



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

43 COM

WHC/19/43.COM/INF.18

Original: English / French

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**Forty-third session
Quarante-troisième session**

**Baku, Republic of Azerbaijan / Bakou, République d'Azerbaïdjan
30 June – 10 July 2019 / 30 juin – 10 juillet 2019**

SUMMARY RECORD

RÉSUMÉ DES INTERVENTIONS

The text contained in the present document is a transcription of the debates of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee held from 30 June to 10 July 2019 in Baku, Republic of Azerbaijan. It is therefore to be considered as a verbatim.

Le texte contenu dans le présent document est une transcription des débats de la 43e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial tenue à Bakou, République d'Azerbaïdjan du 30 juin au 10 juillet 2019. Il doit donc être considéré comme un verbatim.

AGENDA OF THE 43RD SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

OPENING SESSION

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

REPORTS

4. Report of the Rapporteur of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Manama, 2018)
5. Reports of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies
 - 5A. Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's decisions
 - 5B. Reports of the Advisory Bodies
 - 5C. World Heritage *Convention* and Sustainable Development
 - 5D. Priority Africa, sustainable development and World Heritage
 - 5E. Report on strengthening of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties
6. Follow-up to the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy and Progress report on the World Heritage-related category 2 centres

EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

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

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

8. Nomination process
 - 8A. Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties as of 15 April 2019
 - 8B. Nominations to the World Heritage List

- 8C. Update of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger
- 8D. Clarifications of property boundaries and areas by States Parties
- 8E. Review and approval of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value

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

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

PERIODIC REPORTS

- 10. Periodic Reports
 - 10A. Progress report on the follow-up to the Second cycle of Periodic Reporting
 - 10B. Progress report on the Third cycle of Periodic Reporting

WORKING METHODS AND TOOLS

- 11. Operational Guidelines and Policy Compendium
 - 11A. Revision of the Operational Guidelines
 - 11B. Policy Compendium
- 12. Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods and outcomes of the ad-hoc working group

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

- 13. International Assistance
- 14. Report on the execution of the budget for the biennium 2018-2019, budget proposal of the World Heritage Fund for the biennium 2020-2021 and follow-up to Decision 42 COM 14
- 15. Other business

CLOSING SESSION

- 16. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee (2020)
- 17. Provisional Agenda of the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee (2020)
- 18. Adoption of Decisions
- 19. Closing session

INTRODUCTION

N.B: *The languages used for the verbatim of the sessions of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee are English and French. Presentations and comments made originally in another language are indicated by ^[interpretation] at the beginning of the intervention.*

The 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee was held from 30 June to 10 July 2019 in Baku, Republic of Azerbaijan.

The 21 Members of the World Heritage Committee were present: Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Norway, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe.

The elected Members of the Bureau of the 43rd session of the Committee were:

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)
Rapporteur: Ms Mahani Taylor (Australia)
Vice-Chairpersons: Brazil, Burkina Faso, Indonesia, Norway, Tunisia

The following 109 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers:

Afghanistan; Albania; Algeria; Andorra; Argentina; Austria; Bangladesh; Barbados; Belgium; Belize; Benin; Botswana; Bulgaria; Cambodia; Cameroon; Canada; Chile; Colombia; Costa Rica; Croatia; Czechia; Côte d'Ivoire; Democratic People's Republic of Korea; Denmark; Ecuador; Egypt; Eritrea; Ethiopia; Finland; France; Gabon; Georgia; Germany; Ghana; Greece; Haiti; Holy See; Honduras; Hungary; Iceland; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Jamaica; Japan; Jordan; Kazakhstan; Kenya; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Lebanon; Libya; Lithuania; Luxembourg; Malaysia; Mali; Malta; Mauritania; Mexico; Mongolia; Montenegro; Morocco; Myanmar; Namibia; Nepal; Netherlands; New Zealand; Nigeria; North Macedonia; Oman; Pakistan; Palau; Palestine; Panama; Papua New Guinea; Peru; Philippines; Poland; Portugal; Qatar; Republic of Korea; Republic of Moldova; Romania; Russian Federation; Saudi Arabia; Senegal; Serbia; Singapore; Slovakia; Slovenia; South Africa; Sri Lanka; Sweden; Switzerland; Syrian Arab Republic; Tajikistan; Thailand; Turkey; Turkmenistan; Ukraine; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United States of America; Uzbekistan; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); Viet Nam; Zambia.

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

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

The session was conducted in two languages: English and French - the two working languages of the Committee -, with additional interpretation in Azeri provided by the host country. Thanks to the generosity of the Kingdom of Spain, Spanish interpretation was also available for the entire duration of the meeting. Furthermore, thanks to generosity of the authorities of China, interpretation in Chinese was available from 5 June to 7 July.

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

Sunday 30 June 2019

OPENING CEREMONY

The Opening Ceremony of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee was held at the Heydar Aliyev Center on Sunday 30 June 2019.

Speeches were delivered by the following dignitaries:

- H.E. Ms. Mehriban Aliyeva, First Vice President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, UNESCO Goodwill Ambassador
- H.E. Ms. Audrey Azoulay, Director General of UNESCO
- H.E. Mr. LEE Byong-Hyun, Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO
- H.E. Mr. Abulfas Garayev, Chairperson of the 43rd Session of the World Heritage Committee, Minister of Culture of the Republic of Azerbaijan

The speeches were followed by a cultural performance and a reception.

FIRST DAY – Monday 1 July 2019

FIRST MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

The Chairperson:

Dear colleagues, we welcome you once more at the forty-third session of the World Heritage Committee. Thank you for your participation at the opening ceremony yesterday. We hope that you got some impression of the cultural heritage of Azerbaijan and our view for the future. We are very pleased and honoured to have all of you here, to have the honor to host this important international event. And we hope for very active, very productive cooperation between all of the Committee Members and representatives of other States Parties, NGOs and international organizations to proceed for achievement of the results we are expecting from this session.

We would like to note that we have a very tough agenda. That's why we have to follow the timetable strictly. You all are aware of that. So please follow the time limits for your interventions, speeches and according to the Rules of Procedure, we will try to give possibility to all interested parties to make interventions and notes.

So not to take too much of your time, I would like to proceed to the agenda and start with the Document WHC/19/43.COM/2, requests for Observer status.

Ladies and gentlemen, before considering the admission of Observers, I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler for some general announcements.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chair and good morning to all of you. Please allow me to recall that the Committee at its 35th session decided that World Heritage Committee meetings should be live-streamed over the web. Therefore, the debates of our session will be live-streamed through the address which appears on the screens now. It is also available on the website of the 43rd session.

Secondly, please allow me to indicate that UNESCO gratefully acknowledges the host country for providing interpretation in Azeri throughout this session.

Please note also that thanks to the generosity of the Kingdom of Spain, Spanish interpretation will be available for the duration of the entire meeting.

Furthermore, thanks to the authorities of China, interpretation in Chinese will be available from 5 to 7 July.

In this regard, I would like to invite the Azeri, Spanish and Chinese language speakers to choose in which working language, English or French, they would like to see their interventions reflected in the summary records of the session. So your choice should be indicated orally at the time of your first intervention. It should also be transmitted in writing to the Secretariat before the end of our working session this morning. Thank you very much, Mr Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Madam Rössler. We now turn our attention to the Admission of the Observers. The list is presented in document 2, in accordance with Article 8 of the Rules of

Procedure. For your information, this is a bilingual document, in English and in French. I would like to ask the Rapporteur if she has received any amendments to the draft decision proposed?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Chair. We have received no amendments to this one.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Dear colleagues, I now have to ask if you agree with the presence of these Observers throughout the session. Committee Members, no objections? I see no objections. The participation of the Observers is agreed. Thank you.

Now we move to Item 3 of our agenda, adoption of the agenda and the timetable in document WHC/19/43.COM/3A, Provisional Agenda of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. I would like to invite Ms Rössler to present the Agenda and Timetable for the session as contained in documents 3A and 3B. These documents should be read in conjunction with document INF.3A.Rev.5, which contains the provisional list of the documents of our session. All Members of the Committee got it; the other participants can easily find it through the site of this event. Please, Ms Rössler, the floor is yours.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chair. Concerning the agenda of our session, please allow me to indicate that two additions have been made compared to the original agenda approved by the World Heritage Committee at its last session. One item is the progress report on the reflection on processes for mixed nominations and one is on the revisions of the Operational Guidelines. Regarding document 3B, which contains the timetable, please note that as the Bureau was informed yesterday the Baku Declaration will be presented before the end of our morning session. The text of this Declaration has been distributed to you both in English and in French. Please also note that the message from the World Heritage Young Professionals Forum 2019 will be presented to you immediately before lunchtime. It has been suggested to the Committee to take note of this message and a copy of this message has also been made available to all of you in English and French, this morning. Furthermore, Mr Chair, please allow me to inform you that a revised list of documents, Rev.5, was made available on 29 June so please refer to this document for any information on the documents of this session.

Ladies and gentlemen, allow me also to recall that due to the number of items on our agenda and the time constraints, Rule 22.2 of the Rules of Procedures, which grants the Chairperson with the possibility to limit the time allowed to each speaker will be applied if the circumstances make this desirable. Time for interventions therefore will be limited to three minutes for Committee Members and two minutes for Observers. In this regard, please note that a musical timer system to gauge interventions is in place, which interrupts any speaker exceeding the recommended time limit.

Concerning the interventions by Observers from civil society and NGOs, we strongly advise if they wish to take the floor on the same topic, to hold consultations among themselves in order to prepare and deliver one single intervention.

In order to save time as much as possible, we also appeal to you not to repeat what other Delegations have said or for making congratulatory statements. Official statements and declarations should be transmitted to the Secretariat in writing as soon as they have been delivered in order to integrate them into the Summary Records of this session.

Furthermore, please note that timing of sessions will be strictly respected, which means every morning at 10 a.m. and every afternoon at 3 p.m. sharp. Please also note that in the Timetable

you have in front of you and which was just looked at, the meeting of the Bureau will be held every morning from 9:30 a.m. to 10 a.m. as of tomorrow, Tuesday, 2 July.

Dear participants, allow me to remind you that bilateral consultations should be outside of the main conference room and not during the debates here in the room. This was specifically requested by several Committee Members.

Furthermore, I would like to underline a specific point regarding nominations. As you can see, we will have a very tight schedule regarding nominations. While we understand perfectly and share the joy of countries that will have inscriptions of their sites on the World Heritage List, we discussed yesterday in the Bureau meeting that we would recommend that congratulations and celebrations be held outside the room to allow for a smooth continuation of our schedule and also in fairness to the nominations being discussed just afterwards.

I would also like to ask you to switch off your mobile phones, or to put them in silent mode, so as not to disturb the proceedings.

Please note that no specific coffee breaks are foreseen. However, tea and coffee will be available throughout the day in the Delegates lounge.

Last but not least, as it was indicated in the Bureau meeting yesterday, I also would like to remind all Committee Members that all amendments to draft decisions have to be submitted well in advance before the discussion, to our Rapporteur, Ms Mahani Taylor who is sitting here at the podium, in writing, using the blue form and preferably in an electronic version at the following email address shown on the screen: wh-rapporteur@unesco.org. The blue form template to be used will be sent to all Committee Members by email through the Secretariat. In this regard, we will consult each Committee Member Delegation to get email addresses to which the electronic version of the blue form can be sent for easy use. The electronic submission will facilitate the integration of the text in the relevant draft decisions at hand for your consideration. The blue form is available in the room, in both French and English. It includes the email address I just mentioned.

I would like to encourage you as much as possible to avoid submitting substantial amendments immediately before the discussion of an item to allow for transparent and informed discussions. Therefore, Committee Members should ensure that amendments are provided sufficiently in advance and at least 24 hours ahead of the examination of the concerned item, as provided in the Rules of Procedure to allow for their timely dissemination both in paper copy and online on the website of the World Heritage Centre and to ensure their translation. This is very important to ensure the dialogue and transparency here. Thank you very much, Mr Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ms Rössler for this presentation. I would like to know if there are any comments on these agenda items? I see none from the Members of the Committee. Now I invite you to adopt the draft decisions 43.COM 3A and 43.COM 3B. But before doing that I would like to ask the Rapporteur if she has received any amendments to the texts of the draft decisions proposed?

Rapporteur:

I have received no amendments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Therefore I declare the draft decision 43.COM/3A and 43.COM/3B adopted.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us examine Item 4 of our agenda. As you know Ms Anna Zeichner was the Rapporteur of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee, which was held last year in Manama, Bahrain and we had the honor to be there. Therefore, I now have the pleasure to invite Ms Zeichner to present her report, which will highlight the main issues discussed during our last session. Please, Ms Zeichner, you have the floor.

Rapporteur of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee:

Mr Chairperson, Mr Director-General for Culture, Madam Director of the World Heritage Centre, dear Members for the Committee, delegates of Observer States Parties, members of the Secretariat, members of the advisory bodies, participants of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee including those who are following our debates through streaming, I would like to wish a good morning to you all.

I have the honor and pleasure to be here to present my report summarizing the proceedings of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee which was generously hosted by the Kingdom of Bahrain in its beautiful capital city of Manama from 24 June to 4 July 2018 under the high patronage of His Majesty King Hamad Bin Issa Al-Khalifa.

