brahmaputra River in Assam (India) (N 1206 rev)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM 8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.51**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to proceed to the secret ballot on the proposed amendment to the decision on the River Island of Majuli.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the **Chairperson's** request, the Delegations of Peru and Madagascar acted as tellers.

The result of the vote was as follows:

Number of members present:	21
Number of members absent:	0
Number of blank ballot papers:	4
Number of invalid ballot papers:	0
Number of votes recorded:	17
Majority required:	12
Number of votes obtained:	9

Having failed to obtain the required majority, the amendment was rejected.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to return to the proposed draft decision and asked if other amendments were proposed.

Decision **32 COM 8B.51** was adopted, and the nomination was deferred.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated, for the record, that it considered it unfortunate that a vote had been called for, particularly in the light of the lack of time. It would have preferred a decision to have been taken by consensus and did not believe that all possibilities to build consensus had been exhausted. It expressed its concern about the procedure followed.

Property	Bahá'í Holy Places in Haifa and Western Galilee
Id. N°	1220
State Party	Israel
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(vi)

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add
WHC-08/32.COM/8B1. Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.57**

ICOMOS presented the nominated property, as a serial nomination of 26 sites, including two major shrines, and a cultural landscape. At the 31st session, the nomination had been referred back to the State Party for more information on Outstanding Universal Value and a revised nomination. ICOMOS recommended that only the property's holy shrines should be inscribed, with a name change.

The Delegation of **Jordan** indicated that it preferred to keep the original name for the property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its support for the inscription of the two shrines alone. It noted that the reservations it had expressed at the previous session were covered by the revised nomination.

The Delegation of **Kenya** reiterated its support for inscription and said it was happy that the Delegation of the United States of America had changed its opinion.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that the case had already been discussed at the 31st session in 2007 and, noting that 26 places shared the same name, wondered whether they could all be described as being of Outstanding Universal Value. It added that the nomination would be an affront to the Islamic world, as there was nothing holy at all in the proposed places.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed its support for the nomination.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** indique qu'il s'agit d'une secte, et par conséquent se demande comment des monuments appartenant à une secte peuvent avoir une valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS to respond to the two questions raised: the 26 places and their inscription and the question of Outstanding Universal Value.

ICOMOS explained that it had looked very carefully at all 26 places originally proposed. It believed that Outstanding Universal Value had been identified under criteria (iii) and (vi), in view of the importance of the site in terms of pilgrimage. However, that phenomenon was seated only in the two main shrines, not in all the 26 sites.

The Delegation of **Canada** commended ICOMOS for the quality of the evaluation and supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed the point that the nomination was not a useful gesture for the whole region, and called for a vote by secret ballot.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** supported the Delegation of Jordan.

The Delegation of **Cuba** asked ICOMOS which criteria had been used for the comparative analysis of the site.

ICOMOS replied that a detailed comparative analysis had been presented, not by comparing different faiths but by comparing the manifestations of faith and their influence.

La délégation du **Maroc** souhaite savoir de la part de l'ICOMOS qui gère le bien et de l'organisation consultative indiquant, qu'en cas de menace, les populations Bahaï se mobiliseraient si c'est la communauté internationale ou la communauté Bahaï.

ICOMOS explained that the evaluation set out all different parameters, including the question of support from the stakeholders, but that of course it was the State Party that had the responsibility for conservation of the property. It pointed out that it had voiced concerns about the site's vulnerability before but that that concern had been addressed by adjustments made to the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Cuba** reformulated its request to ICOMOS, indicating that it was not asking about faith, but about criteria used to compare those monuments to others for the purposes of comparative analysis.

ICOMOS replied that it had compared examples of how different faiths were manifested around the world. The specifics of the property in question, in particular as a place of pilgrimage, set it apart.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the question of the name still needed to be clarified, as two proposals had been put forward.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** indique qu'il est de son devoir d'attirer l'attention des membres du Comité sur le fait de présenter des sites « soi-disant » présentant une valeur universelle exceptionnelle, alors qu'elle est d'avis que, par définition, une secte ne peut pas avoir une telle valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et se refuse d'appuyer l'inscription d'une secte, quelle qu'elle soit.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked if the Legal Adviser could specify whether or not the World Heritage Committee was authorized to give humanity a new religion and to nominate a new religion.

The **Legal Adviser** explained that it was for the Committee to decide whether a nominated property responded to the criteria for inscription and considered that the matter at hand was not a legal question.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed regret that the Legal Adviser was avoiding answering its question and asked the Chairperson for her opinion.

The **Chairperson** said that the nomination proposed for inscription was a site, not a religion, and recalled that there were many properties on the World Heritage List associated with other religions.

The Delegation of **Egypt** objected that the nomination dossier indicated "religion".

The **Chairperson** reiterated that the name referred to the place and asked if there was any objection to adopting the draft decision as proposed.

The **Rapporteur** recalled that the question of the two titles proposed for the property remained to be resolved.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said it wished to know if the motion for a vote put forward by Egypt had been taken into consideration, or withdrawn.

The **Chairperson** said that, no other Committee member having seconded the motion, as provided for under Rule 41 of the Rules of Procedure, she was proceeding with consideration of the draft decision.

Following a further comment by the Delegation of **Brazil**, the **Legal Adviser** confirmed that, since the motion had not been seconded, Rule 41 did not apply.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, the **Rapporteur** read out the two titles proposed for the property.

The **Chairperson** asked if there was any objection to the name change proposed by the Delegation of Israel and, hearing none, said she took it that the proposed name was acceptable.

The **Rapporteur** read out the further changes that had been proposed to the paragraphs of the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 8B.57** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party of Israel.

*The Delegation of **Israel** thanked the World Heritage Committee, on behalf of all the local communities in Haifa and in Western Galilee and the Baha'i community around the world, for inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.*

La délégation de la **Tunisie** remercie la Présidente mais se dit découragée de voir qu'on ouvre la voie en acceptant que des sectes siègent au Comité. Elle demande à l'ICOMOS s'il s'est bien informé, notamment en consultant des cartes, car la zone-tampon se trouve sur la frontière dans une zone qui n'appartient pas à l'Etat partie d'Israël. Il indique que le Comité ne peut pas prendre de décision tant qu'il n'a pas vérifié toutes ces données. Il s'agit d'une frontière explosive et il réitère son souhait que l'ICOMOS fasse une enquête préalable avant toute prise de décision de la part du Comité.

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** indique que dans le document d'évaluation du site, il est indiqué que le nom a été changé. En ce qui concerne la valeur universelle exceptionnelle (il lit le texte concernant la VUE)

In clarifying further the **Chairperson** cited the title of the property as 'Baha'i Holy Place', and called for other amendments to the decision.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of two outstanding draft decisions. The first concerned a nominated property in Vanuatu.

Property	Chief Roi Mata's Domain
Id. N°	1280
State Party	Vanuatu
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(vi) + CL

(continued)

Decision : 32 COM 8B.27 rev.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the revised draft decision discussed in a working group led by the Delegation of Australia.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed changes, with further minor editorial amendments proposed by the Delegations of Australia and Barbados.

Decision **32 COM 8B. 27** was adopted as amended, and the property was inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of Vanuatu extended thanks to the Chairperson and the Committee for inscribing the first of Vanuatu's cultural landscape heritage properties to be included in the World Heritage List. That decision would encourage other Pacific island countries to work towards their nominations in the near future. Effective protection and management of the property would be ensured in the future. The Republic of Vanuatu was confident that its strong track record in innovative heritage management would enable it to meet the inscription conditions set by the World Heritage Committee and ICOMOS.

Property	Triple-arch Gate at Dan
Id. N°	1105
State Party	Israel
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iv)

(continued)

Decision: 32COM 34 Rev.

The **Chairperson** drew the Committee's attention to the new draft Decision **32 COM 8B. 34 Rev.** concerning the Triple-arch Gate at Dan, Israel, which referred the nomination back to the State Party, and recalled that a working group had been set up to examine the issue at hand.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, reporting on behalf of the group, explained that the group had met twice but had been unable to reach agreement on determining Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It suggested that the Chairperson might wish to re-open discussion on the nomination in order for the Committee to take a decision.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Brazil for its leadership of the group.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed its deep concern and disappointment about the ICOMOS evaluation, which demonstrated controversies related to historical archaeological information and the ownership and supposed Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It pointed out that the site concerned a disputed area that would require legal property

clarification, but there was no mention of that in the ICOMOS report. On the contrary, the ICOMOS evaluation assumed that it was the property of the State of Israel, without giving any reference. The fortifications, which were an integral part of the site, were located in the buffer zone, which was clearly an occupied territory of Syria and where illegal excavations were taking place. The information concerning the archaeological evidence and Biblical identification was misleading and not up to date. Furthermore, the site name had been changed.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it wished ICOMOS to remind the Committee why it found Outstanding Universal Value in the property.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the Committee was in position to resolve neither international conflicts nor judge international borders and that it was not a matter to be submitted to the Legal Adviser. A report by Israel a day earlier had said that the property was located in Israeli territory. The State Party of Egypt considered that that was not the case and wished the State Party of Israel to specify the location of the property. It was not up to the Committee to determine such issues and the Delegation proposed that the nomination be deferred until the question of ownership of the property was solved. The views of the distinguished representatives of Palestine, Lebanon and Syria, who were present, might usefully be sought on the matter.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** se dit découragée de voir qu'on ouvre la voie aux sectes dans cette session du Comité. Elle se réfère à la question du principe fondateur et déclare que l'ICOMOS devrait jeter un oeil aux cartes du site et contacter les parties prenantes, affirmant ainsi que la zone n'appartient pas à l'Etat Partie d'Israel. En effet, la Délégation se demande si toutes les parties prenantes ont bien été consultées.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, referring to Article II, paragraph 3, of the *Convention*, pointed out that the inscription of a site did not prejudice territorial claims on that site. If the property was of Outstanding Universal Value and if the Committee wished to inscribe it then it could do so, and that did not depend either upon the Advisory Bodies. Should the Committee wish to postpone the nomination to a future session, it could likewise decide to do so.

The Chairperson called upon ICOMOS for clarification.

ICOMOS clarified the question of the name of the property and specified that there was Outstanding Universal Value present.

The **Chairperson** called upon the State Party of Israel to provide clarifications.

The Delegation of **Israel**, referring to ownership, said that it thought that the property was within the territory of Israel but that to dispel any problems it would provide more documentation for the Committee.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** déclare que ICOMOS aurait du vérifier que ce site appartenait bien à Israel avant de proposer sa candidature au Comité et que ceci est préoccupant.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked again that the concerned Delegations of Palestine, Lebanon and Syria be consulted on the issue.

The **Chairperson** said that, on account of time constraints, she was unable to give the floor to the concerned observer delegations, as the nomination was a matter for the Committee only. A clarification would be sought, the text was now before the Committee and ICOMOS had also given its report. She sought the Committee's views on whether "has" or "may have" should be used in connection with Outstanding Universal Value in paragraph 2 of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Jordan** said that no agreement had been reached in the working group and recommended using “may have”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** inquired if the property contained Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegations of **Canada** and **Australia** said that the property did have Outstanding Universal Value, on the basis of the information provided by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Spain** said it accepted the explanation that there was Outstanding Universal Value in the property on the basis of the information provided by ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson**, noting that there were three objections to the use of the word “has” in the draft decision, said she took it that the draft decision was acceptable.

Decision **32 COM 34 Rev.** was adopted, and the nomination was referred back to the State Party.

ITEM 8B CHANGES TO CRITERIA OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.46**

The **Chairperson** asked the Advisory Body to explain a number of minor modifications to boundaries.

IUCN said that the decision before the Committee concerned the completion of an exercise largely dealt with at the Committee’s session in Lithuania. Two properties had been held over and that process had now been completed.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 8B.46** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS AND MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE BOUNDARIES OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Srebarna Nature Reserve, Bulgaria

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.47**

IUCN recommended approval of the proposed creation of a 673 ha buffer zone for the 638 ha. **Srebarna Nature Reserve, Bulgaria**, in order to strengthen the integrity and the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property.

Following interventions from **IUCN**, the **Secretariat**, the **Chairperson** and the Delegations of **Hungary, Australia** and **Kenya**, the **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee wished to approve the proposed creation of a 673 ha buffer zone for the **Srebarna Nature Reserve, Bulgaria**.

Decision **32 COM 8B.47** was adopted and the proposed modification was approved.

Caves of Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst (Hungary/Slovakia)

Document : WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision : **32 COM 8B.48**

The **Chairperson** asked the Legal Adviser to provide some information.

The **Legal Adviser** read out a letter from the Head of the Delegation of Slovakia addressed to the Director of the World Heritage Centre, and asked the Secretariat to explain its content.