Mr Chairperson, the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee was chaired by Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa and her the dedication, wisdom, fairness and vigilance in making sure that the we were always following the Rules of Procedures, contributed greatly to the success of our deliberations. Under Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa's able leadership the Committee has taken 225 decisions.

We had long, intensive and sometimes challenging sessions and I believe that we might have even broken the record of longest Committee decision with the 60 paragraphs that were contained in Decision 42 COM 7 and as I have said it was a very long session and I will try my best to summarize only the most salient points of our debates.

The session was attended by 2,975 participants in total including Members of the Committee, representatives of States Parties to the Convention, NGOs and Observers. The second edition of the World Heritage Site Managers Forum also took place and this important capacity-building event has gathered 40 site managers from all over the world in Manama. The Committee examined 157 State conservation reports, 39 of which we open for discussion and the 54 sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee decided to inscribe one property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, Lake Turkana National Park in Kenya and at the same session decided to remove one property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System. According to this, after the closure of our session, the number of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger still stands at 54. Mr Chairperson, Committee nominations under Item 8, the Committee at its 42nd session inscribed 19 new properties on the World Heritage List, 13 of which were cultural, three mixed and three natural and also approved the extension of one property already inscribed on the List. Among the newly inscribed properties there are three cultural landscapes and with this addition we now have 105 properties officially recognized as such on the List. The breakdown by region of the 19 new properties that we inscribed at the last session is two from the Africa region, two from the Latin America and the Caribbean, three properties from Arab States, four properties from Asia and the Pacific and eight properties from Europe and the North America region. All in all, after the close of our last session the World Heritage List is now composed of 1,092 properties of which 845 are cultural, 209 are natural and 38 are mixed.

Mr Chairperson, dear colleagues, when speaking of nominations at our previous session in 14 cases the Committee did not follow the Advisory Body's recommendation presented in draft decisions and I have the duty to report that for the first time in the history of the World Heritage Convention the Committee has inscribed not one but two properties that were recommended for non-inscription, one of which was a newly proposed site while the other one was a site that

was referred back from a previous session of the Committee. I also wish to inform you that all of the referrals presented at the last session were inscribed. The Committee has also upon request of the submitting States Parties referred back a nomination, which was recommended for inscription on the List of World Heritage and simultaneously on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Mr Chairperson, the Committee has devoted considerable time to the deliberation of sites relating to conflict and memories under different agenda items. I wish to note here that following intensive discussions the Committee decided to adjourn consideration of the nomination relating to funerary and memorial sites of the First World War.

Under agenda Item 10, the Committee also decided to adjourn the consideration of every such similar sites until the 44th session of the Committee until a comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee has discussed and decided how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines.

Among the technical innovations that were introduced at the last session, I would like to mention that for the first time the amendments that I received electronically as Rapporteur were uploaded publicly on the website for ease of use, translated into the working languages and this practiced contributed to enhancing the transparency in the matters of work.

Last year was also the first time that a significant modification was introduced to the way Committee conducts its business under agenda Item 8, which as you certainly know is the establishment of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. It was noted by the Committee how the general decision under Item 7, state of conservation reports in recent years has enabled us to have substantial discussions relating to trends in conservation. Upon a proposal from a member of the Committee it was decided to establish a standing general Item 8 to create space on the agenda for more strategic discussions on matters related to nominations and the inscription processes for the World Heritage List.

Mr Chairperson, dear colleagues, the importance of strengthening the dialogue between States Parties and Advisory Bodies was emphasized throughout the session under different items and it was decided to inscribe a new separate item on the agenda for this session, focusing specifically on this matter. We have also inscribed a new point on Priority Africa Sustainable Development and World Heritage. As an important development, I would also like to report to you that the Committee has decided that the reflection meeting should be convened before March 2019 to examine different possibilities for reforming the nomination and evaluation process and to propose recommendations for consideration by the World Heritage Committee in view of increasing the balance and credibility of the World Heritage List. It has also been decided at the ad hoc working group whose mandate had been extended should review the reflection meeting report and recommendations and to submit this together with the advice of the ad hoc working group to the 44th session of the Committee. The Committee under its Decision 42 COM 8 has also decided that and here I will quote, "Considering that in compliance with the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, Outstanding Universal Value is recognised at the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List and that no recognition of Outstanding Universal Value is foreseen prior to this stage, decides to include the review of the referral procedure and its application for examination in the framework of the next revision of the Operational Guidelines at its 43rd session in 2019."

Finally, in the framework of the budget group chaired by Mr Rashad Baratli from Azerbaijan, the Committee decided that a two-year resource mobilization and communication strategy be planned and developed by the Secretariat with the support of the Advisory Bodies and States Parties wishing to assist the Secretariat in fundraising activities. The Secretariat is expected to make a progress report at this session of the Committee.

At the end of my report I cannot but repeat what I said last year on the last day of the Committee, we really need to applaud the Secretariat for the immense and dedicated work

they put forward in ensuring the success of our Committee's session. The job of Rapporteur would not be possible at all without the extraordinary team of the Secretariat under the leadership of Dr Rössler and I feel very grateful and very honored to have worked with them so closely last year. I wish to thank you all for elected me as Rapporteur of the 42nd session. I hope I have served you well and have lived up to the expectations. I also wish to express my deep appreciation to the Kingdom of Bahrain for having hosted the last session of the Committee and I think I can speak on behalf of all participants when I say that we had a wonderful and unforgettable time in Manama. In closing Mr Chairperson, please also allow me to congratulate and wish all the best to my successor, Ms Mahani Taylor from Australia who is our Rapporteur at this session and I am certain that she will fulfil her important tasks splendidly. I wish all the Members of the Committee rich debates, smooth proceedings and a successful session. I once again express my heartfelt thanks to Azerbaijan for hosting the Committee and I thank you for having listened to my rather long report. Thank you. [applause]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ms Zeichner. I can consider the applause as approval of the report and no need for discussion. Can we accept it like that? Then on behalf of all of us I would like to express our gratitude for the great work of the Secretariat at Manama and the Rapporteur's work; we appreciate it highly and once more to thank Bahrain for the perfect conditions provided for the previous session. Thank you very much. If there are no questions we can take note of the report and I am closing Item 4 of the agenda. Thank you very much .

Dear colleagues, as we agreed we have to make some commitment to the questions which are going to be supervised during certain a certain period during our session. That is why I would like to invite you to shift to agenda Item 14, the constitution of the consultative body for the review of the budget document. This document is WHC/19/43.COM/14. As you will remember, the Committee established by Decision 35 COM 12B a standing consultative body for the review of the Committee's biennial budget in conformity with Article 20 of the Rules of Procedure. This consultative body is open to all States Parties that wish to participate including States not members of the Committee. I would also like to recall that the Advisory Bodies will have the possibility to attend the working groups as Observers. Furthermore, based on past years and with a view to avoiding heavy agendas it has been suggested to the Committee to reduce the length of the working group to three days in view of improving the efficiency of the committee's work, instead of being held for the duration of the session. Therefore, and if this proposal is agreeable to the Committee, I would propose that the budget working group meets from Tuesday, 2 July to Thursday, 4 July from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m. Do you have any objections? I see none. So it is decided .

Furthermore, as you know as per Rule 20.2 of the Rules of Procedure it is the responsibility of the group to elect the Chairperson. However, I understand that consultations already took place in this regard. Therefore, I would like to know if a delegation would like to make a proposition. Saint Kitts and Nevis, please, the floor is yours.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis wishes to propose Anna Zeichner in the role of chairperson of the budget committee. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any other proposals? Spain.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] We would like to voice our support to the proposed nomination for the working group. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So if there are no other proposals, I see no objections, so it is decided that Anna Zeichner will be the Chairperson of the budget-working group. Thank you very much. Congratulations [applause]. Once more I would like to note and to remind you that the first meeting of the budget group will be held tomorrow from 2-3 p.m. in Room A7. So we are moving to the next agenda item, which is 11, establishment of the consultative body for the revision of the Operational Guidelines, document WHC/19/43.COM/11A.

Dear colleagues, in conformity with the specific decision of the Committee made in previous sessions, a revision of the Operational Guidelines has been inscribed on the agenda of our session. The proposed revision covers notably the upstream process, the mainstreaming of the policy documents for the integration of sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention into the operational procedures and the revision of the International Assistance process. Therefore, it is proposed that a working group will be established as a consultative body to consider the proposed revision in conformity with Article 20.1 of the Rules of Procedure and that is open to all States Parties including States not Members of the Committee. I would also like to recall that the Advisory Bodies will have the possibility to attend this working group. It is foreseen that this working group will report back to the Committee at its last plenary session on Tuesday, 9 July.

Dear colleagues, as you know we have just established the consultative body of the budget and I would like to put forward a proposal for the length of the working for the Operational Guidelines, that is to establish a limited duration of three maximum full days. If you are in agreement with such a proposal, the group could meet as from Friday, 5 July in Room A7 from 2-3 p.m. I don't see any objections. It is so decided.

Dear colleagues, as you know, as per Rule 20.2 of the Rules of Procedure it is also the responsibility of the group to elect the Chairperson. However, I understand that some consultations have been made in advance so I would like to hear the agreed proposal. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving me the floor. I will be brief. Norway would like to propose Mr Khalifa Al Khalifa from Bahrain as Chairperson for this working group. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie, qui prend pour la première fois la parole, remercie le pays hôte de l'organisation de cette session de notre Comité. La Tunisie soutient la proposition de la Norvège d'élire Bahreïn comme Président du groupe du travail sur la révision des *Orientations*. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

If there are no other proposals, and there are no objections, I would like to announce that Mr Khalifa al Khalifa is elected as Chairperson of the Operational Guidelines working group. Congratulations. [applause] The first meeting of the group will be therefore held as agreed on Friday, 5 July at 2 p.m. in Room A7.

Dear colleagues, now we turn our attention to Item 12, document WHC/19/43.COM/12, which concerns the follow-up to recommendations of evaluations and audits on working methods. As

you will remember the Committee at its 38th session in 2014 decided to establish an ad hoc working group to examine issues related to working methods of the evaluation and decision-making process of nominations, which is very important. Since this date the working group has met between sessions examining different matters of this framework. Therefore, since our last session in Bahrain the ad hoc working group pursued its reflections on the reform of the nomination process as well as the possible use of advisory services of other entities in addition to the current three Advisory Bodies. The Ad Hoc Working Group has met several times during the year under the chairpersonship of Azerbaijan. In this regard, I am pleased to give the floor to the Chair of the working group, Mr Rashad Baratli who will report on the work of the group.

Chairperson of the Ad Hoc Working Group:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Good morning to everyone and once again welcome to Azerbaijan. Through its Decision 42 COM 12A, the World Heritage Committee extended the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group composed of members of the Committee and up to two non-members per Electoral Group.

The main two items in the mandate were to examine different possibilities of reforming the nomination process and propose recommendations in view of increasing the balance and credibility of the World Heritage List, and the second, to discuss the modalities for the possible use of advisory services of other entities with suitable experience and knowledge in line with UNESCO rules and regulations and in addition to the current three Advisory Bodies. The Ad Hoc Working Group commenced its work on 19 November and subsequent meetings took place on 21 January, 25 February, 18 March, 18 April and 23 May and we were happy to organize one open-ended meeting for all States Parties on 29 March 2019.

During the planning of our work we tried to incorporate the results of the Tunisia Expert Meeting outcomes and also outcomes of online consultations survey on the reform process organized by the World Heritage Centre. Furthermore, we had the privilege and opportunity to listen to the presentation of the head of Tunisia Expert Meeting during our early meetings in the Ad Hoc Working Group.

Later on the Ad Hoc Working Group made a scoping exercise and defined certain stages in the nomination reform process overall and these were upstream process, tentative listing, preliminary assessment and, I will explain this later on more concretely, dialogue between States Parties and other stakeholders, package of principles, capacity building, timing, decision-making, code of conduct, evaluation process and financial implications, of course.

The Ad Hoc Working Group also decided that it would be good to have general guiding principles which will guide not only the work of current the Ad Hoc Working Group but also any further possible discussions on the reform process overall. At this stage there are three principles defined. Principle 1: Reforms must enhance the integrity of the World Heritage Convention by supporting the World Heritage List to be more representative, balanced and credible. Principle 2: Reform options will be assessed on their individual merit before being considered as part of a complete package of reforms. The individual assessment will include: issue; outcome; reform; changes required and financial implications. So this principle kind of gives a structure for analysis for any possible reform proposal in this regards. And Principle 3: Reform options will be assessed as part of a complete package of reforms before being recommended to the Committee to ensure the reforms are integrated and effective.

The Group also discussed the financial implications of any possible reform proposals and it was decided that before going to financial implications it would be better to focus on the reform options itself because if we start with financial implications that could create certain obstacles on our way because we are all aware of financial situations in the sphere of World Heritage. Starting with our first outcome, which I would say, is the main outcome and a really important, crucial one—this is the proposal on Preliminary Assessment. Just to give you the background

that this proposal, the idea also came from the Tunisia Expert Meeting but was focused by our Ad Hoc Working Group and was further elaborated during our discussions. The Ad Hoc Working Group produced in this regard a Preliminary Assessment concept paper. We are proposing to the Committee to endorse it so that further modalities will be discussed further on in the upcoming meetings because due to the time constraints we could of course not cover all details of this proposal. So very briefly about this proposal—the scope is very clear, it's a preliminary assessment phase, which contains a very light desk study of the nominations so to give the States Parties an idea whether a certain nomination has the potential of OUV or not and the idea is not just to give a very strict “yes” or “no” cutting-edge response to the States Parties but to create more opportunities for dialogue. The question of whether it should be mandatory or voluntary, the Ad Hoc Working Group clearly recommends that this phase should be of mandatory character so that at a later stage to be included as part of the official nomination process. In terms of methodology, as I already mentioned, it's assumed that it will be a desk study implemented by the Advisory Bodies. Some proposals are also mentioned here concerning the submission format of files presented to the preliminary assessment. We have ideas of using digital solutions and also having a national focal point from the side of States Parties as well. With regard to the submission format we expect that this format will be very light and short so that the States Parties do not invest heavily already at this stage in the possible nomination process. It should be limited in length and volume and as I said already it should be quite light. As a format we can use several other formats, which are already used in the process of nomination. But of course this will be a totally new submission format.