Le **Secrétariat** explique que, comme mentionné dans le document, le bien est transfrontalier et, comme précisé au paragraphe 2, il s'agit essentiellement d'une extension en Hongrie et que celle-ci est recommandée par l'UICN. Il explique également que les paragraphes 3 et 4 traitent de la partie du site qui se trouve en Slovaquie et que c'est au Comité de décider quels amendements il souhaite apporter.

The **Chairperson** requested further explanations about the implications and the impact of the decision to be taken by the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Hungary** explained that it was a common site together with Slovakia. The Hungarian part posed no particular problem, but the State Party of Slovakia had wished to reduce the boundaries on the Slovakian side. Slovakia now no longer wished to change those boundaries and had withdrawn its proposal, agreeing to keep to the existing ones. Discussion had taken place with the authorities of Slovakia, but unfortunately the Delegation of that State Party was not in the room to explain further. The Observer Delegation of Hungary suggested deleting paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft decision, but that was for the Committee, not observers, to decide.

The **Chairperson** asked the Legal Adviser whether it was appropriate to withdraw the two paragraphs in question.

The **Legal Adviser** said that clarification concerning the transboundary proposal was a technical question and would be answered by colleagues from the Secretariat.

The **Secretariat** explained that paragraphs 3 and 4 referred the case back to the States Parties in order to ascertain whether there was a modification in the existing definition of the site and its boundaries, namely that the Hungarian part would be changed, but the Slovakian part would not. If the Committee approved the decision, it would be fully respected. If Slovakia decided to maintain the proposed reduction in the surface area and buffer zone, it should provide further justification and information for the next Committee session. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to adopting the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that the case raised unresolved issues with regard to serial nominations and regretted that one of the States Parties was not present. Its comment was not an objection to the proposal as such.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it understood that the boundaries on the Slovakian side would remain the same as they were now.

The **Chairperson** said that, by adopting the draft decision as it stood and referring the proposal back to the State Party of Slovakia, the same objective would be achieved.

Decision **32 COM 8B.48** was adopted, and the proposed modification was referred back to the State Party of Slovakia.

MIXED PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid Region, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.49**

The **Chairperson**, **IUCN** and **ICOMOS** introduced the proposed modification and the draft decision, in which the World Heritage Committee referred the proposed modification to the boundary of the Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid Region, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, back to the State Party for reconsideration.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if there were any objections to the draft decision.

ICOMOS said that it had considered the proposal from the point of view of the cultural attributes and values of the site. The new boundary put forward was based on an analysis of cultural heritage and archaeological sites. It was the view of ICOMOS that a more logical boundary had been delineated in relation to the property's cultural values, but that conflicted slightly with the view of IUCN, which was looking at the new boundary in landscape and natural terms. ICOMOS would be happy to accept the revised boundary of the property in relation to the property's cultural values.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 8B.49** was adopted, and the proposed modification was referred back to the State Party.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Old Town of Lijiang in China

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.53**

ICOMOS presented the proposed boundary modifications to the buffer zones for two villages in the property. More details needed to be provided by the State Party.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to the draft decision deferring the proposed modifications in order to enable the State Party to consider enlarging the buffer zone and put in place protective measures.

Decision **32 COM 8B. 53** was adopted, and the proposed modification was deferred.

ARAB STATES

Qal'at al Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.54**

ICOMOS introduced the property. Minor modifications had been proposed for the property and a much enlarged buffer zone. ICOMOS proposed approval.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 8B.54** was adopted, and the modification was approved.

The Archaeological Site of Volubilis, Morocco

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.55**

ICOMOS presented the property. The proposed buffer zone was entirely satisfactory and ICOMOS recommended approval.

Decision **32 COM 8B.55** was adopted, and the modification was approved.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn, Estonia

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.58**

ICOMOS recommended approval of the proposed extension of the buffer zone, while urging the State Party of Estonia to prepare a comprehensive management plan for the property, including the enlarged area. It stressed the need to consider development of the wider

setting beyond the buffer zone for its impact on the values of the property, as stated in the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 8B.58** was adopted, and the modification was approved.

.St Mary's Cathedral and St Michael's Church in Hildesheim, Germany

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.59**

ICOMOS said it approved the extension of the buffer zone, especially to protect the visual integrity of the property, with minor modifications. It recommended that the State Party provide the World Heritage Centre with specific information on administrative measures concerning the buffer zone as a complementary element to the Management Plan.

Decision **32 COM 8B.59** was adopted, and the modification was approved.

Cologne Cathedral, Germany

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.60**

ICOMOS presented the proposal for an enlarged buffer zone.

Decision **32 COM 8B.60** was adopted, and the modification was approved.

After their presentation by ICOMOS, the following decisions were adopted without discussion:

Decision **32 COM 8B.61**

Mines of Fammelsberg and Historic Town of Gosler, Germany

Decision **32 COM 8B.62**

Vilnius Historical Centre, Lithuania

Decision **32 COM 8B.63**

Wieliczka Salt Mine, Poland

Decision **32 COM 8B.64**

Historic Centre of Evora, Portugal

Decision **32 COM 8B.65**

Monastery of the Hieronymites and

Tower of Belem in Lisbon, Portugal

Decision 32 COM 8B.66

**Old Town of Avila with its Extra-
Muros Churches, Spain**

Decision 32 COM 8B.67

**Palau de la Musica Catalana and
Hospital de Sant Pau, Barcelona, Spain**

Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev Pechersk Lavra, Ukraine

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add

Decision: **32 COM 8B.68**

ICOMOS informed the Committee that the State Party recommended extending the core area of the property to include two further churches, which would make it a serial nomination. ICOMOS was concerned that the criteria for the first nomination would not be entirely applicable to the additional churches, and had concerns about the State of Conservation and protection arrangements for the two further churches. It did not consider the proposal to be a minor modification; a full nomination was needed.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Jordan** said it would prefer to give the State Party an opportunity to clarify the situation of the site. The State Party had been advised by the Advisory Body to submit a proposal for extension without being told to prepare a full nomination when it was working on it.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Ukraine.

The Observer Delegation of **Ukraine** said it had submitted a request to include the two churches. Ukraine considered that its proposal, which would enlarge the territory, would not have any significant consequences.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the draft decision requesting submission of a full nomination.

Decision **32 COM 8B.68** was adopted and the State Party was invited to submit a full nomination.

The following decisions were adopted without discussion:

Decision 32 COM 8B.69

L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre, Ukraine

Decision 32 COM 8B.70

Durham Castle and Cathedral, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Decision 32 COM 8B.71

Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Decision 32 COM 8B.72

Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and St Margaret's Church, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

REVISION OF STATEMENTS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND OF STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

The **Chairperson**, introducing the item, said that a number of revisions had been withdrawn by the States Parties and were to be examined the following year on account of the wording. She proposed to proceed by reading out the names of the properties and asking whether there were any objections to the relevant draft decisions.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add.
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B1.Add.

Decision: **32 COM 8B. 73**

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that paragraph 3 of the draft decision was confusingly worded in terms of the *Operational Guidelines*. That issue recurred in some of the other decisions. Paragraph 3, as it was currently drafted, appeared to be inconsistent with the *Operational Guidelines* and should be redrafted or deleted. The Delegation suggested that the Rapporteur be empowered to draft a generic text that applied in similar circumstances.

The **Chairperson** asked if the Delegation of Australia's proposal was acceptable to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that the wording of paragraph 3 in the draft decision related to the Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Decision 32 COM 8B.74) should serve as a substitute.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with that proposal.

The **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee agreed that the suggested model would be the generic last paragraph on those statements in the relevant decisions.

It was so agreed.

Decision **32 COM 8B.73** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the following draft decisions had been withdrawn:

Decisions 32 COM 8B.74, 32 COM 8B.75, 32 COM 8B.76, 32 COM 8B.77, 32 COM 8B.78, 32 COM 8B.79, 32 COM 8B.80, 32 COM 8B.81, 32 COM 8B.82 and 32 COM 8B.83.

The following draft decision was adopted without discussion:

Historic Centre of Prague, Czech Republic

Decision: 32 COM 8B. 84

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the following draft decisions had been withdrawn :

Decisions 32 COM 8B.85, 32 COM 8B.86, 32 COM 8B.87, 32 COM 8B.88 and 32 COM 8B.89.

Durham Castle and Cathedral, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Decision: 32 COM 8B. 90

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the consistent wording of paragraph 3 as agreed earlier would apply to the decision under consideration.

La délégation du **Maroc** déclare ne pas s'opposer mais, en accord avec les propos de la délégation d'Australie sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, déclare aussi qu'il est temps pour le Comité d'en reconsidérer le format afin de faciliter l'appréhension des textes.

Decision **32 COM 8B.90** was adopted as amended.

The following decisions were adopted without discussion:

Decisions 32 COM 8B.91, 32 COM 8B.92, 32 COM 8B.93, 32 COM 8B.94, 32 COM 8B.95, 32COM 8B.96, 32 COM 8B.97, 32 COM 8B.98, 32 COM 8B.99, 32 COM 8B.100 and 32 COM 8B.101.

The **Rapporteur** recalled that those decisions were all adopted with the change in the last paragraph consistent with the model of the decision on the Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg, Austria, which had been verified.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that understanding.

She drew the Committee's attention to pending decisions under item 8.

ITEM 8C UPDATE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Decision: 32 COM 8C

The Secretariat presented an update to the Committee on World Heritage in Danger. At the current session there were no properties either inscribed on or removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee was therefore invited to decide to maintain the thirty properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Decision **32 COM 8C** was adopted.

ITEM 8D CLARIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND SIZES BY STATES PARTIES IN RESPONSE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE INVENTORY

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8D

Decision : 32 COM 8D

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the document to be examined was the result of work on the Retrospective Inventory in respect of nomination dossiers of European and Arab States World Heritage properties inscribed between 1978 and 1998. That in-depth examination of nomination dossiers had been initiated in 2004 and was available at the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN.

In its presentation, the **Secretariat** specified that the report represented the results of studies carried out under the Retrospective Inventory for 81 properties already inscribed on the List. The Committee was invited to take note of those clarifications for Europe and the Arab States.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft decision.

In response to a question by the Delegation of **Egypt** about the names of the Arab States listed on page five of the report, the **Secretariat** said that the States Parties of Egypt, Morocco and Tunisia had participated in the study.

The Delegation of **Egypt** queried the mention of Egypt, considering that the country had already submitted the requested information.

The **Secretariat** assured the Delegation that the wording would be amended accordingly.

Decision **32 COM 8D** was adopted.

ITEM 9 DISCUSSION ON OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Decision: 32 COM 9 Rev.

The **Chairperson** introduced the revised draft decision concerning Outstanding Universal Value, submitted by Australia, Brazil, Canada and Israel. She noted that there were still some minor changes to be made to the names of States Parties.

The Delegation of **Australia** presented the draft decision, noting that there had not been a Chair of the group. No formal meeting had taken place; a draft had simply been circulated under the Rapporteur's authority. It might therefore be appropriate for each country to speak about its particular position, or alternatively the draft decision might be considered as a whole.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the successive paragraphs of the draft decision.

La délégation du **Maroc** propose que la première partie du paragraphe 3 soit reformulée en français.

The Delegations of **Australia, Kenya** and the **United States of America** expressed support for the proposed draft.

IUCN, while supporting the draft text, pointed out that paragraphs 5 and 6 had budgetary implications and there might be a problem of delivery. Furthermore, the point at issue concerned cultural landscapes. It would have been helpful for IUCN to have taken part in the discussions on that point. It was another recommendation which had resource requirements and would therefore be difficult to achieve, except for the improvement process for cultural landscapes.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that there were several evaluations where ICOMOS had rightly sought input from IUCN, following which further information had been provided by the relevant State Party. Subsequent refinement of evaluations could not be consistently performed. Cross-referencing of reports would be helpful.

IUCN noted that those points concerned the cultural landscapes process.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed, but thought that the general statement still applied.

The **Chairperson** therefore proposed to amend the wording to "cultural landscapes or mixed sites". She further suggested removing the word "original" in paragraphs 8 and 9.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, noting that in paragraph 10 (a) the requirement was that the property must meet one or more of the ten criteria, asked whether one was sufficient.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that one was sufficient.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments to the draft decision, with the removal of the names of countries from the text and the deletion of paragraph 4.

Decision **32 COM 9 Rev.** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 10 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/INF.10

Decision: 32 COM 10

The **Chairperson** drew attention to the relevant document which contained a proposal for a reflection workshop on the future directions of the *World Heritage Convention*, and to the draft decision submitted by the Delegation of Australia which had been elaborated following discussions with the members of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Australia** pointed out that the information document provided States Parties with more background. The decision had been drafted since the information document had been issued, following wide-ranging discussions on the subject. The *Convention* was approaching two critical milestones: 2012 would see the 40th anniversary of the existence of the *Convention*. Around that time the 1000th property would be inscribed on the List. The proposal was to organize a workshop to prepare for those events, and Australia would be ready to finance it and co-sponsor its development. There were a number of challenges ahead and the aim of the workshop would be to craft an agreed view on those challenges, how they could be addressed and the way forward for the *Convention*. The Delegation drew the attention of States Parties to paragraph 8 of the draft decision. It would be wise to assemble thoughts before gathering together at the workshop.

Congratulating Australia for its proposal, the Delegation of the **United States of America** said it was ready to work with Australia.

The Delegations of **Barbados, Canada, Kenya, the Republic of Korea, Morocco, Spain** and **Sweden** endorsed the Australian proposal, supported the organization of such a meeting or workshop and suggested that the meeting could look into issues of balance of analysis of sites, representativity and the type of strategic analysis required for the General Assembly, with reference to the Global Strategy which had been put in place since 1994.

The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed Australia's proposal and added that it might be useful if the publication entitled "Challenges for the Millennium" was mentioned in the text.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation to submit a draft amendment in writing.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegation of **Morocco**, said it would prefer the proposed workshop to be held in Paris, and proposed amendments to several paragraphs.

Expressing support for the Australian proposal, the Delegation of **Bahrain** suggested that, in addition to the workshop, either before or after it or in parallel to it, an expert consultative and technical body might be convened to discuss in detail specific urgent issues and that the concrete results of those discussions be brought to the Committee at its next session.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, the Rapporteur read out the proposed amendments to the draft decision.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** pointed out that Decision **32 COM.5** under discussion was subject to adoption next Thursday only.

The Chairperson pointed out that Decision **32 COM.5** concerned the Report of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that the aim had been captured in the Committee's discussions.

The **Rapporteur** re-read the proposed amendments.

The **Chairperson** said a choice would have to be made between two different texts and invited the Committee to proceed paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that paragraph 4 of the draft decision was becoming complex and some detail should be omitted. He noted the importance of Global Strategy issues identified by Kenya.

The Delegation of **Barbados** endorsed the comment by the Delegation of Brazil. The idea of such a workshop was important. The main outstanding issues were to agree on a location and the financing. The purpose of the workshop was to look at how to progress in the years ahead.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported Brazil's proposal to delete subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) in paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Egypt** observed that the meeting was moving into too much detail and, in support of the Delegation of Kenya, said that further discussions on the workshop should be left to future meetings.

The **Chairperson** suspended the meeting and said that the discussion would be resumed later in the day.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.

SEVENTH DAY – TUESDAY, 8 JULY 2008

FIFTEENTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 6.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

ITEM 14 REFLECTIONS ON THE ELECTIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Progress report by the Chairperson of the working group

The **Chairperson** welcomed H.E. Mr Seiichi Kondo (Japan), Chairperson of the working group which had been set up to look into ways of ensuring better representativity of the membership of the Committee through a revised electoral system.

Mr Seiichi Kondo, Observer Delegation of **Japan**, Chairperson of the working group, presented the contents of the report contained in document *WHC-08/32 COM/14*, explaining that it reflected the current status of reflection on the question. He looked forward to closing further existing gaps between different views in the near future and thus arrives at a consensual solution through a fully participatory and inclusive process. The time had come to take a pause and consider carefully the way in which sessions of the Committee were run. Would the lengthening of sessions by a few extra days solve the problem of the overloading of the agenda, or should two separate sessions be held, one for nominations and State of Conservation reports, and the other for all other issues? Those aspects were closely related to the question of the electoral system. There were three key points to be kept in mind: the need to preserve the quality and professionalism of the Committee; the importance of ensuring its diversity and the representativity of all cultures; and the relationship between the Advisory Bodies and the Committee, notably with regard to the evaluation of Outstanding Universal Value. The current “free” electoral system had worked well until now in guaranteeing the quality of the Committee, but by limiting access to certain countries had prevented broader representation. Capacity building could be a solution, but as everyone knew the most effective way of building capacity was precisely by becoming a member of the Committee, hence the need for balance. Work on those matters was still ongoing, through intense dialogue among all parties concerned. Considering that the issue pertained to the General Assembly of States Parties, rather than the Committee, Mr Kondo noted that a Committee debate on the question might not be appropriate; however, he was happy to receive any comments.

The **Chairperson** thanked Ambassador Kondo and opened the floor.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated Ambassador Kondo for his report. It nevertheless had several observations on some parts of the text, notably under the heading Part IV, “Preliminary conclusions”, which appeared too strong, while paragraphs 6 and 7 should not be read. It indicated that it had a small amendment to take that into account. Aware as it was that the matter was not for debate, the Delegation was not suggesting modifications to the text but simply making a comment for consideration.

The **Rapporteur**, at the request of the Chairperson, read out a proposed amendment to the draft decision, replacing the word “outcomes” by “the Chairperson’s report of the first two meetings”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stressed that the purpose of the item was simply to provide a point of information stemming from a decision of the General Assembly. It would be better to reflect the interventions in the summary records and for no decision to be taken by the Committee. It was inappropriate for the Committee to take any action.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** observed that the proposed decision only suggested that the Committee would “take note” of the report.

The Delegation of **Brazil** re-affirmed that the report was directed to the General Assembly, not to the Committee, which had no jurisdiction to comment on the report.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** offered to withdraw the draft decision.

Mr Seiji Kondo pointed out that the General Assembly had asked him to make a progress report to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** concluded that the question would be reflected in the summary records and not as a decision by the Committee.

ITEM 17 PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2007 AUDIT

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/17
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.17

Decision: **32 COM 17**

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee, at its 30th session in 2006, had requested a management audit of the World Heritage Centre, which had been conducted between November 2006 and April 2007. The corresponding final report had been considered by the Committee the previous year, and a decision had been adopted. The Committee would now receive the report on the implementation of that decision, followed by a presentation by the UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture, Ms. Françoise Rivière, and the Chair of the working group that had been discussing the matter over the previous days, before examining draft Decision **32 COM 17 Rev.**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** drew the Committee’s attention to the tables summarizing the implementation of the recommendations of the audit report, which would take two or three years to implement. Concerning the administrative flexibility of the Centre, a memorandum from the Assistant Director-General of February 2008 set out in detail the nature and extent of the authority delegated to the Centre. As to the strengthening of the management process, a number of measures had been taken, such as regular staff meetings and the establishment of a steering committee including the two Assistant Directors-General for Culture and the Natural Sciences to coordinate activities, and other ways of improving internal communication and exchange of information. A third issue was the reform of the structure of the Centre, personnel requirements, mapping of workload and innovative ways of hiring non-permanent staff. In that connection, a Blue Note had been issued by the Director-General containing the new organization structure of the Centre. Finally, efforts had been made to further delineate the respective roles and responsibilities of the Centre and Advisory Bodies, to develop a strategy for knowledge management and to draw up guidelines concerning staff missions. That would be reported on in full the following year, including the results of a workload analysis, which was under way.

La **directrice adjointe pour le secteur de la culture** explique que le rapport sur l’audit du Centre identifie des fonctions essentielles occupées par des positions non-stables,

recommandant que ces postes soient sécurisés le plus tôt possible. Le document présenté aujourd'hui contient le résultat de l'analyse effectuée à cet égard et identifie les sept postes, considérés comme indispensables au fonctionnement du Centre, toujours à sécuriser. D'autre part, elle explique le système innovateur proposé pour le financement de ces postes – combinant 3 sources de financement distinctes – le programme régulier, les ressources extrabudgétaires et le Fond du patrimoine. La décision de l'assemblée générale des États parties prévoyait de se servir du Fond du patrimoine mondial pour garantir l'indemnisation en cas de fin de contrat, mais elle explique que, finalement, ces fonds sont déjà pris en compte dans le coût standard – et il en résulte qu'ils sont compris dans les figures présentées. Elle reconnaît que l'utilisation du Fond du patrimoine mondial pour contribuer à ce mécanisme n'est pas populaire. Elle explique qu'un tiers du personnel ici même à la réunion du comité du patrimoine mondial devra être mis à pied d'ici septembre si aucune solution n'est trouvée. Elle rappelle aux membres du comité que les fonds attachés aux autres conventions contribuent en partie au personnel – comme c'est le cas pour les conventions de 2003 et 2005, et que ces conventions seront appelés à engager plus de personnel dans les années à venir. Elle explique que le Directeur général de l'UNESCO a noté que le programme ordinaire, qui n'augmente pas, et diminue même, ne pourra pas se développer pour satisfaire le besoin croissant de ces conventions.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture and opened the floor for discussion.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its concern about the proposal, which would entail diverting resources of the World Heritage Fund to finance permanent personnel postings. It wondered if indeed that was legally possible, and asked that the Secretariat clarify that point.

The Delegation of **Spain** noted that the human resources of the Secretariat were its key assets, underpinning the work of the *Convention*. It expressed its belief that it was worth continuing efforts to attract, train, maintain and motivate the most qualified and experienced people. Through its recent work with the budget committee, it had been exposed to the real difficulties in trying to find a solution. The Delegation noted Brazil's comments and concern about using the World Heritage Fund for human resources. The Delegation stated that it would play an active role in attempting to solve the conundrum.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that the issue had also been discussed at the previous session of the Committee and expressed its concern about the large number of persons at the World Heritage Centre holding temporary posts. Those individuals had dedicated themselves to the Centre and should have been given permanent status. It further asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre how many permanent staff worked in the Africa Unit.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that the possibility that staff could be funded through the World Heritage Fund had been looked into by the working group which had been discussing the matter over the past days and had met with unanimous opposition. However, the need to ensure that adequate human resources were made available to the Centre had been recognized by the working group, hence the proposed amendments to the draft decision inviting the Director-General of UNESCO to rapidly fill the position of Deputy Director of the Centre, which was key to ensuring rationalization and resource mobilization.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the views expressed by the Delegation of Spain. The World Heritage Centre was a centre of excellence and the Committee relied heavily on the institutional memory and the professionalism of its staff.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked for information about the results of the memorandum of 21 February concerning the administrative flexibility of the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation would have liked to see the guidelines established for staff missions and considered that staff costs should be covered by the regular budget of

UNESCO, not the World Heritage Fund, while there was a tendency to do the opposite. It expressed the hope that the new position of Deputy Director of the Centre for management would be rapidly filled.

The Delegation of **Barbados** associated itself with the opinions expressed by the previous speakers.

La **Sous-Directrice générale pour la culture** reprend les questions posées par les délégations. Elle précise que pour les conventions de 2003 et de 2005, c'est la conférence des parties qui est chargée des règles d'utilisation de fonds, mais pour la Convention de 1972, c'est le Comité qui décide des règles de l'usage du fond. En ce qui concerne la question traitant de la nécessité de maintenir le personnel, et d'accroître les ressources allouées au personnel du Centre du patrimoine mondial, elle présente des chiffres illustrant comment le secrétariat du patrimoine mondial n'a connu qu'une légère augmentation sur le biennium précédent, prenant en compte la création du nouveau poste D1, et note aussi que le secrétariat bénéficie d'un budget beaucoup plus grand que les secrétariats des autres conventions sous la tutelle du secteur de la culture, et qu'il n'y avait pas de marge de manœuvre. Concernant la demande du groupe de travail, présidé par la délégation de l'Australie, au directeur général d'accroître les ressources allouées au Centre du patrimoine mondial, elle note que ces demandes sont très fréquentes et ne portent pas souvent leur fruit. Elle rappelle au comité qu'au mois de septembre ou octobre, il faudra prendre des décisions drastiques en ce qui concerne le personnel. Elle termine ses commentaires en notant que le poste D1 était en phase de recrutement.

In reply to the question from the Delegation of Kenya, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the Africa Unit had a staff of six, four of them on permanent posts. As to the results of the measures taken to strengthen the Centre's administrative flexibility, the memorandum in question outlined a series of specific administrative processes for which delegation of authority was granted to the Director of the Centre. The guidelines on staff missions could be certainly shared with members of the Committee. Finally, the process for the recruitment of the new Deputy Director was under way, the vacancy had been closed on 30 June and the selection panel was scheduled to meet soon after the summer break in late August.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that the Africa Unit was severely understaffed and should be a priority.

The Delegation of **Australia** read out its proposal as Chair of the working group. Modifications were proposed to paragraph 4 of the draft decision to make it clear that no staff should be funded through the World Heritage Fund. A new paragraph 5 was introduced urging the Director-General to finalize and fill the position of Deputy Director.

Decision **32 COM 17** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 10 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/INF.10

Decision: **32 COM 10**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the new text of the draft decision submitted by the Delegations of Australia, Canada and Spain, containing a proposal for a workshop co-sponsored by the Australian Government.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the amendments received to the text of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested moving paragraph 5 before paragraph 4 and expressing it in preambular language.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested adding the words “among others” in paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that the wording suggested that the World Heritage Centre was being asked to submit something to itself.

Following a question by the Delegation of **Israel**, the Delegation of **Australia** confirmed that it had envisaged that the meeting would be taking place in Paris.