In terms of financial implications, of course it's not clear at this stage what would be the burden of this proposal, whether it would be an additional burden or help us to save, to make more economy but what is clear that even though in the first stage it may bring additional expenditure, in the long-term perspective it will, of course, help both States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to have more economy and efficient use of resources because through this proposal we are kind of trying to avoid possible deviations during the final Committee session discussion. So that is very important to keep in mind. Relations to upstream—the very simple answer is that upstream is of a voluntary character, whereas our proposal on Preliminary Assessment is to be of a mandatory character and to be a part of the official nomination process. In terms of upstream, basically there are no limits to how many sites can be proposed by one State Party to upstream process, whereas as being part of the official nomination process for Preliminary Assessment the State Party needs to present only one site per cycle.

In terms of timeline, if it's endorsed to be a part of the official nomination process, Preliminary Assessment would be a kind of a new first phase so it would be introduced before the current evaluation process. Of course there are modalities which should be defined further on and the overall idea is that the outcome of the Preliminary Assessment should be ready at least one year prior to the second so-called second stage, so current nomination. And the outcome of the Preliminary Assessment, if I may, also would be live maximum three to five years as actualities change, realities change so it cannot not be indefinitely kept. Of course we will need a statutory deadline, as this would be a part of the official nomination process. The Ad Hoc Working Group also thought that as it's a new concept we may need to have a transitional pilot phase for introducing this new Preliminary Assessment and before doing so, of course, we need to have more time on defining the modalities, as I've said already. There are a lot of modalities. Believe us, we discussed them in the Ad Hoc Working Group and realize that there are loads and we need time to fix them. So this is basically our main proposal of the Preliminary Assessment.

As I said, we have a concept paper and we propose the Committee to endorse this paper and further on give a new kind of cycle of either expert meeting or ad hoc working group to fix the modalities of this proposal. As I said, we did a scoping exercise and we had some other items. We did not have much time to focus very heavily on these items but just to briefly mention--we

discussed the tentative list, regional harmonization, thematic harmonization, we discussed upstream process, the relation to Preliminary Assessment as I already described. We discussed nomination guidance, so how we can help States Parties to prepare more solid nomination dossiers, improve nomination templates, to make them more concise, light, limited so that it doesn't take much time for States Parties and Advisory Bodies to evaluate. We discussed the working methods of Advisory Bodies. We need more transparency so methodology for evaluation of nominations, process for selecting panel members and advisers and Advisory Body evaluation formats. Of course we discussed the Global Strategy on credibility and balance and we discussed code of conduct. What was mentioned specifically here was that code of conduct should not be made just for Committee Members but all stakeholders including States Parties, Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre, I mean the UNESCO Secretariat in this regard. And we discussed dialogue and timing and in this regard I have to mention that we think that the introduction of Preliminary Assessment somehow also tackles the issue of dialogue because we always advocate for more dialogue between States Parties and Advisory Bodies. And just to briefly mention our second item on possible use of additional advisory services. We had quite a long qualitative discussion on this point. But finally it was agreed that the Ad Hoc Working Group proposes to the Committee to retain the current status quo on the working methods in this regard because if there is a need to ask for new advice from a new, let's say, evaluating body there is no legal impediment in this regard in the current working methodology of the Committee so by retaining the current status quo we can still go and ask for additional service if there is a need for such a request. And of course, in the document that you all have, we have a set of recommendations describing what I have already said. There are 16 recommendations and we have prepared the draft decision which is a very initial draft, obviously, and the item is opened, where we may still have some discussion on the text of the draft decision. And I think I will stop here. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to note that the Ad Hoc Working Group was working very seriously during all this period of time. I would like to express the gratitude of the World Heritage Centre and Committee for the dedicated work done during this period of time. We had 23 country representatives, 21 Committee Members and 12 additional countries so it was a team of 33 countries working on the documents, which are recommended and delivered to you in written form and now by Mr Baratli who led the Working Group. I would like to thank them for very serious work. But to avoid long discussions concerned with the items, which are proposed, as usual we would like to propose the following working system with this document. If you don't mind, of course, we will keep Item 12 open until 9 July. This means that during these seven or eight days you have to revise, seriously examine the documents proposed because the decisions, which are proposed there will be reflecting in our future activity in general and from this point of view I think that we have to be very dedicated and very serious with that. We considered that we have to thank all participants of this Ad Hoc Working Group and if you don't mind we will leave it open until 9 July. If there are any objections, maybe other proposals. We want to make it until 9 July to give the possibility of the Working Group and the Secretariat to work with your proposals, which can come later, and we will finish them in time. If there are no objections, I take it that the Committee agrees with the proposal and Item 12 remains open. Thank you very much for understanding. Before we proceed to Item 5, I would like to ask Ms Rössler to make some announcements concerning our procedural methods.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Just to make a few announcements. We have 50 side events during the 43rd session. This will be all announced on the screens outside. Many people are here also for the side events on discussions on different topics related to World Heritage so please make the best use of these events. Today there are a number of events I would like to announce already now which is at 1:10 p.m. It's is Our Natural World at Risk by WWF. At 1:10 p.m. to 2 p.m. Connecting Practice by ICCROM IUCN, in the Advisory Bodies meeting

room and then we have from 2:10 p.m. to 3:00 p.m, World Heritage Leadership programme and Capacity Building programme on People, Nature and Culture in the Advisory Bodies space so this is in terms of announcements at this stage already. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ms Rössler. Now on behalf of all the Committee Members and all the States Parties participants, I would like to greet H.E. Director-General Ms Audrey Azoulay for joining the Committee. We are very grateful for the responsibility given to this country to host it. I hope that your presence enlightens the value of this great event held in our country. Thank you and welcome once more. We will now move to the next item concerning the report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities, which is contained in document WHC/19/43.COM/5A. The report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities will be introduced by the Director of the Centre. I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler. The floor is yours.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre :

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and good morning to our Director-General. It's a great pleasure to have you with us when you hear what we have been doing within one year.

The Culture Sector was reorganized in late 2018. The Division for Heritage ceased to exist and the World Heritage Centre became again an entity in its own right. As the Director I am supported by our new Deputy-Director who is here with us, and the Centre now includes a team dedicated specifically to nomination matters in addition to the policy and statutory meetings and the five regional units supporting the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

The number of posts financed through regular and extrabudgetary funding sources has decreased over the last years but the number of properties on the World Heritage List, as you know currently 1,092, has increased. The tasks for the World Heritage Centre, including the demands by this World Heritage Committee have constantly increased. We are facing a situation that is no longer sustainable as explained already during the information session we had on 29 May, with you Mr Chairperson.

In this regard, I would like to thank very much Germany, Hungary, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Sweden, Turkey and Qatar for their staff support in terms of secondments, junior professional officers, associate experts, non-reimbursable loans and other modalities. So thank you very much for all of that.

In terms of the 39 C/5, the activities of the World Heritage Centre are fully in line with the Medium-Term Strategy 2014-2021 and the approved programme and budget 2018-2019.

As you know, the World Heritage Convention has one Expected Result: "Tangible heritage identified, protected, monitored and sustainably managed by Member States, in particular through the effective implementation of the 1972 Convention".

Five clear performance indicators have been developed to track progress and achievements in line with this Expected Result. While the performance indicators focused on quantitative information this presentation will provide concrete examples to illustrate how the World Heritage Centre has worked with States Parties, Advisory Bodies and many other stakeholders to identify, protect, monitor and sustainably manage the World Heritage.

Concerning the Governing Bodies, we have heard the key outcomes of the last session of the World Heritage Committee from our Rapporteur, Ms Zeichner. The decisions report and video

recordings of the sessions are fully available on the webpage of the 42nd session as well as in the summary records.

With Decision 42 COM 12A, the Committee decided to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group and we just have heard the report by Mr Baratli. The Ad Hoc Working Group has met several times since the 42nd session and the Centre provided background material and information prior to the working meeting and subsequently provided input as required.

An Orientation Session led by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee took place on 29 May 2019 in conjunction with the Information Session, where a budget briefing was also presented as requested by the World Heritage Committee. The second Orientation Session took place yesterday, which allowed the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to support Committee Members and States Parties in the preparation of this session. I would like to recall that this was noted as a best practice by the Governance Group.

Concerning performance indicator 2, capacity building: capacity-building activities were implemented in all regions and I would like to highlight only a few here.

We had the second Site Managers Forum in Bahrain in June 2018. The theme was World Heritage Site Managers: Roles, Responsibility and Capacity-Building Needs. In Bahrain the Forum included 44 representatives of World Heritage properties located in 33 States Parties. The meeting confirmed the utility and the importance of bringing site managers from different regions together for training, reflection and discussions. We are very much looking forward to hearing at this session the outcome of this year's meeting and Forum. I can assure you they had very lively debates. I attended a few sessions with them and we opened the meeting together with our Chairperson.

For the beginning of the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting, a series of workshops were organized to train National Focal Points and site managers from the Arab States region as a collaboration between the category 2 centre ARC-WH and the Secretariat. A preparatory workshop for the Africa region was also organized in Nelspruit (South Africa) in collaboration with the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) and the Department of Environmental Affairs of South Africa. The AWHF also organized the first African Regional Course on "Promoting People Centered Approaches to Conservation of Nature and Culture" Mosi-oaTunya/Victoria Falls in Zambia in collaboration with ICCROM and IUCN. A national seminar of site managers was held in Buenos Aires (Argentina) on strengthening risk management in World Heritage properties, with the support of the Argentinian National Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO, the Argentinian Committee for World Heritage and the Secretariat.

Now we move to Performance Indicator 3, which is on conservation and awareness raising. As you are well aware, this Convention is about conservation, and during this session the Committee will examine 166 state of conservation reports that were prepared by the World Heritage Centre with the Advisory Bodies, including 54 reports on sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. All state of conservation reports are integrated into our online World Heritage State of Conservation Information System. This Information System offers 3,600 state of conservation reports on 566 properties and is receiving growing attention and I know very much that you the Committee Members use it often.

At its 40th session in Istanbul and at UNESCO in 2016, the World Heritage Committee highlighted that stakeholders of the Convention were not always familiar with the content and procedures of the reactive monitoring process. It therefore decided to formally address the situation and requested an evaluation of the effectiveness of the reactive monitoring including procedures and case studies and that was Decision 40 COM 7. The evaluation was initiated in December 2017 and included wide consultation of all stakeholders of the Convention, as well as direct interviews of its main actors from States Parties, site managers, Committee

members, Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre as well as civil society. The final evaluation is presented under agenda item 7 for examination by the Committee.

The performance indicators have been amended this year to reflect the United Nations greater focus on the involvement of women, young people and civil society in its statutory processes. The examples given in this section of the report reflect this priority in conservation and awareness-raising activities carried out by the Centre. In partnership with the European Union, the World Heritage Education Programme organized the European Young Heritage Professionals Forum in May 2019 in Zadar, Croatia. The five-day Forum was designed to foster intercultural learning and exchange by bringing together 28 young professionals, one representative from each of the EU Member States, to address for the first time, both tangible and intangible cultural heritage, exploring potential synergies and challenges of protection and safeguarding in the European context.

In Mali, the programme for the Rehabilitation of Cultural Heritage and the Safeguarding of Ancient Manuscripts continued to receive financial support from the European Union and the Spanish Cooperation. This has allowed restoration and conservation work in Timbuktu and the Old Towns of Djenné and on the Tomb of Askia in Gao. It has further allowed several capacity-building activities on heritage protection for local actors, Malian institutions, as well as civilian and military personnel of MINUSMA.

The fourth phase of the UNESCO/Republic of Korea Funds-in-Trust project Safeguarding of Koguryo Tombs in the Republic of Korea was launched May 2019 during a ceremony organized in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This event also marked the 20th anniversary of the cooperation between UNESCO and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the preservation of Koguryo cultural heritage, and in particular the complex of Koguryo Tombs. A technical report on the third phase of the project is available online. This long-time international cooperation supported by the Republic of Korea's Cultural Heritage Administration.

Please note, due to unexpected circumstances the side event, which was indicated in document 5A, paragraph 56 will not be organized during this session. We are planning to organize this activity during the General Assembly of States Parties in November 2019 at UNESCO.

The World Heritage Volunteers campaign under the theme of "Empowering the Commitment to World Heritage" organized 47 action camps between March-November 2018 at 44 World Heritage properties and sites on Tentative Lists, located in 25 countries, involving 41 local organizations. These action camps bring together organizations, institutions, volunteers, communities and specialists working towards the conservation of World Heritage properties by participating in practical activities and awareness-raising campaigns to develop an appreciation of World Heritage values.