Following some minor comments from the Delegations of **Brazil** and **Morocco** concerning some duplications and appropriateness of the date by which inputs were expected by States Parties, the **Rapporteur** read out once again the current draft of the decision with all the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Canada** considered that more focus should have been given to paragraph 7, which was too broad.

The Delegation of **Australia** commented that it did not expect the workshop to solve all problems, but simply to assist in framing the questions to be discussed by the Committee.

Following the introduction of a further amendment suggesting the insertion of the words “more effective” before “implementation of the Convention”, Decision **32 COM 10**—was adopted as amended.

ITEM 10A PROGRESS REPORT ON THEMATIC STUDIES

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/10A

Decision: **32 COM 10A**

Following a brief presentation by the **Secretariat**, **IUCN** informed the Committee that its thematic study on karst and cave sites had been completed and was available. It expressed its gratitude to the French authorities for supporting a French version. Those studies were indeed very important but benefited from limited resources.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed on the importance of the thematic studies and asked whether any material had been developed on prehistory and rock art.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that the thematic studies were indeed essential to provide a basis for comparative analyses. It considered that more resources should be made available to support the process of evaluation of nominations.

The Delegation of **Spain** likewise stressed the importance of thematic studies and expressed its belief that they provided the foundation of the work of the *Convention*, from establishing tentative lists to writing statements of Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation announced that Spain had dedicated funds to support seminars and studies on

various themes such as rock art, resulting in useful information in support of the *Convention* processes, and that it would provide a report on that work at the Committee's next session.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed that thematic studies could be useful, but considered that, especially for cultural properties, they could not possibly cover all categories of sites. It was more urgent, therefore, to concentrate on developing guidelines on methods for conducting comparative analyses. It further asked what criteria had been followed for the selection of the thematic studies to be carried out as a priority. Finally, the Delegation wondered what the status of the recommendations resulting from the thematic studies should be. Should they be adopted by the Committee?

ICOMOS noted that the themes identified for the studies were related to the sites coming forward from the States Parties, such as cultural landscapes. They were increasingly broad in scope and more resources were therefore needed.

The **Secretariat** commented that thematic studies were often conducted at the initiative of States Parties following a difficult nomination. They were also inspired by emerging needs, such as the study on the heritage of the Arctic, threatened by climate change. Finally, thematic studies had been requested by the Committee itself at previous sessions. The recommendations contained in the studies were for the time being simply for the information of the Committee. The latter could, however, decide to give them a more formal status.

The Delegation of **Barbados** welcomed the proposed thematic studies, but noted that it was also important to focus on regions such as the Caribbean. Concerning themes, moreover, it would be appropriate to consider Small Island States.

The Delegation of **Israel** wondered if the long-term objective of the exercise was to develop thematic studies covering all categories of heritage.

IUCN confirmed that that was indeed its intention, starting from the identified priorities, such as cave and karst sites and desert landscapes.

ICOMOS clarified that the priorities for developing thematic studies stemmed from its publication "Filling the gaps", which had been presented to the Committee at previous sessions.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** indique que les études thématiques sont très utiles, ainsi que les analyses comparatives. Parmi les thèmes utiles, ce sont les espaces sacrés qui méritent une étude approfondie pour que nous puissions avoir une idée précise et synoptique, afin de savoir dans quelle mesure ces espaces sacrés peuvent avoir une place dans la liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegation of **Australia**, considered that it was first necessary to identify the themes to be studied, as ICOMOS appeared to select them arbitrarily. Reflection on the matter would be appropriate.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Australia concerning paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 to note the need to provide support to priority activities.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if it would not be appropriate to thank Spain and France in the text of the decision.

The Delegation of **Spain** said it had no objections to the proposal.

Decision **32 COM 10A** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 11 PERIODIC REPORTS

ITEM 11A FOLLOW-UP ON THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR AFRICA

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/11A

Decision: **32 COM 11A**

Following a brief presentation by the **World Heritage Centre** on the progress made in the follow-up to the Periodic Report in the Africa region, the Delegation of **Kenya** asked how the Centre intended to finance the proposed activities.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the activities were intended for implementation under the next budget cycle, after 2009. Their overall costs were estimated at around USD 150,000-200,000. For the time being, the Centre had some resources that could be used to initiate the process.

Decision **32 COM 11A** was adopted.

ITEM 11B FOLLOW-UP ON THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR THE ARAB STATES

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/11B

Decision: **32 COM 11B**

Le **Secrétariat** présente le rapport sur les activités dans les États parties arabes. Ceux-ci se sont engagés à identifier des points focaux nationaux pour le patrimoine mondial et à développer et mettre en œuvre des plans d'action pour le patrimoine dans leur région. Le Secrétariat explique que le Bahreïn établira un centre de formation pour mettre en œuvre la Convention dans la région et conclue en annonçant le lancement du 2e cycle du rapport périodique dans la région, qui portera sur la période 2008-2010, et pour lequel les résultats seront présentés au Comité en 2010.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** announced its proposal to establish a UNESCO Category II centre in Manama, Bahrain, to carry out the recommendations of the Committee. It would be developed in the best possible manner. Bahrain had presented the project to Arab experts in world heritage matters during a meeting in Kuwait the previous month. All had expressed appreciation and support for the project, which was expected to assist in the conservation of Arab World Heritage sites and prepare experts to carry out conservation activities. The Delegation welcomed all support from other States Parties so that the initiative could be strengthened.

The Delegation of **Sweden** welcomed the proposal of the State Party of Bahrain and congratulated it for that achievement. The Nordic World Heritage Foundation had contributed significantly to the establishment and strengthening of the African World Heritage Fund, and the new initiative for the Arab States appeared equally useful.

The Delegation of **Egypt** welcomed and appreciated the establishment of the centre in Bahrain and, on behalf of Egypt as the centre of the Arab world, with experts in various fields of conservation, suggested that two centres could be established, one in Bahrain and one in Cairo, to facilitate the training of future generations.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if the State Party could clarify whether the new centre was going to be established by Bahrain or by UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported both the proposal from Bahrain and that made by Egypt.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** approuve l'initiative qui annonce de bonnes choses pour la région et demande que tous les pays arabes soutiennent le centre.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that the institute would be a UNESCO Category II institute with its headquarters in Bahrain, receiving support from Bahrain and UNESCO.

ICCROM welcomed the initiative and stated that it was looking forward to collaborating with the authorities of Bahrain as well as with those of other countries which were considering establishing training centres. That kind of centre could play an enormously important role for capacity building in the various regions of the world. The new trend, following the creation of the World Heritage Institute for Training and Research in China, suggested that a reassessment of the World Heritage Global Training Strategy might be needed.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments proposed by the Delegations of Egypt and Bahrain whereby the Committee would note the offer by Egypt to host another centre in Cairo for similar purposes.

Decision **32 COM 11B** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 11C FOLLOW-UP ON THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR EUROPE

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/11C

Decision : **32 COM 11C**

The **Secretariat** provided information on the numerous activities carried out since the previous year to follow up the completion of the periodic reporting exercise, including meetings, the compilation of Statements of Outstanding Universal Value and the redefinition of boundaries.

The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its gratitude for the work carried out by the Secretariat on the European region, for its work on defining Outstanding Universal Value and for drawing up management plans for properties, for the support received from the States Parties in the area in that connection, and particularly to the Government of Greece for having organized and hosted the 2008 World Heritage meeting for the Mediterranean, and to Portugal for offering to host that meeting in 2009.

Decision **32 COM 11B** was adopted.

ITEM 11D FOLLOW-UP ON THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/11D

Decision : **32 COM 11D**

The **Secretariat** provided information on the three regional meetings carried out in the previous year, following the adoption of the Action Plan of Cartagena. Support had been provided to serial nominations, while cooperation had been strengthened with the UNESCO

Regional Offices on capacity building activities. A meeting had also been organized at Bariloche (Argentina) in the framework of the International Congress of Protected Areas in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The Delegation of **Barbados** asked why no information had been provided on the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Programme, including the Caribbean, despite the fact that it had been requested by the Committee. It insisted that a report on the SIDS Programme should be presented at the 33rd session.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said it shared the views expressed by the previous speaker. Some countries of the region appeared to have been neglected. It expressed the hope that as soon as the position of Chief of the Latin America and the Caribbean Unit at the Centre was filled, the situation might improve.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** acknowledged that a specific report on the SIDS Programme had not been presented, although relevant information had indeed been provided in a piecemeal way in other documents. He took note of the request and confirmed that a report on the SIDS Programme would be prepared for the following session of the Committee. The recruitment of the Chief of the Latin America and the Caribbean Unit was nearing completion.

The **Rapporteur** read out a proposed amendment submitted by the Delegation of Barbados noting with concern the apparent lack of progress on the SIDS Programme and requesting a specific report on the issue at the 33rd session of the Committee.

Decision **32 COM 11D** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 11E REFLECTION ON THE PREPARATION OF THE NEXT CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/11E
WHC-08/32.COM/INF.11E

Decision : **32 COM 11E**

The **Chairperson** asked Mr John Pinkerton, former Rapporteur of the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session and member of the working group involved in the reflection on the periodic reporting process, to provide information on the results of its work.

Mr. Pinkerton recalled the background to the establishment of the working group and the holding of its five meetings, as well as the three main points that had guided the work of the group: focus on Outstanding Universal Value as the key element around which everything was built; ensuring the linkage of all various processes within the World Heritage Convention; and consolidating the data through the continuation of the Retrospective Inventory. The new draft questionnaire developed by the working group had been tested by 18 States Parties on 32 properties between January and March 2008, providing very useful feedback that had made it possible to refine the outcome. The group felt confident that the new cycle of periodic reporting could now start on solid ground. The new tool developed was user-friendly in that it offered almost everywhere multiple choices to select, was mostly pre-filled in by the World Heritage Centre with information already available (to be confirmed by the State Party) and allowed for working offline where Internet connections were less reliable. It also facilitated cooperative work. Despite the above, the group considered that training would be required to assist the States Parties in familiarizing themselves with the new format, which now included a number of questions related to factors affecting the

property, the possibility of assigning gradual marks to various aspects qualifying the property and a sort of summary table to capture its overall state of conservation.

The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the working group for the results and referred to the previous debate by themes and criteria. On the understanding that periodic reporting was done by regions, it would also be interesting to analyze issues by themes and criteria and not only geocultural areas.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, the **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to the draft decision: paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 remained unchanged; in paragraph 6 “their work” was inserted and in paragraph 8 “and encourages other regions to conduct similar workshops on the new periodic reporting process”. Paragraph 9 should refer to “all States Parties” and not only the Arab Region. Paragraph 10 was to be deleted, whereas paragraphs 6, 7, 11 and 12 remained unchanged.

Decision **32 COM 11E** was adopted as amended.

SPECIAL REPORTS

ITEM 12 PROTECTION OF THE PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Document : WHC.08 /32.COM /12

Decision : **32 COM 12**

Le **Secrétariat** présente le document en citant quelques activités prévues selon le plan de travail établi en concertation avec le Ministère du Tourisme et des Antiquités, et notamment l'établissement de plans de conservation pour les vieilles villes d'Hébron et de Naplouse, et d'un plan de gestion du site archéologique de Tell Balata, à Naplouse, seconde phase du projet de sauvegarde des paysages culturels ; projets mise en oeuvre à Bethlehem, Hébron, Jéricho, Naplouse.

Decision **32 COM 12** was adopted.

ITEM 13 REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Document : WHC.08 /32.COM /13

Decision : **32 COM 13**

Le **Secrétariat** présente les progrès accomplis en réponse à la décision **31 COM 16** du Comité adoptée à sa 31^e session (Christchurch, 2007). Une version révisée des *Orientations*, incluant toutes les modifications décidées par le Comité du patrimoine mondial, a été téléchargée sur le site Web du patrimoine mondial en janvier 2008, avec toutes les corrections surlignées en jaune.

Le **Secrétariat** informe le Comité que les documents de travail suivants incluent plusieurs propositions d'amendements aux *Orientations* :

- Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7.1* : « Présentation des résultats de la réunion internationale d'experts sur le patrimoine mondial et les zones tampons, Davos, Suisse » ;

- Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7A* : « État de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril » ;
- Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8.A* : « Listes indicatives soumises par les États parties au 15 avril 2008, conformément aux *Orientations* » ;
- Document *WHC-08/32.COM/10B* : « Point d'information sur la préparation des propositions d'inscription transnationales en série » ;
- Document *WHC-08/32.COM/INF.10B* : « Science et technique – Atelier d'experts dans le cadre de la Stratégie globale pour la Liste du patrimoine mondial globale, équilibrée et représentative ».

Le **Secrétariat** souligne que le Comité a demandé au Centre du patrimoine mondial de publier une version papier des textes anglais et français des *Orientations* tous les quatre ans, à partir de 2009, pour diffusion de la version papier révisée à sa 33e session (2009). Cependant, le **Secrétariat** propose de publier une version papier des textes des *Orientations* après la 33e session du Comité, afin de pouvoir y intégrer tous les amendements qui pourront être adoptés à cette session.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted the overall trends in the work of the *Convention* and the many changes that had taken place, and proposed to suspend the decision taken in Christchurch to publish the *Operational Guidelines* now. It would not be useful to spend money for such a booklet at the present stage.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the Delegation of Morocco that when changes were made they could be all printed separately in an annex.

The Delegation of **Sweden** drew attention to emerging issues, notably sustainable tourism, and requested that they be reflected in the *Operational Guidelines* as they had implications for protection and management; the Delegation presented an amendment to the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed that there should be a discussion on sustainable tourism and supported the proposal by Brazil. It also proposed the setting up of a working group on Chapter VIII, on the World Heritage emblem, in particular to align it with recent decisions on the use of the UNESCO emblem.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed concern that the results of the science and technology expert workshop might be overlooked, and considered that more guidance would be needed as to how they could be properly reflected.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the Delegation of Sweden on the sustainable tourism issue as there were negative impacts on World Heritage sites and mitigation measures to be taken.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the comments by the Delegation of Sweden. It underlined that the Spanish authorities had already organized a meeting on tourism and archaeological sites, in February 2007. The Delegation agreed that tourism could have negative impacts on some sites.

The Delegation of **Barbados** noted that tourism could only be seen in the broader context of site management as a whole and needed to be covered under management and protection. It also noted the overlap with other conventions in that regard and that impacts could come not only from tourists but also from over-use by locals.

Following a question by the **Chairperson**, the Delegation of **Canada** confirmed its proposal for the establishment of a working group on the emblem.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained ways of integrating sustainable tourism and said that the issue could be reported on the following year.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** insisted on inserting a reference to the recommendations of the expert workshop on science and technology in the *Operational Guidelines*.

The **Chairperson** suggested including it in the Annex, as could be done for other subject areas including tourism.

In response to a comment by the Delegation of the **United States of America** on the language on Tentative Lists on page 4 which had not yet been adopted, the **Chairperson** noted that it would be updated.

The **Rapporteur**, reading out the proposed amendments to the draft decision, said that paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remained unchanged except for a minor amendment by Brazil; in paragraph 4 the Canadian text on the emblem would be inserted; a new paragraph 6 would be added on the suspension of the Committee's previous decision; a new paragraph 10 would cover sustainable tourism, as proposed by Sweden; and item 21 of the Annex would cover the recommendations of the science and technology workshop.

Following questions by the **Chairperson** and the Delegation of **Canada** about the working group on the emblem, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that there were two types of group, subsidiary and consultative bodies, but the best would be an informal working group which could be organized by the Chairperson.

In response to a further question by the Delegation of **Egypt** about the language on Tentative Lists on page 4, the **Chairperson** repeated her reply that, following the new working group proposal, it would be updated following the decision taken by the Committee on item 8A.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed that the Committee should have the final decision.

The **Chairperson** emphasized that the text would be replaced and that the working group would be working on the World Heritage emblem and alignment with the UNESCO guidelines on the use of the emblem.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed with the establishment of an informal working group.

Decision **32 COM 13** was adopted as amended.

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

ITEM 15 INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Documents: WHC.08 /32.COM /15
WHC.08 /32.COM /INF.15

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that there were no new requests for international assistance as at 15 April 2008 and that therefore there was no decision to adopt.

ITEM 18 OTHER BUSINESS

TITLES AND COSTS FOR WORLD HERITAGE RESOURCE MANUALS

Decision : **32 COM 18**

The **Secretariat** recalled that at its 32nd session the Committee had approved the publication of a number of titles within the World Heritage Resource Manuals Series in 2008/2009 (*Preparing World Heritage Nominations, Managing Natural World Heritage Properties, Managing Cultural World Heritage Properties, Tourism, Public Use and Interpretation and Presentation of World Heritage Properties*). The drafting of an additional manual, on *Disaster Risk Reduction*, was progressing with ICCROM and its finalization was envisaged before the end of the current biennium. It further noted that a revised draft decision was being presented separately, as the budget for the series had been the subject of discussions in the working group on budget as part of agenda item 16.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that some of the manuals were no longer proposed or would need modification as a result of changes in policy issues including buffer zones, priority-setting and visual impacts. The key issue was the monitoring of Outstanding Universal Value which was mandatory under the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the Secretariat and stressed that the materials in question were of great importance to sites and technicians. It agreed with the Delegation of Australia. However, if the titles were too narrow, there might be some loss of focus. The emphasis should be on World Heritage property.

The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed the resource manuals and asked whether there was one on serial nominations, whether there would be an umbrella of subjects to choose from and what the priorities would be.

The Delegation of **Canada** thanked the Advisory Bodies and the Centre and also inquired how the priorities were established.

The Delegation of **Spain** thanked the World Heritage Centre and requested more information about the format of publication, the themes and the availability of the manuals on the World Heritage Centre web pages. The Delegation underlined the necessity to prepare the manuals for individual and transnational serial nominations and for the definition of Outstanding Universal Value for cultural and mixed properties.

La délégation de **Madagascar** souligne qu'il est nécessaire de faire des propositions de thèmes pertinentes.

IUCN noted the positive message conveyed by the resource manuals. Priorities needed to be established for the future, including in respect of serial nominations for which more guidance was needed. The issue of serial nominations would be covered by the manual on nominations. IUCN shared the view that World Heritage sites involved broader issues, not only Outstanding Universal Value, but that they needed to be managed for their Outstanding Universal Value and other values. The priorities lay in preparing nominations.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were still some issues outstanding, including buffer zones and how priority-setting was being done.

The **Secretariat** stated that the priorities were set by the Committee and that, once published, the manuals were available on the web site at *whc.unesco.org*.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that the issue of buffer zones was important for the manual on nominations.

The Delegation of **Israel**, supported by the Delegation of **Canada**, said that the Committee should look at the priorities at its 33rd session.

ICCROM noted that the manuals were important for capacity building, that many problems encountered with the nominations would improve with the manuals and that concepts had always evolved in the course of implementation, as had proved the case with buffer zones.

IUCN endorsed those comments.

ICOMOS stated that the nominations manual had to be in line with the changes made by the Committee, including on new and emerging issues.

The **Rapporteur**, summing up the proposed amendments to the draft decision, noted that paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 remained unchanged and that a new paragraph 7 was added, requesting the World Heritage Centre to prepare a list of titles to be presented and prioritized at the 33rd session.

Decision **32 COM 18** was adopted as amended.

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES (continued)

ITEM 16 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE 2006-2007 BUDGET AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2008-2009 BUDGET

ITEM 16A PRESENTATION OF THE ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2006-2007, THE PROVISIONAL STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2008-2009 BUDGET AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE BUDGET PROPOSED TO THE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC.08 /32.COM /16A

Decision : **32 COM 16.1**

The **Chairperson** invited the Chair of the working group to contextualize the draft decision on the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund.

The Delegation of **Australia**, speaking as Chair of the working group, noted that the group had met four times and thanked all participants. He explained the revised draft decision, drawing attention to one addition to paragraph 3.

Decision **32 COM 16.1** was adopted as amended.

Decision: 32 COM 16.2

The **Chairperson** invited the Chair of the working group to explain the revised draft decision on budgetary adjustments.

The Delegation of **Australia**, speaking as Chair of the working group, reported that compensation for the declining dollar value had been discussed by the group. The option of compensating for the negative effects by a reduction in the regional programmes had not been accepted. It had therefore been proposed to use the balance of unspent funds from 2006-2007, as was now reflected in paragraph 3 of the draft decision. For Reinforced

Monitoring an amount of USD 50,000 was proposed, and for the other items the amounts were slightly changed. The impact of the proposed budgetary revisions contained in the decision was equally spread among the Advisory Bodies and the Centre.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it supported the decision and the need to include it under item 18.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed that it should be included under item 18.

IUCN stated on behalf of the Advisory Bodies that the revised draft decision did not address resource shortfall issues and that IUCN alone had experienced a loss of USD 205,000, or 13% of its budget for the biennium, due to the currency fluctuation. Therefore any additional tasks such as the compendium, Statements of Outstanding Universal Value or Desired State of Conservation could not be covered.

The **Rapporteur**, summing up the proposed amendments to the draft decision, said that paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were retained and that a new paragraph 4 would recommend that the unspent funds in budget line 1.2 be reallocated to the resource manuals.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked about the USD 90,000 allocated for studies and evaluations and not spent. It proposed to use that amount towards publication of the Resource Manuals series.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the budget line on studies and evaluations could be used, as no such studies and evaluations were planned.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the proposal to increase the budget of the World Heritage Centre.

Le **Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture / Le représentant du Directeur Général de l'UNESCO** citant le paragraphe 7 du projet de décision, informe le Comité que le Directeur Général n'est pas habilité à prendre ce type de décisions sans l'avoir soumis pour approbation au Conseil Exécutif et à la Conférence Générale. Le Directeur Général ne peut décider pour ce biennium que de réaffecter des ressources non utilisées à l'intérieur du Secteur de la Culture. Cette demande a été déjà faite 4 ou 5 fois, mais il n'est pas possible de satisfaire toutes les demandes.

The **Legal Adviser** confirmed those comments, pointing out that only in the framework of the adoption of the next C5 document by the General Conference could such decisions be taken and that for any rapid funding, such as transfer of funds between the Sectors, the Executive Board could take decisions.

The Delegation of **Australia** underlined that the intention of the Committee was made clear.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment, with "General Conference and Executive Board" to be added.

Decision **32 COM 16.2** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** informed the Committee that Italy had provided an amount of 250,000 euros to the World Heritage Fund for international assistance in line with paragraph 239b of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The **Chairperson** thanked Italy on behalf of the Committee.

ITEM 16B SUSTAINABILITY OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/16B

Decision: **32 COM 16B**

The Delegation of **Australia** presented the revised draft decision under item 16B and in particular the challenges in ensuring the continuity, efficiency and effectiveness of World Heritage work and the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, adequate resourcing to the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, and the establishment of an informal working group to address those issues, with the question of deciding about a Chair of the group still pending.

The **Rapporteur** proposed a reformulation of the text.

Decision **32 COM 16B** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 7B STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

TRENDS IN THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE SITES

Documents: WHC-08/32.COM/7B and Add. and Add.2

Decision: **32 COM 7B.129**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the pending draft decision on trends under item 7B.

The Delegation of **Israel**, speaking as Chair of the working group, explained the context and highlighted the preparation of an analytical summary, the identification of conservation issues, the preparation of a lexicon of terms, matching Statements of Outstanding Universal Value and State of Conservation reports, and web links for further information.

IUCN requested a clarification on paragraph 4(d), asking to which process it referred which was not already in existence.

The Delegation of **Israel** explained that it related to linking the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and Danger Listing.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked if there was not a missing paragraph related to a suggestion made in the working group on the State of Conservation documents.

The Delegation of **Israel** explained that the working group had considered the matter in respect of factual errors reported by States Parties, and said that if the Committee wished it could be added.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that adding another layer to the heavy production process of State of Conservation reports between 1 February and the Committee session would not be possible as it would delay the production of documents for the Committee. The reports would be issued and any factual errors directly reported to the Committee.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that delegations often did not know what was in the documents before the meeting and observed that the secretariat had participated in the working group.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said that a preliminary discussion had taken place and that it was suggested that password access to the documents might be possible after receipt of the drafts from the Advisory Bodies so that a dialogue with States Parties could be initiated.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that improvement of such dialogue between the Centre and States Parties was an important point to be borne in mind for the future, but that logistical issues could not be solved now.

ICCROM, while welcoming the possibility to create communication links, expressed concern about adding another layer to the already complex process, placing additional strain on human and financial resources which would lead to delays in document production. It was happy to work towards better dialogue.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested the addition of a paragraph to the draft decision requesting the World Heritage Centre to identify processes for consultation with States Parties during the development of State of Conservation reports to ensure their accuracy.

Decision **32 COM 7B.129** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

SEVENTH DAY – TUESDAY, 8 JULY 2008

SIXTEENTH MEETING

7 p.m. – 8.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

**ITEM 8A TENTATIVE LISTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES AS AT 15 MAY 2008,
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES***

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/8A

Decision: **32 COM 8A**

The Delegation of **Jordan** made a statement concerning the inclusion by Israel on the Israeli Tentative List of “Jerusalem, the Old City and Ramparts to include Mount Zion “ as an extension to the “Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls”, already inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation summarized the background of the inscription in 1991 of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by the State Party of Jordan). It further recalled that the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee had met in June 2002 requesting the legal opinion of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in particular on whether the rights of the Israeli State would be accepted. The World Heritage Committee at its session in December 2001 had not tabled the legal advice but the Director of the World Heritage Centre had sent it to all members of the World Heritage Committee in 2002. Israel could request inscription of Mount Zion on the World Heritage List, but not as an extension to the existing site of Jerusalem. The Delegation requested the removal of Jerusalem from the Israeli Tentative List.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it fully supported the statement of Jordan on the situation of Jerusalem and hoped it would be dealt with more in conformity with international law.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft decision.