An extrabudgetary project was developed in cooperation with the national and local authorities involved in the conservation and management of Pre-Columbian Chiefdom Settlements with Stone Spheres of the Diquís in Costa Rica, financed by the German Foreign Office for International Cooperation. The project aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities, particularly young people, in conservation and management as well as developing opportunities for education and communication.

As further awareness-raising activity, the Secretariat has ensured a regular publications output including quarterly issues of the World Heritage Review, as well as a special edition supported by the State Party of Azerbaijan for this Committee session. As you see here on the screen we did a joint publication with other United Nations agencies and in this case, UNITAR and UNOSAT on "The Ancient City of Aleppo" which was published in English, French and Arabic. There is also a side event on this publication during this session.

On Performance Indicator 4, the SDGs and sustainable development: further to the adoption of the World Heritage Policy for Sustainable Development in 2015, the Centre continues to mainstream sustainable development in all its activities, as appropriate, including statutory processes, operational projects and capacity-building activities. This is further reflected in detail in document 5C, which we will discuss later and here I will give only a few examples. A major \$US 9M project, led by a private-public consortium, was launched in October 2018 to build climate adaptation strategies within five marine World Heritage sites. An exchange of best practices between Glacier Bay National Park and West Norwegian Fjords also led the Norwegian Parliament to adopt a resolution to halt emissions from cruise ships and ferries and make the World Heritage site the world's first zero-emission zone at sea. Congratulations [applause].

As an example of collaboration with the organization of other bodies I would like to use the example of the Organization of the World Heritage Cities (OWHC), which continues. For example, in February 2019 I attended a conference with more than 50 representatives from UNESCO World Heritage Cities organized by the city of Vienna and OWHC. The event was a forum for exchange and discussion on the challenges facing dynamic cities between development pressures and the preservation of their World Heritage sites. Representatives from the Centre also attended the OWHC Congress in June 2019 in Krakow, Poland, with the theme Heritage and Tourism: Local communities and visitors sharing responsibilities.

Furthermore, the implementation of a project financed by the German Federal Foreign Office to develop Disaster Risk Management Plans for three properties in Chile began in 2018 with meetings and workshops held between national authorities and local management actors in Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works, Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso and Rapa Nui National Park.

The UNESCO-Africa-China Forum on World Heritage Capacity Building and Cooperation mentioned by the Director-General yesterday in her speech was held at UNESCO Headquarters from 3-4 June 2019 and it concluded with the adoption of recommendations and an action plan for joint projects supporting long-term capacity building for the safeguarding of African World Heritage properties. The Forum was attended by 173 participants including Ministers, academics, World Heritage experts, Advisory Bodies, the African Development Bank and the African Union Commission. The recommendations pledged greater cooperation between Africa and China in the field of heritage conservation and exchange programmes in areas concerning sustainable development, traditional management systems, use and innovation among others. A Memorandum of Understanding was also signed between the African World Heritage Fund and the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for Asia and the Pacific Region for the strengthening of capacity and heritage safeguarding activities and we will further look into the specific topics of sustainable development in the Africa region under Item 5D.

Now concerning Performance Indicators on nominations. There were 19 properties inscribed by the Committee at its 42nd session. The List reached 1092 properties including 54 on the Danger List. As a follow up to Decision 42 COM 12A, an Expert Meeting was held in Tunis in January 2019 further to the invitation of the Tunisian Government and with financial support from the Australian Government. The meeting brought together 24 experts from all regions of the world, including an indigenous peoples expert and a young heritage professional, as well as our Advisory Bodies, category 2 centres and the Secretariat to review the nomination process, Tentative List and upstream process, bearing in mind the Global Strategy and to consider other possible measures. The outcomes of this meeting were then discussed by the Ad Hoc Working Group, which you just heard about from Mr Baratli, and you can see the full report in documents INF.8 and INF.12A.

The Centre continues, of course, to support States Parties in the process of updating Tentative Lists and providing advice and information on good practices concerning the elaboration of nomination files.

Let me give you some concrete examples. The African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) organized initiatives aimed at improving the representation of Africa on the World Heritage List. They did, for example, a three-week long Francophone World Heritage Nomination Training Course in September 2018 in Kigali, Rwanda. This course was implemented by the *Ecole du Patrimoine Africain* with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre and gathered participants from ten French- and Portuguese-speaking countries working on nine World Heritage nomination dossiers.

A subregional conference, World Heritage Global Strategy in the Context of South Asia, was held in February 2019 in Kolkata, India and provided an opportunity for National Focal Points and experts from Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal and Sri Lanka to identify and discuss gaps in heritage identification and nomination.

An expert meeting on the Safeguarding of the Oasis systems in the Maghreb was organized in Oujda, Morocco in October /November by the UNESCO Office in Rabat and the *Agence de l'Oriental*, in collaboration with the Ministry of Culture and Communication and with the financial support of the Netherlands. This meeting, during which the Centre underlined the importance and complexity of these natural and cultural landscapes, aimed at presenting oasis systems as developing human settlements. A detailed and participative methodology on updating Tentative Lists was developed in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, and is being piloted successfully with the States Parties of Peru and Honduras through the International Assistance mechanism. Both have held international and national workshops, with ICOMOS and IUCN experts. Several other States Parties in the region, including Colombia, Chile and the Plurinational State of Bolivia have also demonstrated their interest in applying the same methodology.

Now on gender equality. Gender is one of the Global Priorities of UNESCO. The gender equality dimension is consistently integrated in the implementation of all activities carried out by the Centre following the adoptions of the World Heritage and Sustainable Development Policy. Effective mainstreaming of gender equality is particularly demonstrated by the World Heritage Education Programme both for content and for participants. For example, the participation of girls has exceeded 50% for the World Heritage Youth Forum.

Let me now also talk about synergies with other Conventions. I think these synergies have been increased and further enhanced by the Centre since the last World Heritage Committee meeting. The Secretariat has ensured cross-disciplinary collaboration with the other culture Conventions in our Culture Sector, for example, by including a specialist of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, in a training workshop on Periodic Reporting for National Focal Points for the Arab States region in February 2019. I think the practice of inviting the participation of other UNESCO culture and biodiversity-related Conventions and programmes to meetings related to the third cycle of periodic reporting should be continued.

On the occasion of biodiversity-related Conventions (BLG) meeting last September, members of these eight biodiversity-related Conventions met with the UNESCO Culture Conventions Liaison Group (CCLG), so the BLG met with the CCLG and this is a unique photo—you see me in the middle; I'm sandwiched because I'm representing you, the World Heritage Convention which is at the same time a biodiversity-related Convention and a cultural-diversity Convention so you see on the right-hand side of the photo the biodiversity-related Conventions and on the left-hand side the culture-related Conventions. The Assistant Director-General for Culture and myself attended the 2018 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development held at United Nations Headquarters in New York in July 2018 and the Secretariats of the

biodiversity-related Conventions organized a successful joint event called the Living Planet--the foundation of sustainable development and there we promoted the cooperation among all the Conventions.

The seventh session of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) met at UNESCO Headquarters from 29 April to 4 May 2019. The first Global Biodiversity Assessment was presented for adoption at this meeting, which presented the overall status of biodiversity in the world and was a wake-up call to the global community, presenting evidence to indicate that biodiversity loss is still accelerating. The release of the Assessment is a major step on the way towards the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of Parties (COP 15) in China in 2020. The Centre participated in IPBES-7 and I had the pleasure of presenting a joint statement from all biodiversity-related Conventions to this IPBES meeting.

The Global Assessment report also clearly demonstrated that the world is failing to reach the objectives as set in the Aichi Targets in the framework on the Convention of biological diversity to slow down the loss of biodiversity. In this context the States Parties of CBD are currently negotiating the future Global Biodiversity Framework that should be adopted at COP15 in Kunming, China in November 2020. This new global agenda to halt biodiversity loss has to bring about transformative change to address the drivers of this loss, including land conversion, over exploitation of natural resources and climate change, requiring shifts in global financial and economic systems to build a worldwide sustainable economy. From 10-12 June the World Heritage Convention, together with the all seven other biodiversity-related Conventions, participated in a consultation workshop in Bern, Switzerland to discuss the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

The “Follow-up to Global Decisions” section of our report summarizes some of the work of the Secretariat, which is presented in other key documents of the Committee; therefore I will not go through it here. However, I would like to highlight two points. The organization of an expert meeting on memory sites, requested by the Committee at its 42nd session is subject to the availability of extrabudgetary funds, of which limited amounts have been committed by States Parties so far. The Secretariat is actively seeking extrabudgetary contributions in order to finance the organization of the meeting and you can find further details in the general document on nominations, document 8, which was requested by the Committee to send to the Centre for the first time last year. The process for UNESCO’s strategic transformation is also outlined, as is the role of the World Heritage Committee in this specific process.

As mentioned in the beginning, there are five annexes to our Secretariat’s report, which are important to look at.

Annex 1 is the results-based report on the activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre in pursuit of the five Cs, covering the period from July 2018 to June 2019 and detailing in greater depth the inspiring activities the Centre has been involved with since the last session of the Committee. Please note there is an error on page 25 of the English version and page 27 of the French version of Annex 1 and I would like to inform you that the reactive monitoring mission to Iraq to “The Ahwar of Southern Iraq: refuge of biodiversity and the relict landscape of the Mesopotamian cities” has now been postponed until after this Committee session.

Annex 2 is the follow-up to all of the Decisions you have adopted in Manama, 2018.

Annex 3 is the World Heritage Expert and other Meetings from January 2019 to December 2019.

Annex 4 is the report on the use of the World Heritage emblem from February 2018 to February 2019.

Annex 5 is an inventory of the World Heritage partnerships.

Dear Committee Members, the draft decision is on page 19-20 in the English version and 21 in the French version of the document. I would like to thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I know I have been a little bit long but I can assure you that it's the only time that I speak this long to the Committee just to give justice to the report we have presented. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ms Rössler for this detailed presentation on the work accomplished this year and I would like to know whether there are any comments from the Members of the Committee concerning the report of Ms Rössler. I see none. Norway. Please, Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson for giving Norway the floor again. On behalf of Norway, I would like to thank you for hosting the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee and thank you for the very warm and friendly welcome and for the fantastic opening ceremony yesterday. I would also like to congratulate you on your position as Chair, a role that I'm confident that you will fulfil in an excellent manner. And let me compliment the World Heritage Centre on its hard work and great achievements. The many meetings, workshops and projects that the Centre takes part in is essential for the implementation of the Convention as a whole. The capacity-building and awareness-raising activities contribute to sow seeds of knowledge and a sense of ownership to heritage. This will hopefully permit present and future generations to harvest sustainable management and safeguarding of our unique and shared values.

During the course of the year the Centre performs an impressively high number of activities. These are in close collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, the regional field offices, the category 2 centres and other institutions. The knowledge of these institutions is important. It is also essential that the Centre itself holds a high level of expertise. Why? In order to ensure the overall quality of the work as well as to facilitate synergies, particularly those that strengthen the comprehensive management of nature and culture.

Finally, let me express my great concern for the following fact. During last year's meeting, we the Committee went against the Advisory Body's recommendations on several occasions. According to the report in question we did so in 87% of the nominations. We even managed to write ourselves into history by being the first Committee to have ever inscribed nominations recommended for non-inscription on the World Heritage List. As a Member of the Committee this is something that Norway is not proud of and this year we hope to do better.

I would like to end my intervention by confirming that Norway supports the draft decision. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your comment. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe. Please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Firstly, we want to congratulate you for being the Chair of this 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. Secondly, we would like to thank the Republic of Azerbaijan for hosting this 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. That State Party of Zimbabwe expresses satisfaction with the activities of the World Heritage Centre, in particular, those aimed at capacity building for the participation of African States Parties in ensuring a balanced and credible World Heritage List. We encourage the Centre to continue with this work. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now the floor is going to Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. À la suite de la présentation du rapport du Centre du patrimoine mondial, c'est avec plaisir que nous voulons dire notre satisfaction de l'ensemble du travail du Centre, qui tient à la fois à sauvegarder l'esprit, la lettre de la Convention, mais aussi les recommandations de chaque session du Comité. Ce rapport traduit le travail, la diversité, mais aussi la sollicitude que le Centre témoigne à l'endroit de beaucoup de situations et beaucoup d'éléments de notre Convention.

Je voudrais, au nom de la Tunisie, souligner deux points qui émergent à nos yeux de ce rapport. Le premier est celui de la réflexion autour de l'évolution du processus d'inscription, et je suis heureux de vous voir souligner l'accueil par la Tunisie, grâce aussi au soutien de l'Australie, de la réunion en janvier dernier sur l'avenir du processus d'inscription, quand on sait quelle est l'importance accordée à cet aspect de la Convention.

Le deuxième point qui me paraît émerger et à la fois témoigner de l'importance de l'avenir de cette Convention, c'est ce que Mme Rössler a rappelé à plusieurs reprises tout à l'heure : c'est le dialogue entre les différentes conventions. Il nous incombe de veiller au bon respect de notre Convention, mais également à la cohérence générale de l'arsenal juridique de notre Maison, et donc réfléchir, travailler de concert avec ceux qui veillent à l'application des autres conventions de l'UNESCO me paraît extrêmement important, et c'est pour ça que, au nom de la Tunisie, non seulement nous le soulignons mais nous l'apprécions. Merci beaucoup de votre attention.

Chairperson

Thank you very much for your intervention. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. The Tanzanian Delegation congratulates you, Chairperson for being elected to be the Chair of this important session. Tanzania thanks Azerbaijan for the warm hospitality that was extended to us. The Tanzanian Delegation congratulates and commends the work of the World Heritage Centre for the report that covers various activities that were implemented. The Delegation also commends the efforts of the World Heritage Centre for the support to States Parties in the development of national policies, the development of the climate adoption strategies, the assessment of the impact of climate change for the conservation of World Heritage Coral Reef and also the submission of national reports on the progress of the implementation of the 2011 Historic Urban Landscape recommendations. Furthermore, the Tanzanian Delegation commends the work of the World Heritage Centre for its excellent organization of the context-specific activities through its regional offices as presented in the Performance Indicators.

In addition, Chairperson, the Tanzanian Delegation is satisfied with the progress made by the Centre to ensure that the gender equality dimension is consistently integrated in the implementation of the activities carried out within the Centre and further wishes to encourage the involvement of women in decision-making efforts of the Centre's activities as part of UNESCO's global priorities. The Tanzanian Delegation commends the Centre on the achievements made in the reconstruction and recovery of World Heritage properties damaged by conflict or natural disasters worldwide. The Tanzanian Delegation encourages the Centre to continue the development of the webpage to expand the understanding of the synergies of the 1972 Convention with culture- and biodiversity-related Conventions and programmes.

Chairperson, the Tanzanian Delegation is convinced that the Centre will continue to instill measures that are in the interest of the protection of World Heritage properties worldwide amid the changing societal circumstances. Furthermore, the Tanzanian Delegation has interests in two areas: one is on sites associated with memories and the second is on the thematic study on astronomical heritage.

Recalling last year's decision where it was decided to convene an expert meeting on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts to allow for both philosophical and practical reflections on the nature of memorization, the value of evolving memories, the interrelationship between material and immaterial attributes, in relation to memory we have heard the report that we have the challenge of financial challenges, we call upon the international community to try and look for those funds because for Africa we think this is an agenda that should be actually pursued. Chairperson, I support the decision and thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The floor goes to Brazil.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much. Allow me first of all to express our most sincere gratitude to the Government of Azerbaijan for the exceptional hospitality extended to all of us. Allow me also to congratulate you, Mr Chairperson for the excellent organization of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. We were all very impressed with the magnificent reception offered to us yesterday, reflecting the rich and ancient culture of Azerbaijan. Allow me now on behalf of the Brazilian Delegation congratulate Ms Rössler for the very clear presentation of the draft report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities which will be submitted to the 40th session of the General Conference. Brazil as a Member of the World Heritage Committee is engaged in its strategic objectives, oriented towards the strengthening of the credibility of the World Heritage List, ensuring effective conservation of the properties, promoting capacity building including through the activities of category 2 centres and UNESCO field offices and also increasing public awareness, involvement and support for World Heritage through communication. So we commend the decision and activities of the World Heritage Centre. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your comments and appreciation of our work. Now the floor goes to Burkina Faso.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Permettez-moi, au nom de la délégation du Burkina Faso, de vous adresser nos sincères félicitations pour votre élection et remercier la République d'Azerbaïdjan pour son accueil chaleureux et pour les excellentes conditions de travail qui nous sont offertes. Je voudrais également remercier et féliciter le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le rapport qui nous a été soumis sur ses activités et sur la mise en œuvre des décisions du Comité. La délégation du Burkina Faso note avec appréciation les différentes activités réalisées dans les différentes régions du monde, avec une attention particulière portée sur des priorités de l'UNESCO que sont l'Afrique, l'égalité des genres, les jeunes et les petits États insulaires en développement. Nous saluons les efforts du Centre du patrimoine mondial et des centres de catégorie 2, ainsi que tous les partenaires, pour le travail réalisé en vue de la mise en œuvre des décisions du Comité. Nous voudrions souligner avec insistance l'importance du renforcement des capacités et encourager le Centre du patrimoine mondial à développer davantage d'activités dans ce sens-là. Il en est de même pour la sensibilisation sur l'engagement en faveur du patrimoine mondial. Enfin, nous souhaiterions souligner la

nécessité de revoir les modalités et les méthodologies générales sur les rapports afin de mieux faire apparaître les résultats atteints dans les documents. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The floor goes to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

La délégation de Bosnie-Herzégovine remercie le Gouvernement de l'Azerbaïdjan pour cette extraordinaire organisation, et l'UNESCO pour le travail préparatoire effectué. Je donne la parole à notre expert pour ajouter quelques mots.

Bosnia and Herzegovina Expert:

Thank you, Chairperson. Bosnia and Herzegovina would like to congratulate the Centre for the preparation of this document with a non-exhaustive list of its activities. Especially we congratulate the Centre for very good progress in synergistic work with biodiversity Conventions and IPBES, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. We understand that the goals and values of World Heritage sites are not only of the aesthetic nature. The essential function is to conserve ecosystems necessary for human wellbeing. In this regard we support the draft decision, especially paragraph 4 of this decision. However, we would like to emphasis the need not only to call States Parties to engage in the preparation but also the implementation of post-2020 global biodiversity framework once it is decided and defined including through synergistic actions of the World Heritage Convention and other biodiversity-related Conventions on the national, regional and global levels. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for these comments.

Chairperson:

Now the floor goes to China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all I wish to use the opportunity to congratulate Azerbaijan for the wonderful hospitality they extended to this Committee and to all the Members and also for the wonderful organization the Azerbaijan Government has so far extended to us. We also wish to use the opportunity to congratulate you Minister for being the Chairperson and we look forward to a wonderful conference. With regard to Ms Rössler's report we wish to congratulate you and the World Heritage Centre for doing a wonderful job in the last year. The list of very rich activities demonstrates the extent and focus of the World Heritage Centre. We are delighted to notice the active participation of the States Parties, particularly African nations in building this report. China is proud to be part of the process and we shall continue to act as we did and continue to work with very closely with the World Heritage Centre. I also wish to make a comment that, just as Ms Rössler indicated, since the restructuring of the Culture Sector last year we noticed that the World Heritage Centre is now much more focused on the main activities of the Centre and we believe this is conducive to the development of the World Heritage cause. We congratulate the World Heritage Centre and we also use this opportunity to congratulate UNESCO and Madam Director-General and the ADG and we wish to thank you for your part in the strategic transformation. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please, you are welcome.

Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Since this is the first time our delegation takes the floor we would also like to congratulate you for your election and we would also like to thank Azerbaijan for hosting our session. I can tell you that as a Hungarian I am particularly glad to be here in the friendly country of Azerbaijan. Now we would also like to thank Madam Director for the comprehensive report on the activities of the World Heritage Centre. We particularly appreciate the capacity-building and awareness-raising activities in helping States Parties to preserve World Heritage sites in their territories and to help the understanding of the Convention and the Operational Guidelines. These activities are essential for promoting the core aim of the Convention, which is conservation.

This is a very comprehensive report and we have a very short time so we will only touch upon a few of the activities but we could actually go on for hours. We would like to say that we welcome the World Heritage Journeys of the European Union initiative which was supported by the European Union in collaboration with National Geographic and we hope to see these kinds of websites focusing on World Heritage and sustainable travel and tourism be extended not only to other regions but even within the European Union since it only focuses on 34 sites for now. We also wish to express our appreciation to Norway for having provided funding to the publication on the city of Aleppo. It's a very important report for the strategic planning of recovery and reconstruction and it's a sad reality that we need to have such publications. We would also like to say as we do every time we get a chance that we are very concerned about the human resources situation since such a rich and comprehensive list of activities undertaken by the Centre, it seems almost impossible that this could be done with such a small staff so we are very grateful to the colleagues working there, because with only 28 established posts under the regular programme the workload they face is enormous.

The World Heritage Convention is different from other Conventions or programmes with listing mechanisms because it foresees and has developed a very efficient and constant monitoring and follow-up system of the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The balance of the List also affects the work of the regional units as the sites to be monitored keep growing every year.

Hungary is seconding a national expert to the Europe and North America regional unit but secondments of experts is not a sustainable way forward and we find it worrying that 28 posts are financed through voluntary contributions or in-kind resources. We would also like to add here that we find it very in trend in general that more and more programmes have to be financed through extrabudgetary means. We need to find a sustainable solution to the budgetary constraints that the Fund is facing.

We want to close our intervention by expressing our appreciation to the Centre and to underline how much we appreciate working together with them in a constructive dialogue and we stand ready to continue to support their work. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Hungary.

Chairperson:

Now the floor goes to Saint Kitts and Nevis, please.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Let me first of all open by congratulating you, distinguished Minister for hosting this event this year and also for the spectacular opening ceremony last night, showcasing the diversity of cultural heritage legacy that your country brings to the world stage. I'd like to thank the Director of the World Heritage Centre, Ms Rössler for a very

comprehensive report on the World Heritage Centre activities and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's decisions. But I'd also like to commend her and indeed her staff for the implementation of the World Heritage programme. We don't thank them enough for the work that they do under sometimes very restrictive conditions of budget and so on and also to thank her for the specific assistance she has provided to Small Island Developing States like Saint Kitts and Nevis. Let me, Mr Chairperson, seize this opportunity to say that having taking note of the fact that we have now reached 1,092 sites on the World Heritage List, it is worth pointing out that slightly less or a little bit more than 2% of these sites are located in Small Island Developing States. I think this speaks volumes about recognizing the inherently limited nature of institutional capacity that is faced by the majority of SIDS and which acts as an impediment in terms of identifying, inventorying and proposing potential heritage sites and it also, I think, speaks volumes about the need going forward to recognize the Small Island Developing States as a specific area of continuing technical assistance on funding, to help us identify, inventory and evaluate and conserve some of our unique cultural heritage associated at regional and subregional levels. It also needs to take into account the emerging issues, notably in relation to identifying and persevering heritage tourism and its implications and potential going forward. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for these kind words.

Chairperson:

Now the floor goes to Uganda.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Mr Chairperson, since this is Uganda's first time taking the floor we wish to congratulate and thank the Republic of Azerbaijan for hosting this 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee here in Baku. We particularly appreciate the warmth and hospitality extended to us since our arrival in your capital. Your Excellency, Uganda further thanks UNESCO in general and the World Heritage Centre in particular for the continued efforts in saving the surviving cultural and natural heritage on the globe.

Your Excellency, Mr Chairperson and distinguished delegations from across the globe, it is no more in doubt that humankind is greatly supported by this heritage. However, humankind's deliberate or unintentional actions of encroachment, development intrusions, agricultural expansion, mineral exploitation, crime, civil unrest—all of these have immense impact and pressure on heritage sustainability. Combined with the rapidly growing population estimated at over 230,000 babies in a day, these pressures increase and are further exacerbated by the occurrence of natural disasters. All of these together are degrading and affecting the outstanding universal values of these important treasures.

We have a responsibility, Mr Chairperson, to safely deliver world protected heritage for posterity and this cannot be within the role of individual Member States, rather we need to build strong partnerships. We need to promote meaningful coordinated efforts to build the capacity of the youth, to build the capacity of communities and to build more experts to facilitate the smooth handover of these treasures over to the next generations. We further need to improve information sharing and employ the right technologies that will promote sustainable management of the world's heritage.

In Uganda, conservation is not a matter of choice; it is a matter of survival in our case. It is enshrined in our constitutions; it is in our cultural. It is also in our religion. The work of this Committee therefore is very important to humanity.

We, the States Parties, the UNESCO Convention and all other States that hold and use these world heritages have an obligation to engage and act responsibly. Mr Chairperson, distinguished colleagues, the delegation of Uganda supports the draft decision on Item 5A and wishes this session successful deliberations. And we thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Now the floor goes to Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would like to thank the Secretariat for its report and the five performance indicators are indeed a powerful and important tool to enable States Parties and Committee Members to assess the activities of the Secretariat in different areas. But my delegation has certain observations with regard to several activities done by the Secretariat.

The first is the capacity building. Azerbaijan is always advocating for increasing the capacity-building activities of the Secretariat. We commend the activities of the Secretariat in this regard but still we believe there is room for improvement in delivering capacity building first to the least wealthy countries, namely in Africa and also to assist the countries in the conservation and awareness raising. There are just a few examples of lack of expertise or lack of resources in Africa in submission of the nominations. For example, this year we have only one nomination from Africa or 80% of heritage in Africa is on the in Danger List, so these are alarming indicators that we need to redouble our efforts and invest more in Africa for capacity building. In this regard we believe that the Site Managers Forum is a powerful tool to attract attention to the challenges facing the site managers and also to increase capacity building and we are very happy that Azerbaijan for the third time is hosting the Site Managers Forum in Baku and a special focus is given to the site managers from Africa.

The second very important point we believe is the synergies. We are always talking about the synergies being on this Committee for four years and we still observe that there are some issues that need more coordination between the Convention's Secretariat and the activities that the Conventions are doing within their mandates. As we see that the main threats to heritage are caused by conflict, we believe that the main, I would say, the activities, the coordination should be established in a more comprehensive and closer way with the cultural conventions dealing with conflicts and the Hague Convention and the 1970 Convention. But at the same time of course we do understand that there are other problems caused by natural disasters and climate change and biodiversity conventions are indeed also very crucial in terms of strengthening the protection of the heritage.