Decision **32 COM 8A** was adopted.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Sacred Mijikenda Kaya Forests (Kenya)

Decision: **32 COM 8B.50 Rev.**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the nominated property and drew its attention to draft Decision **32 COM 8B.50 Rev.** containing a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Rapporteur** said that she had received minor editorial modifications from the Delegation of Madagascar to the French version of the decision that required no debate.

La délégation du **Maroc** demande à ce que dans le 1er paragraphe du point 3, à savoir la Déclaration de valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, soit mentionné le nom de l'Etat partie du Kenya pour plus de clarté.

The Chairperson said that the English version contained such a reference, and the two versions would be checked for consistency.

Decision **32 COM 8B.50** was adopted.

The Chairperson stated that some 285 decisions had been taken since the beginning of the session. In terms of statistics, there had been 851 World Heritage sites on the List before the Committee session had begun and 30 sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Now, at the end of the current session, there were, in addition, 19 cultural and eight natural sites, four extensions, and four States Parties with new sites for the first time: Papua New Guinea, San Marino, Saudi Arabia and Vanuatu. The total number of sites to date on the List was now 878 and there were still 30 sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ITEM 19 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE 33rd SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (JUNE-JULY 2009)

Decision: **32 COM 19**

The Delegation of **Kenya** took the floor at the request of the **Chairperson** and, supported by the Delegations of **Australia** and **Israel**, nominated H.E. Ms Maria San Segundo (Spain), Ambassador of Spain to UNESCO, as Chairperson of the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee. It described the professional experience of the nominated Chairperson and said that her experience and knowledge would be an asset to the next session of the Committee.

Félicitant tout d'abord la Présidente actuelle pour son excellent travail, la délégation du **Maroc** se réjouit de la proposition du Kenya, et souhaite bonne chance à la nouvelle Présidente, rappelant que le Maroc est voisin de l'Espagne.

Ms Maria San Segundo (Spain) was elected as Chairperson of the 33rd session of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** welcomed the nomination and congratulated Ms San Segundo on her election.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** congratulated the new Chairperson and welcomed her nomination. Her wisdom and knowledge were highly appreciated and the Latin American Group would be very pleased to work under her guidance. The Delegation was convinced that she would lead the 33rd session successfully.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite la nouvelle Présidente, et remercie la Présidente de la 32^e session.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked the outgoing Chairperson for her professional handling of the session and congratulated the newly-elected Chairperson, referring to the close cultural links between Egypt and Spain.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** expressed thanks to the outgoing Chairperson and congratulated the newly-elected Chairperson, noting that Italy and Spain shared the Mediterranean spirit.

The Delegation of **Cuba** congratulated the State Party of Spain for the nomination, highlighting the long tradition of Spain in heritage conservation.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to proceed with the election of the five Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur of the Committee.

La délégation de **Madagascar**, au nom des pays africains, propose le Kenya comme Vice-Président.

La délégation du **Maroc**, au nom des pays arabes, propose la Tunisie comme Vice-président.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed strong support for the nomination of Tunisia.

The Delegation of **China**, after congratulating the newly-elected Chairperson, proposed Australia as Vice-Chairperson on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific region.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated H.E. Ms Maria San Segundo for her election and said that it looked forward to working with her. The Delegation nominated the United States of America as the Vice-Chairperson on behalf of the Europe and North America region.

The Delegation of **Peru** proposed Barbados as Vice-Chairperson on behalf of the Latin America and the Caribbean region. The Delegation congratulated the newly-elected Chairperson.

Kenya, Tunisia, Australia, the United States of America and Barbados were duly elected Vice-Chairpersons of the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson**, explaining that the Rapporteur would be elected in his or her personal capacity, invited the Delegation of Australia to propose a candidate.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed Mr Antonio Ricarte, a career diplomat, second in position at the Permanent Delegation of Brazil to UNESCO, as Rapporteur of the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee.

Mr Antonio Ricarte (Brazil) was duly elected Rapporteur of the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee.

H.E. Ms Maria San Segundo, the newly-elected Chairperson of the 33rd session, thanked the Committee for having elected her to so important a position and for the confidence it had placed in her. Acknowledging the backing she had received from her colleagues, she thanked the Government of Canada for its hospitality and expressed particular appreciation to the Chairperson for the excellent way she had conducted the Committee session. Her knowledge and diplomatic skills were to be commended. She would take her as a role model and hoped to be able to run the 33rd session as successfully. She then introduced a short video presentation of Spain.

Mr José Jimenez, Director-General of Arts, Spain, said how pleased the Government of Spain was at the nomination of Ms Maria San Segundo to the position of Chairperson of the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee. Under her leadership, the Committee was in good hands. He stressed the long heritage and conservation tradition of Spain, which had joined the Convention in 1982 and had since then been actively involved in its implementation. He also drew attention to the fact that Spain had always tried to diversify its nominations in order to enhance the representativity of the World Heritage List, and had made ongoing efforts to improve the state of conservation of its properties. He welcomed the participants to Seville the following year.

Mr Antonio Ricarte, Delegation of **Brazil**, congratulating H.E. Ms Maria San Segundo, thanked the Chairperson for her excellent work and said that it would be hard to live up to the standards she had set. He also thanked the Committee for electing him as Rapporteur of the 33rd session. Brazil was very pleased to be hosting the Committee's 34th session in 2010, the year that Brasilia would be celebrating its 50th anniversary.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** congratulated the Chairperson and the Rapporteur for their excellent work.

ITEM 20 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 33RD SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/20
Decision : **32 COM 20**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that it was a standard agenda with very few variations. For practical reasons, it would be easier to maintain the same order of

agenda Items and numbering. He then went through the agenda briefly, stating that there might be a few very minor adjustments.

The Delegation of **Sweden** proposed that an item on the report of progress in periodic reporting for Europe and North America be introduced.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled the decision which had been taken to alternate reviews of the reports every two years. As the Committee had reviewed a report at the current session, it would be reviewing the next report at the 34th session, but it was up to the Committee to decide.

The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the Chairperson and the Rapporteur for their excellent work. Noting that the item on training and capacity building was often added at the last minute, he hoped that it could be included under the item on the Global Strategy, or working methods and tools under item 10C.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed that the report of the workshop scheduled to be held in February on “Reflection on the Convention” should be introduced as an agenda Item, as item 14bis, with the title of item14 amended accordingly.

The Delegation of **Bahrain**, after congratulating the newly-elected Chairperson, requested that an item be introduced on trends in State of Conservation under agenda item 7.3.

The **Chairperson** replied that a summary of trends had been requested and that a reflection on such trends might usefully be included as item 7C.

The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the newly-elected team and expressed support for the proposal of Bahrain. It proposed, following Spain’s suggestion for an activity on prehistory, that an item on a thematic study of prehistory might be placed under the item on the Global Strategy.

The Delegation of **Canada**, congratulating the newly-elected team, recalled that the Committee had to decide on the draft principles, policies and procedures for participation at Committee sessions. The relevant discussion could come under item 2, Observer status, or elsewhere in the agenda.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with all the points made, particularly the proposal by Brazil. Referring to discussions on item 7.1, concerning revision of the *Operational Guidelines*, it wished to have that reflected in the relevant agenda item.

The **Rapporteur** recalled the proposal of Barbados on Small Island Developing States (SIDS Programme) and another proposal on the *World Heritage Convention* and Natural Heritage Conventions with relation to SIDs and suggested that those topics be reported on under item 5C and the working group on reflection under item 10. The report on the outcome of the working group on Tentative Lists might be included under agenda item 8.

The **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee wished to adopt the provisional agenda of the 33rd session as contained in Decision **32 COM 20**.

Decision **32 COM 20** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the new team and gave special thanks to the Rapporteur for the excellent teamwork that had been established. Pending the adoption of the decisions, that concluded the deliberations of the 32nd session.

The meeting rose at 8.30 p.m.

NINTH DAY – THURSDAY, 10 JULY 2008

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 8.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Christina Cameron

ITEM 21 ADOPTION OF DECISIONS

Document: WHC-08/32.COM/24

Decisions: **32 COM 8B.1 to 32 COM 23**

The **Chairperson** said that the document containing the decisions would be reviewed in three parts: Part I, from the start to include all decisions concerning the State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger (7A); Part II, the State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List; and Part III, all other agenda items. The scope of the exercise before the Committee was editorial, the purpose being to identify any error or misinterpretation that might alter the meaning of the decisions as actually adopted during the session, with no debate on the substance of the decisions. The Chairperson suggested that the Secretariat be asked to polish the text to correct minor grammatical errors and graphic layout at a later stage, under the control of the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** explained that, in preparing the text, particular attention had been paid to stylistic changes, clarification of specific points, material errors, the renumbering of paragraphs and minor spelling mistakes. In the process, some duplication had been noted and she had taken the liberty of integrating the text to make it more comprehensible. Every effort had been made to remain faithful to the deliberations of the Committee. Mistakes, however, were always possible and she welcomed any intervention to clarify possible ambiguities.

The **Chairperson** proposed to suspend the meeting for thirty minutes to enable Committee members to go through the first part of the document.

The meeting was suspended at 2.40 p.m. and resumed at 3.20 p.m.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the first part of document *WHC-08/32.COM/24*, proceeding decision by decision.

Decisions **32 COM 2**, **32 COM 3A**, **32 COM 3B**, **32 COM 5** and **32 COM 6A** were adopted.

With reference to paragraph 5 of Decision **32 COM 6B**, the Delegation of **Australia** considered that a report should have been requested from the World Heritage Centre, as customary.

The **Rapporteur** said that she had received no amendments to that effect during the session.

The **Chairperson** noted that the decision would therefore not be changed.

Decision **32 COM 6B** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested, with reference to paragraphs 2 and 5 of Decision **32 COM 7.1**, that the term “international expert meeting” be used consistently.

Decision **32 COM 7.1** was adopted as amended.

With regard to Decision **32 COM 7.2**, following an editorial amendment by the Delegation of the **United States of America**, the Delegation of **Sweden**, referring to paragraph 5, recalled that it had been suggested during the debate that the Advisory Bodies should also be involved.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to that addition.

On the same paragraph, the Delegation of **Australia** said that, rather than referring to “guidance” generically, it would be preferable to mention the *Operational Guidelines*.

Decision **32 COM 7.2** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested an editorial amendment to paragraph 4 of Decision **32 COM 7.3**.

Decision **32 COM 7.3** was adopted with a minor editorial amendment.

Decisions **32 COM 7A.1** to **7A.15** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested editorial amendments to paragraphs 5 and 7 of Decision **32 COM 7A.16**.

Decision **32 COM 7A.16** was adopted with minor editorial amendments.

.

Decisions **32 COM 7A.17** to **7A.23** were adopted.

Following an editorial amendment by the Delegation of **Canada** to paragraph 4 of Decision **32 COM 7A.24**, the Delegation of the **United States of America** recommended removing the word “Italy” from the same paragraph.

In response to a question by the Delegation of **Brazil**, the **Secretariat** explained why the word “Italy” appeared in paragraph 4 of the decision.

Decision **32 COM 7A.24** was adopted as amended.

ICOMOS requested that the words “and rebuilding” be added after the word “demolition” in paragraph 8 of Decision **32 COM 7A.25**.

The **Rapporteur** said that there had been no written amendment to that effect, and that it had not been included in the amendment proposed by Bahrain.

La délégation du **Maroc** considère qu’une inspection complémentaire doit être effectuée puisque la mission n’a pas eu lieu.

Decision **32 COM 7A.25** was adopted as amended.

Decision **32 COM 7A.26** was adopted with a minor editorial amendment.

With reference to Decision **32 COM 7A.27**, the Delegation of the **United States of America** said that the name of Serbia should have been removed from the title of the property.

The **Legal Adviser** recalled that he had provided two clarifications on that point during the session to explain that UNESCO, as part of the United Nations system, was bound to consider Serbia as the State Party for the property in question and indicate it in the property's official name. There had been confusion in the discussion since some Committee members had been referring to the use of the name in the text, while others had been referring to the use of the name in the heading. In the heading it would be advisable to retain "Serbia", as Kosovo was not a State Party.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that that was not its recollection of the debate, its understanding being that "Serbia" would not be referred to in the decision.

The **Legal Adviser** noted that the Delegation of the United States of America had not objected after either of his interventions.

Decision **32 COM 7A.27** was adopted.

Decisions **32 COM 7A.28** to **32 COM 7A.30** were adopted.

Decision **32 COM 7A.31** was adopted with a minor editorial amendment.