All of these issues are discussed with Committee Members and were reflected in the Baku Declaration, which will be adopted after this item. I thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Now the floor goes to Guatemala.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. This is the first time we are taking the floor so we would like to thank the Republic of Azerbaijan for this truly wonderful event and for the support they provided to the World Heritage Centre to carry out its work. We have looked at the World Heritage Centre's report and are grateful for it and it shows the extensive and complicated work involved in conserving heritage and this would only be possible thanks to networks, alliances, cooperation and many-faceted partnerships and cooperation with clear aims.

I'd like to take this opportunity to say that in a same way Guatemala has continued working on the implementation of the Convention in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean jointly with the category 2 centre in Zacatecas, Mexico. We agree with what other Committee Members have said in so far, as we need to continue working to strengthen capacities with respect to the nomination process, in particular with respect to the sustainable management of sites inscribed in the List. We support the Global Strategy to have a more balanced, credible and representative List. Thank you for your attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, you are welcome.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish to English] Thank you, Chairperson. We'd like to join others in thanking the Republic of Azerbaijan for the wonderful hospitality it has provided to all of us and the wonderful organization of the event. I would also like to thank the World Heritage Centre and its Director, of course, for the excellent work they have carried out. We are all aware of the fact that this work is carried out with fewer and fewer resources and very limited staff. We are also aware of the fact that this work is added to by the decisions that we take at Committee meetings and perhaps we should think about how our ability to act is limited by the limited resources and so we are very grateful for the technical support that is provided.

We really appreciate the priority on Africa and we know there are requirements for conservation and preservation of heritage and this has to be combined with the aspirations to full development to all Member States. We know that tremendous efforts have been made to support all States in this respect.

We are very grateful that SDGs are in the resolution with special focus on gender equality. We have share heritage and share the idea of harmonious coexistence. We all live on the same planet and we have to share it in a more humane way and in a way based on solidarity.

Spain will always cooperate with the World Heritage Centre and with those States who seek to defend and protect heritage. This is a key pillar for peaceful coexistence for all humankind. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your comments.

Chairperson:

The floor goes to Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. At the Australian Delegation, we're delighted to be here in Baku and thank the hospitality of all the Azerbaijani people and are quite taken with the diversity and cultural heritage of this city. We wish you every success in chairing this meeting. Madam Rössler's report outlines the enormous scope of work undertaken by the Centre focused on the protection of our world heritage in partnership with States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and many other actors. There is a great deal being done with very limited resources and we shouldn't lose sight of this fact as several delegations have already underlined.

The demands for action by support for the conservation and protection of World Heritage properties grow ever larger as is evidenced by the fact we have 160 properties being examined because of concerns for their state of conservation on our agenda this year. We need to invest in capacity building focused particularly on how to protect the managed sites at all levels in lawmaking, in governance, in community participation, in recognition of indigenous peoples' rights, in conservation practices, in resilience management...the list is extensive and the need is deep. So when and how will the World Heritage Committee find the ways and means to invest in conservation substantially and as is required of us under the Convention? We need to find answers to this question and we need to continue that dialogue during the course of this meeting.

Likewise we need to work vigilantly to improve the processes of the Committee in session and out of session to ensure we uphold the integrity and credibility of the Convention. We have that opportunity here in Baku with the general items we have around for example, the reform of the nomination process and also in looking at the reactive monitoring review.

At this meeting, we have the opportunity to seize the day and make reforming decisions that leave a lasting positive legacy to the Convention and I encourage a constructive dialogue towards that end and am very hopeful that by the time we reach day 10 here in Baku, we will look back with a great deal of satisfaction at our collective achievements. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now the floor goes to Bahrain.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you very much. I would first like to express our congratulations from Bahrain to the State of Azerbaijan for hosting this 43rd meeting and Bahrain was honored last year to host the 42nd meeting and we would also like to thank the World Heritage Centre and UNESCO for supporting us through the preparation, implementation and management of that event. I would like also on behalf of Bahrain to congratulate His Excellency, Mr Garayev on being elected as the Chairperson for this session.

For us in Bahrain we are continuously working through the authority for culture, BACA, and also the category 2 centre in Bahrain for the Arab region. We work very closely with the World Heritage Centre and we would like to congratulate the Centre and the Director, Dr Rössler for the wonderful work that they carried out last year and their continued support also to the States Parties.

We are quite happy and congratulate you all with the Advisory Bodies for preparing and managing a reflection meeting in January in Tunis for reviewing and possible revision of certain parts of the nomination process and we believe that this with your continued efforts for capacity building and public awareness of the value of cultural heritage and natural heritage.

We believe this will help bridge the gap between various States Parties especially in regions that are underrepresented on the World Heritage List. I thank you all and I would like again to

thank the State of Azerbaijan for the generous hospitality and wonderful running of this Committee meeting and also our appreciation and how impressed we were with the wonderful evening we had last night. Thank you all very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for those kind words.

Chairperson:

Now there are no Committee Members so the Republic of Korea.

The Observer Delegation of the Republic of Korea:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like to express my deep appreciation to the World Heritage Centre for its efforts to implement the Committee's decisions. We are all aware that each heritage site may have different and even conflicting meanings for different communities and peoples. Therefore, the Republic of Korea has been strongly committed to fostering interpretation strategies that would allow for understanding of the full history of each site.

In this vein, I would like to recall two recent incidents by the Committee regarding the sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution. These sites were inscribed under the condition that the Government of Japan prepare an interpretive strategy to allow an understanding of the full history of each site. Subsequent to this decision, the representative of the Japanese Government stated that Japan was prepared to incorporate appropriate measures into the interpretative strategy to remember the victims, such as the establishment of information centre.

Since there has been no progress made thereafter, the Committee in Manama last year reiterated the key points of the previous decision by requesting the full implementation of the Government of Japan. The Committee also encouraged continued dialogue between the concerned parties. Considering that an updated status of conservation report of this property is due 1 December this year, however, I regret to notice no visible sign of implementation or willingness for dialogue.

The Government of the Republic of Korea therefore urges the Government of Japan to faithfully implement these decisions and uphold its promises made before the international community through bilateral talks with Korea.

Finally, I would like to bring the attention of the Committee Members to this very important issue, which is closely linked to the authority and credibility of the Committee, and therefore request due diligence and appropriate follow-up measures. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Now I give the floor to France.

The Observer Delegation of France:

Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président. Cette intervention brève est destinée d'abord à remercier l'Azerbaïdjan d'avoir organisé cette réunion du Centre du patrimoine mondial dans d'excellentes conditions, la cérémonie d'ouverture d'hier soir était particulièrement exceptionnelle, et rappeler que nous aurons avec vous, l'Azerbaïdjan, deux événements : le premier, demain soir, au Musée du tapis, avec les collections du Musée du Louvre qui seront exposées à cette occasion, et le deuxième le 4 au soir, au Musée d'archéologie nationale,

pour montrer l'état des travaux menés en commun par l'Azerbaïdjan et la France sur un certain nombre de sites.

Nous soutenons évidemment au quotidien le travail du Centre du patrimoine mondial, qui nous paraît d'excellente qualité, et nous remercions toute l'équipe. Je voudrais simplement dire que nous sommes prêts à contribuer à ce que, dans les mois qui viennent, cette réflexion d'experts sur les sites de mémoire – nous en avons deux qui sont actuellement, en quelque sorte, différés tant qu'ils ne seront pas examinés en 2021 –, à ce que cette action entreprise par le Centre du patrimoine mondial soit menée à bien dans l'hiver 2019-2020. Nous sommes prêts à y contribuer financièrement. Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, France, for this information. Now the floor goes to the representative of the NGO, Europa Nostra. Please.

Observer NGO (Europa Nostra):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. On behalf of Europa Nostra, the largest European federation of NGOs active in the field of cultural heritage let me first congratulate the Chair of this Committee on his election and wish him every success in his work.

Secondly, we wish to congratulate the World Heritage Centre, its Director Dr Rössler and its staff for all that has been achieved since the last meeting of this Committee and this in spite of the very limited resources compared with an ever-growing list of tasks. Let me convey our special praise for the Centre's dedication to maintaining an ongoing dialogue with civil society and involving them and their input in the various activities undertaken by the Centre. When an organization has limited resources it is a necessity to develop partnerships and this is what the World Heritage Centre has been doing with great success.

We wish especially to praise the partnership with the European Union, which was further developed in the framework of the European Year of Cultural Heritage celebrated in 2018. This year was a historic for Europe and has resulted in stronger engagement of the European Union for the safeguarding of cultural heritage and stronger recognition of its value for a more sustainable and more inclusive Europe. Ten days ago the EU leaders approved the strategic orientation for the next five years and we are delighted to share with you the excellent news that for the very first time this strategic agenda includes a commitment for investing in culture and cultural heritage. We believe that this should open further opportunities for building synergies between the work of the World Heritage Centre and the European Commission, not only with regard to World Heritage sites located in Europe but also elsewhere in the world. Europa Nostra, which cooperates closely both with the European Union and UNESCO stands ready to contribute to developing this vital synergy. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ISESCO, please.

Observer IGO (ISESCO):

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais tout d'abord vous remercier pour l'invitation que vous avez adressée à l'ISESCO pour participer à cette 43^e session du Comité. Mes remerciements vont également à Mme la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO. L'ISESCO est fière de pouvoir participer à cette réunion et a écouté les doléances de nos États membres communs, relatives justement à la formation des cadres qui s'occupent de la gestion des sites du patrimoine. J'ai eu l'occasion hier de me réunir avec la Directrice adjointe du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour essayer de trouver comment est-ce qu'on pourrait coopérer, l'ISESCO et le Centre du patrimoine mondial, pour renforcer davantage les capacités des

cadres des États membres de l'ISESCO et de l'UNESCO dans ce domaine-là. Donc je voudrais, s'il vous plaît, essayer de montrer que l'ISESCO essaie par cette participation de renforcer davantage la coopération déjà existante entre l'ISESCO et l'UNESCO, mais je voudrais quand même que cette coopération puisse s'élargir aussi entre le Comité du patrimoine mondial et le Comité du patrimoine du monde islamique. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler for some comments, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like to thank all the delegations for their congratulations for the work of the World Heritage Centre. I turn this to my team because I'm supported by a fantastic team, here. So I give the thanks to them and I'm very grateful for the kind words you said about our programme. I have also noted some of the areas of concern, which concerns the SIDS. I participated myself in the SIDS meeting with the Science Sector just last week and also some other areas of capacity building and improving the situation to produce more nominations from the Africa region, so this is well taken note of.

Concerning the meeting on the sites of memory—we have made an effort to get some funding. I confirm what France just stated: we have received 5000€ from France. I have also received an announcement of \$10,000 from the Republic of Korea but we still need funding for a meeting, which needs to be balanced in terms of regions and expertise together with the different Advisory Bodies so we hope that we can manage to have this meeting by December 2019.

With this Mr Chairperson, you may turn to our Assistant Director-General who would also like to say something about the budget. Thank you.

Chairperson:

First if you don't mind I will give the floor to the representative of Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I will be very brief. I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for their great efforts and also I would like to congratulate you for being Chair for this Convention and thanks to the Republic of Azerbaijan for the great hospitality. I would also like to announce as we discussed with the World Heritage Centre that Kuwait will also donate 10,000€ for their programme. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for this support. Now I would like to give the floor to the Assistant Director-General, Ms Ernesto Ottone, please.

The Assistant Director-General for Culture:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Je voudrais faire deux commentaires par rapport à tout ce que nous avons entendu de tous les États ici présents. D'abord rappeler qu'à ces réunions participent non seulement le Centre du patrimoine mondial, mais aussi d'autres entités de l'UNESCO, il y a Legal Affairs, il y a l'équipe de production, il y a bien sûr KMI, DPI, donc je voudrais bien qu'on commence aussi à comprendre que c'est tout l'UNESCO qui est derrière le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Dans ce sens, il est important de vous écouter dire qu'il faut renforcer les équipes en effectif et financièrement, pour le renforcement des capacités, la priorité Afrique, les sites et de manière générale. Donc je voudrais aussi faire le point lorsqu'on

aura la discussion pendant le prochain Conseil exécutif concernant le financement, que, effectivement, c'est le seul moyen d'assurer dans le temps, d'une manière permanente, de pouvoir travailler avec les bureaux hors Siège et mener à bien tout ce développement. Lorsque vous aurez la discussion sur le budget intégré, il serait bien que pour le budget régulier il y ait cette réflexion, car vous avez raison, on a besoin de plus de moyens pour disposer des ressources humaines et financières permettant de développer la majeure partie du programme que vous souhaitez, pour avancer avec le patrimoine mondial. Voilà. Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now as far as I know and as I can see there are no other comments and interventions so I invite you to adopt draft decision 43.COM 5A, which is contained in document 5A. I would like first to ask the Rapporteur if there are any amendments.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have no amendments for this draft decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So if there are no amendments I declare the draft decision 43.COM 5A adopted. Thank you very much. *[applause]*

Dear colleagues, as we had preliminary consultations with Committee Members we would like to draw your attention to another question which is not on the agenda. Our heritage is facing ever-increasing threats including direct and indirect impact of conflicts or natural disasters. This underlines more than ever the urgent necessity to join forces towards the preservation and safeguarding of our common heritage. That is why I took as the Chairperson of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee, the initiative to present to you with a declaration to be adopted by the World Heritage Committee as a message to the international community, testifying to our common endeavor in protecting our heritage for generations to come. I have proposed today the Baku Declaration¹. The text has been shared with all the Committee Members and according to their opinion the last draft was presented to us just recently. So I will give you brief information about that and if you don't mind I hope that we can adopt this presentation by proceeding to applause—no voting.