Decision **32 COM 7A.32** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** proposed to suspend the meeting for thirty minutes to enable Committee members to review the second part of the document.

The meeting was suspended at 2.50 p.m. and resumed at 4.00 p.m.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the second part of the document.

Following an intervention by the Delegation of **Brazil**, the **Chairperson** proposed a further brief suspension to rectify a printing error in the French version.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested harmonization of the acronyms AIE and EIA, and asked if they should not be spelled out.

The Delegation of **Australia** drew attention to the official way of referring to Outstanding Universal Value, since sometimes the concept of integrity was mentioned and sometimes not. With a view to harmonizing the decisions it might be useful to always specify “Outstanding Universal Value and conditions of integrity and authenticity”.

Speaking on a point of order, the Delegation of the **United States of America** said it wished to revert to Part I of the document, Decision **32 COM 7A.27**. It reiterated not having any recollection that the word “Serbia” would be part of the decision, which was what had just been adopted, and would like to have the transcript of what had been discussed earlier on the matter, or to listen to the recordings.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked what the final decision had been concerning the issue raised by the Delegation of the United States of America.

The **Chairperson** called for comments from the members of the Committee as to how to proceed in order to reach agreement on the subject.

The Delegation of **Spain** said it was in favour in adjusting the position of the Committee to the current international legal framework.

The Delegations of **Brazil** and **Jordan** agreed with the Delegation of Spain.

The **Chairperson** suspended the discussion pending further consultations, and invited the Committee to resume its consideration of Part II.

Decision **32 COM 7B.1** was adopted.

Decision **32 COM 7B.2** was adopted with a minor editorial amendment.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.3** to **32 COM 7B.12** were adopted.

Decision **32 COM 7B.13** was adopted with a minor editorial amendment.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.14** to **32 COM 7B.17** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested the inclusion of “activities” in paragraph 4 of Decision **32 COM 7B.18**.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it opposed the amendment.

Decision **32 COM 7B.18** was adopted.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.19** to **32 COM 7B.25** were adopted.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.26** and **32 COM 7B.27** were adopted with minor editorial amendments.

Decision **32 COM 7B.28** was adopted.

With regard to Decision **32 COM 7B.29**, the **Rapporteur** read out the following final version of sub-paragraph 4(b) and (i): (i) increase efforts to understand the causes for the slow recovery of the cutthroat trout; instead of increase efforts to remove the lake trout invasive species. Paragraph 5(b) stood as: “continue assessing visitor numbers and the effects of visitor use on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property”; in paragraph 6, the year 2010 was corrected to 2011; and in paragraph 7, two corrections were included: 2011 instead of 2010 and “34th” instead of “34rd”.

Decision **32 COM 7B.29** was adopted as amended.

Decision **32 COM 7B.30** was adopted.

Regarding Decision **32 COM 7B.31**, the Delegation of **Brazil** and **IUCN** noted that there was a mix of content between the texts of the decisions concerning the properties located in Argentina and in Brazil.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the Rapporteur had taken note to amend the text of both decisions.

Decision **32 COM 7B.31** was adopted as amended.

Decision **32 COM 7B.32** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested clarification of “authenticity” in paragraph 5 of Decision **32 COM 7B.33**.

Decision **32 COM 7B.33** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.34** to **32 COM 7B.41** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported by the Delegation of **Kenya**, said it wished to include “Congratulates the State Party of Spain for its efforts in addressing the conservation issues facing the property” in paragraph 3 of Decision **32 COM 7B.42**.

The **Rapporteur** said that the amendment had been made orally but no amendment in written form had been received.

The Delegation of **Brazil** pointed out that it was a standard sentence, and underlined the importance of including the amendment since serial nominations could need different treatment for each of the countries involved.

Decision **32 COM 7B.42** was adopted as amended.

Decision **32 COM 7B.43** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Peru** requested the deletion of “strongly” before “urges” in paragraph 13 of Decision **32 COM 7B.44** because in the Spanish language it sounded reiterative and inconsistent with the tone of the discussion, and proposed, rather, “suggests” or “requests”.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that the amendment received from Canada stated clearly “strongly urges”.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested an amendment to paragraph 9 to clarify “planning”.

Decision **32 COM 7B.44** was adopted as amended.

Decision **32 COM 7B.45** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed to amend paragraph 6 of Decision **32 COM 7B.46** to read “property” instead of “core zone”.

Decision **32 COM 7B.46** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.47** and **32 COM 7B.48** were adopted.

In Decision **32 COM 7B.49**, **ICOMOS** proposed to substitute “visitor facilities” for “toilets” in paragraph 7.

Decision **32 COM 7B.49** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed to amend paragraph 4 of Decision **32 COM 7B.50** by substituting “attenuation” for “resorption”.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification of the French translation of “attenuation”.

Decision **32 COM 7B.50** was adopted as amended.

Decision **32 COM 7B.51** was adopted.

ICOMOS requested the deletion of paragraph 6 in Decision **32 COM 7B.52**.

.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that the mission stood.

Decision **32 COM 7B.52** was adopted.

ICOMOS recalled that in paragraph 5 of Decision **32 COM 7B.53** changes had been discussed but they were not included in the decision, and requested clarification of “prior to the arrival of the mission” in paragraph 10.

Decision **32 COM 7B.53** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked whether, in Decision **32 COM 7B.54**, subparagraphs 6 (a) and (b), the terms “environmental audit” and “environmental assessment” did not mean the same thing, in which case the same term should be used. In paragraph 7, “for” the efforts should replace “to” the efforts.

La délégation du **Maroc** indique qu'une formule, relative à la Déclaration de valeur universelle exceptionnelle, devant être préparée "avant l'arrivée de la mission" et ayant fait l'objet de débats pour d'autres décisions, devrait être retirée de la décision.

Le **Secretariat** confirme que cette formule doit être retirée.

Decision **32 COM 7B.54** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.55** to **32 COM 7B.57** were adopted.

ICOMOS asked if it was involved in the mission referred to in paragraph 6 of Decision **32 COM 7B.58**.

.

The **Rapporteur** answered that the formulation was as had been requested by the Delegation of Egypt, but that the matter would need to be clarified.

Decision **32 COM 7B.58** was adopted.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.59** to **32 COM 7B.68** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed adding "for review by the Advisory Bodies" in paragraph 3 of Decision **32 COM 7B.69**. It also requested the inclusion of "World Heritage" and "33rd" before "session" in paragraph 6.

Decision **32 COM 7B.69** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** drew attention to the end of paragraph 6 of Decision **32 COM 7B.70**, "for examination by the Committee", pointing out that a standard expression was missing.

Decision **32 COM 7B.70** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.71** to **32 COM 7B.73** were adopted.

With regard to Decision **32 COM 7B.74**, the Delegation of **Israel**, recalling its intervention on stakeholders, said that the end of paragraph 4 should read “strengthened coordination with local stakeholders”.

Decision **32 COM 7B.74** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.75** to **32 COM 7B.80** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that it had submitted an amendment to Decision **32 COM 7B.81** and asked whether it was correct that the order of paragraphs 6 and 7 should be reversed.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that that was correct.

Decision **32 COM 7B.81** was adopted.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.82** to **32 COM 7B.84** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that “Old bridge structure” should more correctly read “bridge structure” in Decision **32 COM 7B.85**.

.

The **Rapporteur** said that the change could be made, but that the decision had been adopted with that wording.

Decision **32 COM 7B.85** was adopted as amended.

.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.86** and **32 COM 7B.87** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that paragraph 2 of Decision **32 COM 7B.88** should not read “excluded” but rather “prevented”.

ICOMOS said it recalled that in paragraph 3(c), the last phrase should have been deleted.

Le **Secrétariat** répond qu’il y a eu plusieurs changements, notamment Monsieur Bouchenaki qui déclara que l’ICCROM faisait déjà partie du Comité scientifique.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the members of that committee were nominal and were not institutions. The World Heritage Centre could not therefore be a member of that committee.

ICOMOS noted that the wording of the last part of paragraph 6 was incorrect.

Decision **32 COM 7B.88** was adopted as amended.

ICOMOS asked, with regard to paragraph 8 of Decision **32 COM 7B.89**, if the Committee had set a timeframe of one year for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it recalled from the discussion that it had been agreed that the technical parts should be left to the Secretariat.

Decision **32 COM 7B.89** was adopted.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.90** to **32 COM 7B.103** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that at the end of paragraph 9 of Decision **32 COM 7B.104**, the standard line, “for examination by...”, was missing.

Decision **32 COM 7B.104** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Israel** recalled with reference to Decision **32 COM 7B.105** that it had asked during the discussion that height levels of buildings in St Petersburg be specified.

The **Chairperson** said she remembered the related discussion but thought the proposal had not been taken on board.

The **Rapporteur** said it had been noted but did not seem to have been taken on board as it had not been further discussed.

Decision **32 COM 7B.105** was adopted.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.106** to **32 COM 7B.113** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that “would” in paragraph 4 of Decision **32 COM 7B.114** was not correct.

The **Rapporteur** said that that had not been discussed, but that the grammar would be corrected.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said that paragraph 4(a) did not seem clear and that “core zone” should be replaced by “property”.

The **Chairperson** remarked that that was a general change made systematically throughout the document.

La délégation du **Maroc** remarque qu’à partir du Paragraphe 3, dans la version française, tout est en italique.

Decisions **32 COM 7B.115** to **32 COM 7B.128** were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** said that paragraph 4(d) of Decision **32 COM 7B.129** should read: “provide a written statement of Outstanding Universal Value for properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and for properties considered for Danger Listing”.

The **Chairperson** proposed the suspension of the meeting to enable Committee members to review Part III of the document.

The meeting was suspended at 6.20 p.m. and resumed at 7.15 p.m.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Part III of the document.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted with regard to Decision **32 COM 8A**, and as a general comment which would apply to a number of decisions throughout the document, that the sub-titles “Values” and “Integrity” should be in italics and that in paragraph 5, “at” should be substituted for “of”.

Decision **32 COM 8A** was adopted with editorial amendments.

Decisions **32 COM 8B.1** to **32 COM 8B.16** were adopted.

La délégation du **Maroc** signale qu'au paragraphe 4(c) de la Décision **32 COM 8B.17**, il est nécessaire de clarifier le nom des sociétés et organismes en mentionnant leur intitulé complet.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed an editorial amendment in paragraph 6.

Decision **32 COM 8B.17** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 8B.18** and **32 COM 8B.19** were adopted.

La délégation du **Maroc** indique qu'au début du texte de la Déclaration de valeur dans la décision **32 COM 8B.20**, il est indiqué "les tulus proposés" alors qu'il serait plus correct d'indiquer "les tulus de Fujian".

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested an editorial amendment to paragraph 4(d), and the deletion of "core".

Decision **32 COM 8B.20** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 8B.21** and **32 COM 8B.22** were adopted.

With regard to Decision **32 COM 8B.23**, the Delegation of **Brazil** asked whether the text concerning Azerbaijan had been changed on the basis of an agreement.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that a written agreement had been reached with both States Parties.

Decision **32 COM 8B.23** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested the addition of "to include the elements of landscape value" to paragraph 2(b) of Decision **32 COM 8B.24**.

Decision **32 COM 8B.24** was adopted as amended.

La délégation du **Maroc** indique une répétition du nom dans la description du critère (ii) de la décision **32 COM 8B.25**,

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed an editorial amendment.

Decision **32 COM 8B.25** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 8B.26** to **32 COM 8B.28** were adopted with minor editorial amendments.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** indicated that in paragraph 5 of Decision **32 COM 8B.29** the introduction between subparagraphs (c) and (d) did not seem correct.

Decision **32 COM 8B.29** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 8B.30** to **32 COM 8B.49** were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** noted that in paragraph 2 of Decision **32 COM 8B.50** the year 2010 should read 2009.

Decision **32 COM 8B.50** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked for the term “core zone” to be replaced by “property” in paragraph 2(a) of Decision **32 COM 8B.51**.

Decision **32 COM 8B.51** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 8B.52** and **32 COM 8B.53** were adopted.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested the replacement of the term “core zone” in Decision **32 COM 8B.54**.

Decision **32 COM 8B.54** was adopted as amended.

Decision **32 COM 8B.55** was adopted.

La délégation du **Maroc** indique que le nom du site a été compressé dans la Décision **32 COM 8B.56**, sans pour autant se souvenir d'une telle décision.

The **Rapporteur** said that she would reintroduce the full title.

The Delegation of **Israel** recalled that two different texts existed and that consistency should be ensured. It sought clarification on which one was being adopted.

The **Chairperson** said that the official title was the longer version.

Decision **32 COM 8B.56** was adopted as amended.

La délégation du **Maroc** rappelle, à propos de la décision **32 COM 8B.57**, qu'une discussion a eu lieu au sein du Comité sur les "lieux saints et les mausolées" et souhaite en connaître l'issue.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that the version distributed was the correct one.