The text is on the screen and it notes the importance of the attention to the matters of heritage protection. It is connected with the difficulties and challenges of the modern world, encourages the work of the existing experience and asks governmental bodies to pay more attention to the matters of protection and conservation and to bring this heritage safe to the future generations. If there are no objections from Committee Members, can we accept this declaration by applause? *[applause]* Thank you.

I think that we have another very important matter, a message from the World Heritage Young Professionals. You know that we had a meeting of Young Professionals on 23 June in Baku as an integral part of the session of the Committee and in the framework of UNESCO's World Heritage Education Programme under the theme "Local Insights for Global Challenges". As you know it is customary that the Young Professionals present a message prepared during the Forum and of which the Committee will take note. Allow me in this regard to give the floor first to Mr Ernesto Ottone, the Assistant Director-General for Culture. Please.

¹ The Baku Declaration on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage adopted by the World Heritage Committee on 1 July 2019 can be found in Annex 1.

The Assistant Director-General for Culture:

Thank you, Mr President. Mesdames et Messieurs, le 23 juin 2019 a effectivement commencé le Forum des jeunes professionnels du patrimoine mondial à Bakou. Cette année, le Forum a eu 30 participants de 30 pays représentant toutes les régions. Ces jeunes de différentes origines sont venus avec la même conviction qui est de façonner un avenir meilleur pour notre patrimoine. Au cours des huit derniers jours, ils ont exploré différents sujets liés au thème « Perspectives locales pour des défis mondiaux ». Ils ont visité des sites du patrimoine mondial, participé à des ateliers et à des activités pratiques et approfondi divers concepts, notamment le nouveau programme pour les villes et les objectifs de développement durable.

Les résultats du travail et les recommandations des jeunes professionnels ont été formulés dans un document final qu'ils ont rédigé tous ensemble sous la forme d'un message. Avant de donner la parole aux jeunes professionnels qui vont communiquer leur message démontrant leur engagement en faveur de la protection et de la conservation du patrimoine mondial, je vous invite à regarder la vidéo qui montre l'expérience enrichissante vécue par ces jeunes durant ces huit derniers jours.

[video]

J'invite les jeunes professionnels à présenter leur message. Merci.

The participants of UNESCO World Heritage Young Professionals Forum 2019:

We, the participants of UNESCO World Heritage Young Professionals Forum 2019 "World Heritage, Local Insights for Global Challenges" would like to extend our sincere thanks to the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Mr Abulfaz Garayev, Chairperson of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Furthermore, we are grateful to the Ministry of Culture for organizing and financing the Forum. Our heartfelt thanks go to the executive and volunteer teams for their support and to the groups of experts for the rich insights and mentorship.

We have examined three aspects of heritage in Azerbaijan including urban contexts in Baku, cultural landscapes in Gobustan and intangible heritage through local insights for addressing global challenges. Building on the declarations of the previous youth fora, this examination has led us to express the following.

We as young people see the attraction of urban life as a magnet for innovation, creativity and new ways of living. However, ongoing uncontrolled development in urban centres worldwide is completely unacceptable, leading to the erosion of distinct character and identity of the place. Sustainable development and the improvement of cities' socioeconomic vitality and livability are needed for robust place-based, integrated strategies, to help reinforce rural-urban linkages. By involving local stakeholders through a participatory and multi-stakeholder partnership approach, we can achieve the United Nations SDGs and the New Urban Agenda and realize the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. We recognize the importance of defining place-sensitive indicators to monitor the effective implementation of the SDGs and their effects over time.

By only focusing on the total expenditure of the preservation, protection, and conservation of heritage, the social, cultural and economic values are not fully captured. This risks irreplaceable harm to heritage assets and its transmission to future generations. New indicators should be established to better monitor and evaluate the qualitative needs of the future. We require urgent action as failing to do so would be irresponsible.

The multi-layered concept of the cultural landscape, in which the local communities play a central role in the human society-nature interaction, is frequently reduced to the aesthetic

aspects of the landscape, thereby diminishing its inherent diversity. Inclusive strategies that incorporate community-centered management are needed that span beyond the realm of tangible and intangible heritage to incorporate all aspects of life. We call upon all stakeholders to ensure the engagement of locals, especially youth and minorities, so they can contribute with their knowledge and experience.

We stress the importance of a thoughtful and efficient management system that looks out for the interests of the community and its well-being and fosters education in order to secure long-term conservation. Intangible heritage is fundamental to preserving diversity and local identity in both, urban and cultural landscape contexts. The threat to social and cultural diversity due to migrations, urbanization and globalization is deeply concerning, and we urge all local stakeholders to establish both local and global connections for the exchange of knowledge and foster intercultural dialogue.

Digital technologies have an increasing role as a tool to interpret and disseminate multiple values of heritage. The younger generations should not be ignored, but included in the utilization of these technologies as they are at the forefront of this advancement. We sadly witness how economic and political interests get in the way of pursuing sustainable protection of both people and the environment. World Heritage is more than just a beautiful postcard picture and the status should not be used solely as a tourism promotion label but as a tool for its protection and enhancement.

We, young professionals from all over the world, commit ourselves to pursue UNESCO's mandate of building peace in the minds of humankind in our practice of heritage management. Our recommendations are built upon the belief in the unifying power of heritage, freedom of expression, and the force of cultural and natural diversity in attaining sustainable development.

In this time of rising political tensions and polarization, we emphasize the need for respectful dialogue based on mutual understanding. The challenges we have highlighted require action today and not be left for future generations to resolve. Let's work together to respond to the global challenges of our time before it's too late. We would to thank you by performing an indigenous Australian dance to support the International Year of Indigenous Languages. *[applause]*

The Assistant Director-General for Culture:

Au nom de l'UNESCO, je vous remercie. Je vous remercie en tant que jeunes décideurs de demain pour votre participation et pour votre excellent travail durant ce Forum, travail consistant autant à débattre qu'à danser, et je vous souhaite le meilleur pour votre future carrière en tant que partenaires du patrimoine. Maintenant, j'invite Mme la Directrice générale et mes collègues à rejoindre les jeunes pour une photo de groupe, si vous le permettez. Merci.

Chairperson:

Honorable delegates, Members of the Committee, I would like to thank all of you for the evaluation of the work done by the Azerbaijani Government during the preparation time and for the hospitality. It will be our pleasure to make the convenience and conditions where you will feel so comfortable until the end of the conference, until the end of the Committee and to leave our city with perfect reflections. I would like to thank all of you for such evaluations and for such a friendly attitude to the host country. At the same time it would not be possible without your personal involvement, your participation in all the preparation along with the World Heritage Centre and those who prepared this very important international event. We are doing well according to the schedule. If we proceed like this I hope we will succeed at the end of the day. Before announcing the break until 3 p.m. we have some other events, press conferences, some meetings. At 3 o'clock we will resume our meeting but now I give the floor to Ms Rössler.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson and you are going well with the schedule. You have on the screens the side events. As I said this morning, we have 50 side events during the Committee session. They are here on the screens and outside on the screens and in addition I have to announce that the meeting of the Arab Group will take place at 2 o'clock in room P5. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have time to realize what is going on. Thank you and I would like to on behalf of all of us to thank the Director-General for her personal participation at the Committee meeting and express not only our gratitude but also our wish for the successful work of UNESCO on this position in future years. Thank you very much.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

FIRST DAY – Monday 1 July 2019

SECOND MEETING

15.00 a.m. – 18.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)
later: H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil)
later: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Please take your seats. Dear colleagues, before we proceed with our agenda for this afternoon, I would like to inform you that the Observer Delegation of Japan has requested the possibility to take the floor in relation to Item 5A that was discussed before the break. Thank you for your understanding. Japan, you have the floor.

Japan:

Thank you, Chairperson. With regard to the comment made by the Republic of Korea in this morning's session, Japan would like to mention that Japan has been sincerely implementing the recommendations made in 2015 and 2018 by the World Heritage Committee. Towards the examination of the SOC at the 44th session of the Committee, Japan continues to implement our commitments made in the 2015 statement and will duly submit its SOC report to the World Heritage Centre. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler. Please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. The situation is quite clear. We have a decision of the last session of the World Heritage Committee in Manama. It's Decision 42.COM 7B.10 and this Decision requests a report from the State Party of Japan which is due on 1 December 2019, so the Secretariat hopes that this Decision will be implemented and that we will receive the report, as requested. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have to proceed to our next item, which is 5B. I now invite the representative of ICOMOS to briefly present its report. Please, the floor is yours, ICOMOS.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Since this is the first time for ICOMOS to take the floor, I would like to congratulate you on your election and chairpersonship. ICOMOS would like to express its deepest gratitude to the State Party of Azerbaijan for the organization of this session of the World Heritage Committee and warm welcome. I would like to present a short summary of ICOMOS activities today. ICOMOS believes that the value of the World Heritage Convention admired by millions of people and communities all over the world can be maintained only with services of the highest quality. ICOMOS rigorously applies the World Heritage code of conduct throughout the evaluation process in order to maintain the quality and integrity of its advice.

For the 2019 cycle, the ICOMOS World Heritage panel met in November 2018 and in March 2019, in Paris. This cycle has posed a significant challenge for ICOMOS. Besides three referred-back nominations ICOMOS received 32 new nominations, which is 10 more than the

last cycle. Nomination dossiers were 965 pages on average, which is almost double in size compared to the previous cycle. All panel members and more than 170 desk reviewers contributed their time, effort and great expertise and I think it is important to know that they worked on a pro bono basis throughout the entire process and covered their own travel expenses.

The composition of the panel, its advisers and selection of mission experts reflect the nature of the nominated properties, as well as the proportional and geographical balance. Full information on the panel including the names of its members is available on the ICOMOS website.

Constructive exchanges with the nominating States Parties took place between the two panels. ICOMOS would like to thank the nominating States Parties for collaborating in the dialogue process. That said, ICOMOS strongly feels that the time available under the current calendar to conduct dialogue with the States Parties is far too limited. In this context, ICOMOS welcomes the currently ongoing reforms of the nomination process. ICOMOS thanks the governments of Tunisia, Australia, and UNESCO, for the invitation to the Expert Meeting held in Tunis in January 2019. ICOMOS actively participated in discussions to improve the evaluation system at this meeting as well as the session with the Ad Hoc Working Group. ICOMOS also welcomes the inclusion of the discussion of the nomination process under agenda Item 8. As this is related to many fundamental and interrelated issues of the Convention, ICOMOS looks forward to proactively contributing to data sharing, further discussions and in-depth analysis which must be a key part of the working document.

The work on the state of conservation, although not receiving such a high profile as nominations, remains crucial to the implementation of the Convention. Now that the regular interval between SOC report is two years, we welcome the recent shift towards more dialogue with States Parties and the use of advisory missions which are proving to offer a productive way forward at several properties. For this Committee session, ICOMOS has carried out and prepared report for 12 reactive monitoring missions as well as 14 advisory missions at the request of States Parties. I have to say that as a number of inscribed sites have been constantly increasing. While the window for the state of conservation report is limited, the percentage of sites reviewed has been proportionally decreasing. We are noting the rise in cumulative threats resulting from incremental changes, which brings into focus the need for more detailed monitoring over time. This is an area where ICOMOS considers more attention is needed.

Mr Chairperson, ladies and gentlemen, ICOMOS has also committed its energy and expertise to efforts to address difficulties and challenges facing the World Heritage system. To name a few of our projects, ICCROM and ICOMOS jointly initiated a case study project on recovery and reconstruction on cultural heritage in post-trauma context. By the beginning of 2020, selected and peer-reviewed case studies will be available. The ICOMOS working group on climate change and heritage has continued to be very active and it will organize two side events tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, and we will report the outcome of its work. Collaboration with IUCN and ICCROM has been progressed, which includes the Connecting Practice Project and the World Heritage Leadership Programme, in particular the Heritage Impact Assessment. ICOMOS has been collaborating with the UNESCO regional office in Bangkok and the category 2 centre in Manama for capacity building in the regions. ICOMOS has been organizing workshops; the ICOMOS University Forum is collaboration with universities to create innovative ideas and approaches for heritage conservation. ICOMOS reaffirms its commitment to serve the World Heritage Committee and assist, protect and conserve all the cultural heritage of the world and transmit it to future generations. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for this report. If there are not any specific questions, we can pass on to the other report and if there is a need to discuss the decision itself. If you don't mind I now invite the representative from ICCROM to present its report, briefly.

ICCROM:

Thank you. I would like to express ICCROM's thanks to you and the Government of Azerbaijan for the warm welcome and hospitality accorded to our delegation. Chairperson, ICCROM is pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words about its activities in the past year in favor of the World Heritage Convention. The full report of ICCROM's activities can be found in document 5B.

This year, ICCROM continued its role in the reactive monitoring including one reactive monitoring mission to China and four advisory missions to Africa and the Arab States. Our participation in these missions not only helped to contribute to the better conservation at the sites involved but it also contributed to our gaining knowledge, which helps us to better prepare our capacity-building activities. We also actively participated in the periodic reporting process and we look forward to working with regions that are now beginning the third cycle of periodic reporting.