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to the interventions of the Delegations of Egypt and the United States of America at the time concerning shrines.

Decision **32 COM 8B.57** was adopted.

La délégation du **Maroc** indique qu'au Paragraphe 2 de la Décision **32 COM 8B.58** le terme "zone principale" doit être remplacé par "le bien".

Decision **32 COM 8B.58** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 8B.59** to **32 COM 8B.61** were adopted.

La délégation de **Madagascar** indique qu'au paragraphe 2 de la Décision **32 COM 8B.62** le terme "zone principale" doit être remplacé par "le bien".

Decision **32 COM 8B.62** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested the replacement of "core zone" by "property" in Decision **32 COM 8B.63**.

Decision **32 COM 8B.63** was adopted as amended.

.

La délégation de **Madagascar** indique qu'au paragraphe 2 de la Décision **32 COM 8B.64** le terme "zone principale" doit être remplacé par "le bien".

Decision **32 COM 8B.64** was adopted as amended.

Decision **32 COM 8B.65** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked whether the Committee meant visual “identity” or “integrity” in paragraph 2 of Decision **32 COM 8B.66**.

Decision **32 COM 8B.66** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 8B.67** to **32 COM 8B.96** were adopted.

In Decision **32 COM 8B.97**, the Delegation of **Australia** requested the removal of the introductory part of paragraph 2.

Decision **32 COM 8B.97** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 8B.98** to **32 COM 8B.102** were adopted.

Decision **32 COM 8C** was adopted.

Decision **32 COM 8D** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed an editorial amendment to paragraph 5 of Decision **32 COM 9**.

Decision **32 COM 9** was adopted with an editorial amendment.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted in connection with Decision **32 COM 10** that it was proposed that the meeting should be held in Paris, but not necessarily at UNESCO Headquarters.

La délégation du **Maroc** signale qu’au paragraphe 3 le “e” de “mondiale” doit être retiré; et indique qu’au paragraphe 4, il a été décidé d’utiliser le terme “succès” plutôt que “popularité” et d’indiquer les opportunités “qui pouvaient pleinement être envisagées”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that “to” was missing in paragraph 7.

Decision **32 COM 10** was adopted as amended.

In Decision **32 COM 10A**, the Delegation of **Israel** asked whether a report should not be mentioned in paragraph 11.

The **Rapporteur** answered that no amendments had been submitted asking for a report.

ICOMOS asked about criterion (vii).

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the word “art” was missing from paragraph 11.

The **Rapporteur** reminded that the proposal had concerned prehistoric sites.

Decision **32 COM 10A** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed several editorial amendments to Decision **32 COM 10B**.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** queried the terms “issues” in paragraph 6(f) and “all potential future” in paragraph 7.

The **Rapporteur** said that there had been a specific amendment in that regard.

The Delegation of **Israel**, referring to paragraph 9, asked who was hosting the workshop, noting that the meeting in Germany was only on natural heritage. Was there was one on cultural heritage?

The **Rapporteur** pointed out that paragraphs 6, 8 and 10 referred to the expert workshop.

IUCN added that paragraph 10 was linked to the workshop mentioned in paragraph 6.

Decision **32 COM 10B** was adopted as amended

Decision **32 COM 11A** was adopted.

In Decision **32 COM 11B**, the Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed that paragraph 4 should begin with “Takes note”.

Decision **32 COM 11B** was adopted as amended.

Decisions **32 COM 11C** to **32 COM 19** were adopted.

Referring to Decision **32 COM 20**, the Delegation of **Barbados** requested that a report on SIDS should be covered under a separate agenda item.

Decision **32 COM 20** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** proposed the adoption, as a whole, of all the decisions contained in document *WHC-08/32.COM/24*, as amended.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that Decision **32 COM 7A.27** entitled “Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia)” could not be adopted the way it was reflected in the draft decisions and informed the Committee that it had gone back to the recordings of the Committee’s discussion and had further discussed the issue with the Legal Adviser.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked whether the Delegation of the United States of America had requested a change of the title.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** replied that the decision needed to conform to the discussion, that the title needed to be changed, but that the Legal Adviser still had concerns about the issue. The decision was up to the Committee and a solution might be found in the coming days, as the Legal Adviser had asked for a revised decision. It regretted that the question could not be resolved at the present stage.

The **Chairperson** noted that the decisions document should be adopted at the session and invited comments by Committee members.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that the outcome was exactly as described and asked whether there remained any possibility of changing it. It did not remember the matter being discussed under item 14.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that item 14 did not include any decision on the question.

The **Rapporteur** agreed with the Delegation of the United States of America and recalled that the item had been reopened the subsequent day following an intervention by the Legal Adviser, that several States Parties had expressed concerns and that the wording had been changed the next day.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested that the decision be kept as it had been amended, just without the word “Serbia”. It would discuss the matter with the Legal Adviser to see whether there was a way of dealing with the situation. As far as it was concerned, only one decision had been taken.

The Delegation of **Spain** stated that it understood the point of view of the United States Delegation, but that the *World Heritage Convention* and the decisions taken by the Committee had always moved within the framework of contemporary international law and that that must be maintained. The decision should not be adopted if it did not conform to international law.

The **Legal Adviser** pointed out that deleting the name of Serbia as a State Party was a problem, because Serbia was the State Party and had ratified the *Convention*, which Kosovo had not. He reminded the Committee that the final pronouncement at the end of the discussion had been that the decision had been adopted, but no mention had been made of the change in the heading, and that was partly what had led to the confusion and caused some of the delegations to raise the issue. He had explained, on the morning following the adoption of the decision, that the changes only affected the decision itself, and that the Secretariat had to continue with established practice in matters of listings, headings, et cetera, with the word “et cetera” referring to agenda items and questions of terminology. He had never, at any point, said that Serbia was considered to be in any political position to govern Kosovo. He summarized the situation by saying that a certain pronouncement had been made and the United States of America had not objected at the time by proposing that the word “Serbia” should be left out of the heading when the decision had been adopted. The next day he had raised the point again and the Delegation of the United States of America had not objected. He proposed, if the Committee had no objection, to retain the solution proposed by the United States Delegation, namely that that Delegation’s declaration would be recorded and it would discuss the matter with the Legal Adviser at UNESCO to try to find a formulation that would be in conformity with international law and still be to the

satisfaction of the United States of America. He reassured the Delegation of the United States of America that the Legal Office would be happy to explore options with it.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there were any objections to that proposal.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked for clarification of what exactly was now being adopted.

The **Chairperson**, explaining what she recalled from the discussion and from consulting the tapes, said she thought that the spirit of the current discussion was that, bearing in mind the intervention from Kenya, the Committee was inserting a title without the name “Serbia” in it. As the Delegation of Spain had pointed out, the issue of the international legal framework needed to be clarified. What was now being adopted was the title without “Serbia”, which then needed to be worked on to make sure that conformity with the legal framework was assured.

Decision **32 COM 7B.27** was adopted as amended.

Document *WHC-08/32.COM/24* containing the Committee’s decisions, as a whole, was adopted as amended.

ITEM 22 CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

Mme Edith Arnoult-Brill, Présidente de Hostelling International, remercie la Présidente de lui donner l’opportunité de s’exprimer en faveur de l’implication des jeunes au sein du patrimoine, pour la construction d’un monde fait de paix, de tolérance et de respect de la diversité culturelle. Elle ajoute que le prix qu’elle va remettre à trois jeunes du Forum-Jeunesse, le “Prix Hostelling International Christina Cameron pour la jeunesse” a été nommé, en hommage à son engagement et expertise internationalement reconnus. Trois jeunes ont été choisis pour leurs projets et récompensés par des bourses de 1,000 dollars canadiens pour les 2e et 3e places, et 3.000 pour la 1ère place.

M. Ansoumane Sané (Sénégal), bénéficiaire du Premier prix, remercie les organisateurs et les autres participants. Il ajoute qu’après une expérience murie, il convient d’adopter le “patrimoine mondial” comme une “famille unie”, et qu’il ne faut faire de mal à aucun des ses enfants.

The other winners were Ms Karen Barry (Canada) and Mr We-Bi-Woo (Indonesia).

Mr Larry Ostola (Canada) presented the gift of a painting to the Director of the World Heritage Centre in recognition of the excellent work the Secretariat had carried out on behalf of all States Parties.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, unveiling the painting, thanked Mr Ostola for the gift. He said that the Committee session was always the culmination of the Secretariat's work, bringing together many World Heritage actors including the Advisory Bodies, States Parties and experts, after intensive preparations throughout the year. The Committee had set many new and exciting tasks to be carried out in following up on the decisions. He thanked the Chairperson, whom he had known for many years and from whom he continued to learn, highlighting her commitment to World Heritage, including the project on the future of the *World Heritage Convention* for the 40th anniversary. He thanked the Rapporteur, in particular for her exceptional and impeccable skill in tackling her tasks at the service of the Committee, recalling that she was the President of a prominent NGO, ICOM, and had other important tasks. He expressed gratitude to all those who supported the Committee and to the people and authorities of Canada. The illuminations and music were much appreciated. He thanked the staff of the World Heritage Centre who were highly motivated and dedicated to World Heritage work. He also acknowledged the interpreters and translators for their professional work and all the technical personnel behind the scenes. Finally, he extended thanks to the Committee, which was the "lifeblood" of World Heritage.

The **Rapporteur** thanked all for their kind words and said that it was a special honour for her to work with the Chairperson and the Secretariat. It was a pleasure to undertake so inspiring a task in the true spirit of the *Convention* and to see the tremendous commitment of the Committee members and Observer States. She thanked the previous Rapporteur for the advice given, the Canadian secretariat for all the support provided and the World Heritage Centre for the smooth running of the session and for its assistance. Finally, she would welcome written comments on any oversight in the decisions or the records of the meeting to ensure that the deliberations were accurately reflected.

The **Chairperson** wholeheartedly thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his staff, the translators, the interpreters, the Canadian Delegation and its support team. The unique and influential role of World Heritage was growing, encompassing as it did diverse places and cultures on earth and how they evolved over time. She specially commended the Youth Programme and the award provided and emphasized that she would remain

committed to the Youth Programme in the future. She concluded by stressing the significance of World Heritage in providing opportunities to work for an important cause for the future and the cultural identities of humankind. She wished all a safe journey home.

The Delegation of **Spain**, speaking on behalf of group I, thanked the Chairperson and the Rapporteur, and Quebec for hosting so wonderfully the 32nd session of the Committee. It would like to thank the World Heritage Centre and appreciated the hard work made by Francesco Bandarin and his entire team for one year. It also thanked the translators and the youth. Finally, it expressed its excitement to meet in Seville the year after.

La délégation de **Madagascar**, s'exprimant au nom du groupe Afrique, et des autres pays membres du Comité (Kenya, Maurice, Nigeria) tient à adresser ses plus vifs remerciements au Canada et à la Ville de Québec pour leur avoir permis de participer aux festivités. Elle félicite la Présidente et le Rapporteur, soulignant que la tâche est loin d'être terminée et les remercie pour leur sagesse, patience et pour faire si bel honneur aux femmes. Elle remercie également le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial et à son équipe. Enfin, elle remercie les jeunes qui ont participé à cet événement et à toutes les équipes qui ont contribué à la réussite de ce Comité.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its gratitude to the Committee and Bureau members, and to the Chairperson, the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for the hard work carried out during the session. It assured all of its continued support and said that the presentation of the young people carried the hope of the future for World Heritage.

The Delegation of **Peru**, speaking on behalf of group III, thanked the Chairperson and the Rapporteur for the quality of the debate. It also thanked the Secretariat and the Canadian secretariat for all the support provided. Finally, it thanked the city of Quebec for its warm welcome and it is looking forward to meeting everyone in Seville next year.

The Delegation of **Jordan**, speaking on behalf of the Arabic group, thanked the city of Quebec and the Canadian government for holding this meeting. In particular, it also thanked the Chairperson and the Secretariat and all Mr Bandarin's team from the World Heritage Center. It thanked the Advisory Bodies such as ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM. With satisfaction, it noticed the great strides made by the Committee this year and looked forward to meeting in Seville next year.

The Observer Delegation of **Lithuania**, speaking on behalf of Group II, which was not currently represented on the World Heritage Committee, thanked all for their work, and especially commended the youth team. It also thanked the Chairperson, the Rapporteur, the Secretariat and all those working behind the scenes. It was a pleasure to find that in Quebec there was always music in the air.

IUCN, speaking on behalf of the Advisory Bodies, thanked the Government of Canada, the Secretariat and the Committee, which was always open to new ideas and emerging challenges. Alluding to the 5 Cs, it thanked Canada, the Centre, the Committee, Ms Cummins and Ms Cameron. In the following year, the 200th natural property would be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** thanked all for their interventions and declared the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

The meeting rose at 8.30 p.m.