Taking note of Committee Decision 13A from its 39th session, ICCROM was invited by ICOMOS to attend the ICOMOS World Heritage Evaluation Panel as a non-voting member. While attending the first panel in November 2018, due to budget constraints ICCROM did not attend the second meeting of the panel in March 2019. We would respectfully point out to the Committee that given the ongoing problems with the resources of the World Heritage Fund, we have not budgeted for our participation at ICOMOS panel meetings for the next biennium.

I am particularly pleased to reiterate ICCROM's commitment to its role as a focal point for capacity-building activities within the Convention. In the past year, the World Heritage Leadership Programme, a joint programme of ICCROM and IUCN, implemented a new course on People, Nature and Culture. This course brings a people-centered approach to conservation of cultural and natural heritage properties and took place in Zambia and Victoria Falls/Mosi-oa-Tunya transboundary World Heritage Site shared by Zambia and Zimbabwe. In addition, we continued work on the development of online learning platforms, which provide information on approaches to management of cultural and natural heritage and include subjects such as disaster risk management and impact assessment. World Heritage Leadership Programme is carried out in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS with the very generous financial support from the Ministry of Climate and Environment of Norway. The Government of Switzerland also contributes to the People, Nature and Culture course and I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the Government of Korea for their new contribution to World Heritage Leadership. I would request that States Parties with an interest in capacity building to become partners in this programme.

ICCROM has further continued to collaborate with both category 2 centres and universities around the world, on capacity-building activities. I would highlight a new programme currently being developed in collaboration with the African World Heritage Fund and the *Ecole du Patrimoine* in Benin and other partners to strengthen the capacity of African youth to better care for and benefit from their heritage. You will hear further results on capacity building in the presentation on Item 6 later on in the meeting. I would also like to highlight the work of our office in Sharjah. You see a photo exhibition here, entitled ICCROM Medina, capacity building for integrated conservation and management of historic cities in the Arab region. This is one of the programmes the regional centre is offering.

Other activities include work on post-crisis recovery of cultural heritage. And in that context, we are pleased to be working with UNESCO on activities in Mosul. Over the past year, the regional centre has also carried out capacity building workshops in Lebanon.

I would also take the opportunity to mention that ICCROM and the other Advisory Bodies as we have in the past we will be holding a series of side events during this session in the AB space. We have already carried out two of these activities this morning. I specifically call your attention to a side event, which will happen on Wednesday, which will also highlight the results of the Site Managers Forum, an activity that we are pleased to co-organize along with the World Heritage Centre and the Government of Azerbaijan. I invite everyone with an interest to join us for this event and exhibition. Finally, I would like to ensure the Committee that even given the budgetary pressures currently being faced; ICCROM takes seriously its ongoing commitment to ensure the highest-quality advisory services to the Committee, States Parties and other parties. We must work together to protect the credibility of the Convention, so as to ensure that the heritage of our outstanding universal value is transmitted to future generations. I pledge ICCROM's continued commitment to achieve this goal. Thank you again, Chairperson, for the opportunity to present ICCROM's activities to the World Heritage Committee. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for this presentation. I think there are no special comments here and we move on to the other report, which will be done by a representative of IUCN. Please, you are welcome.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and good afternoon everybody. As this is IUCN's first intervention at the Committee, may we also congratulate you on your election and express our thanks to the Republic of Azerbaijan for its generous hosting of this session of the Committee and for the stunning opening ceremony that we all enjoyed yesterday evening. Mr Chairperson, IUCN's report is before the Committee, so I will not repeat the content which is there. However, please allow me to focus on a few important points.

First, IUCN believes that we must find more synthetic, strategic and innovative ways to deal with growing threats to World Heritage. We know that natural World Heritage sites shoulder a proportionally higher burden of threat and account for nearly one third of properties on the in Danger List. IUCN's independent World Heritage Outlook, which was last updated in 2107 and will be updated again in 2020 dramatically illustrates the increasing number, pace and extent of threats to natural World Heritage. At this session, we will again hear of increasing impacts from climate change, invasive species, major infrastructure development and excessive tourism. These are places under stress, especially so from external pressures that are often cumulative. In some cases, we are witnessing a disturbing trend that almost any development is appropriate within a World Heritage site and that any impact can somehow be mitigated. We need to make better use of Item 7 to move beyond cataloging the threats to become much more action oriented. But we need to retain our site focus, as each case is different. Here IUCN is increasingly using World Heritage Outlook as a catalyst for conservation action planning on the ground and the World Heritage Leadership initiative, which was mentioned by my ICCROM colleague, is an initiative that is driving a much more integrated bio-cultural approach.

Second is the question of reform. We must be bold and far-reaching if we are to keep the Convention healthy. Credibility and balance are different issues and require different approaches. We remain committed to dialogue and providing quality advice to the Committee such that decisions are informed, based on sound science and in compliance with the Operational Guidelines. An integrated set of operationalized and fully costed reforms is needed to address the mismatch between expectations and resources. We continue to deliver but we

need to take stock of exactly of what it costs to run this Convention in the 21st century if we are to realize its promise.

Mr Chairperson, IUCN last year celebrated its 70th anniversary and as an intergovernmental organization is now working across its diverse network of membership from state and civil society and expert towards the defining moment that is 2020. The two leading United Nations intergovernmental reports on nature and climate command our attention. The 2018 IPCC report on global warming of 1.5°C and the 2019 IPBES biodiversity assessment, which we have heard about already this morning, make for sobering reading. These are the most comprehensive assessments ever made and they are telling us in very frank, strong language that we have limited time to react to these two accelerating and closely linked crises. Nature is declining globally at rates unprecedented in human history. As IPBES reminds us, the health of ecosystems on which we and all other species depend is deteriorating more rapidly than ever eroding economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide. The good news is that both reports come with solutions to deliver the transformative change that we must together achieve for people and planet. IUCN has for seven decades championed the fact that nature is not an optional extra but underpins all of human development including the richness of our collective heritage. The world will set new targets for nature beyond 2020 next year and IUCN believes the World Heritage Convention has a pivotal role to play. IUCN believes that it is time to work towards a transformational, unified action plan for nature. We strongly believe that it is necessary for the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework to integrate not only the objectives of the CBD but also the other two Rio Conventions and the biodiversity-related Conventions, including this World Heritage Convention. IUCN will work to integrate World Heritage specific elements into the Post-2020 Framework and look to position nature's most outstanding places as the litmus test for whether we are achieving nature-based solutions to the world's challenges. IUCN urges the Committee and all States Parties to commit to meeting this challenge.

It is in this context that IUCN is pleased to announce that it will stage its next major World Conservation Congress in June 2020 in Marseille, France. This Congress will shape decisions on the future of nature and be an important stepping stone to CBD COP15 in Kunming, China November 2020. President Macron of France is making the IUCN Congress a major part of France's efforts to galvanize global momentum for nature and we hope that you will make it a priority for your efforts as well. Mr Chairperson, IUCN is committed to working with the wider World Heritage family across all these areas and we reiterate our pledge of nearly half a century to continue to provide the highest standard or advice to the Committee. We look forward to playing our part in a productive 43rd session under your guidance. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for the interesting presentation. Any comments, any specific questions? Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all I would like to thank the three Advisory Bodies for their great reports and their continuous efforts to improve the evaluation process and the work of this Committee. But I also would like to see, Mr Chairperson, the report for the future as we discussed in previous meetings and different ad hoc group meetings, to see the number of experts in different regions and to have in the reports key performance indicators (KPI), the number of experts from different regions especially the regions where we have a lack of experts, not just the number but also the expertise. I know, hearing from the Advisory Bodies, there are always financial constraints to improve this database and to show good gestures the State of Kuwait is trying to help overcome these obstacles, we will happily work with the World Heritage Centre and donate 10,000€ for the Arab region and 10,000€ for the Africa region to

improve their capacity building for new experts, not just the number but also the area of expertise. So hopefully this will help them and we see that indicator in the next reports. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any other proposals? Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania also notes with appreciation the detailed reports by the Advisory Bodies on various activities that were carried out during the reporting period. Nevertheless, we also note that the reports are overwhelmingly activity based. They are a simple enumeration of what was done, as opposed to the achievements. This makes it difficult, Chairperson, for us to gauge any achievements that have been attained at the scale that is commensurate with the strategic objectives, making it difficult to gauge the success over the long term. My delegation is therefore of the opinion that the Advisory Bodies should consider improving their reporting so as to conform to the strategic level achievement. Thank you very much, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like to start by expressing our sincere appreciation to all the Advisory Bodies for their important work. Their role is central and essential to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and protection of World Heritage. Due to the little time we have, I would like to concentrate my comments on one aspect, the referencing in the reports and now in the oral presentations by all Advisory Bodies to the ongoing discussion on the reform of the nomination evaluation process which is happening in the framework of the Ad Hoc Working Group and also the Tunis Expert Meeting. As member of the Ad Hoc Working Group we just wanted to take this opportunity again to acknowledge how valuable it was to have the Advisory Bodies following the deliberations in a very constructive experience throughout this whole process and that we think that if we are to have real reform that further enhances the dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies, we can only do it by working all together so we welcome very much the positive attitude that we have seen expressed. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now the floor goes to Brazil.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like first of all to say how grateful we are for the presentations of the reports and activities of the Advisory Bodies since the 42nd session of the Committee. The work of the Advisory Bodies is extremely important to provide the technical support necessary for the presentation and evaluation of nominations to the World Heritage List, as well as to ensure that adequate measures are taken for the preservation of sites already included in the List. In this sense, we would like to draw attention to the importance of increased dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties at different stages of the nomination process and of the evaluation of the state of conservation of properties in the List. The proposal for the creation of a new phase in the nomination process with the concept of preliminary access that has been developed in the Ad Hoc Working Group is a relevant step in this direction. We would also like to favour the importance of expanding the geographical basis of the group of experts that integrate the Advisory Bodies in order to

have a more pluralistic approach to evaluations. And finally, we would also welcome the continued collaboration of ICCROM, IUCN and ICOMOS in particular in the implementation of the World Heritage capacity-building strategy. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. My delegation would also like to join previous speakers to commend the work of the Advisory Bodies and to thank them for their activities reflected in the reports. It is indeed of crucial importance what they are doing. But, there are some issues that need to be improved and in this short time my delegation would like to point out those elements that we believe would serve for better cooperation between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties.

The first issue is the lack of dialogue. It is a very important issue and we were discussing this for over an hour in this Committee that the Advisory Bodies and States Parties need more dialogue to understand the requirements to better know what are the requirements and what information is needed from the Advisory Bodies. We believe there are some shortcomings that need to be addressed by the Advisory Bodies.

The second very important point is capacity building. Capacity building is a very powerful tool to help the States Parties to understand the requirements and standards of the Convention. Here it is not only about capacity building for the conservation and preservation of the sites but also in the nomination process, especially given the lack of nominations from certain regions in the world.

One of the most important issues is credibility. We always talk about the credibility of the Convention but we believe that the credibility depends also on the Advisory Bodies; it starts from the evaluation process and it goes to the Committee debates. So we have to understand that there is a shared responsibility on the credibility.

And last but not least is the methodology. We really believe that the methodology that has existed for so many years needs to be improved in a way that will bring more transparency and more predictability in terms of the experts participating in this process and here I would like to concur with what was said by the Ambassador of Kuwait and supported by the Ambassador of Brazil, that we have to have a more geographically balanced list of experts. This will bring more credibility to this evaluation process as well.

Finally, I think all those issues are very much debated in the ad hoc meetings over the year and we have certain recommendations, which will address those issues. I thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Zimbabwe commends the support of the Advisory Bodies during the period from March 2018 to March 2019. Their advice in programmes and projects supporting the Convention are worth noting, particularly in aspects of evaluation of nominations for properties, monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, research, documentation as well as capacity building initiatives. We appreciate and acknowledge the focus of the Advisory Bodies on the inter-linkages of the management of cultural and natural

heritage proprieties and this is a commendable initiative in light of historic gaps and challenges relating to such nominations.

In addition to their direct work on the Convention, we want to commend the initiative of the Advisory Bodies to mainstream World Heritage issues in their own programmes. For example, ICCROM's programme on integrating cultural heritage conservation in Sharjah, economic, urban and environmental planning is World Heritage capacity building as part of its programmes. The creativity driving the technical support including the adoption of ICT in World Heritage management, for example in the development of policy compendiums and online handbooks, are indeed commendable. We are confident that through their support the ideals of the Convention would be actively pursued and achieved. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to ask the Rapporteur if there are any amendments or proposals on this item.

Rapporteur:

Once again, we have no amendments to this decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So if we don't have any amendments, I declare draft decision 43.COM 5B adopted. Thank you very much. Now we proceed to Item 5C which is World Heritage Convention and Sustainable Development. Please refer to document 5C in this regard. I have the pleasure to give the floor to Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar, Deputy Director of the Centre, to present the document. Please, Madam, the floor is yours.

The Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Document 5C presents the progress made by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in implementing the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy since the 41st session of the Committee in 2017. The World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy was adopted by the General Assembly in 2015, a few months after the major international agreement by all countries on the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development thus furthering policy coherence. It calls for all sites, cultural, natural and mixed to fully respect and help protect the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage properties, while also promoting all the dimensions of sustainable development: environmental sustainability, inclusive social development and inclusive economic development, together with fostering peace and security.

The Sustainable Development Policy emphasizes the value of engaging and benefitting local communities and calls for a human rights-based approach to sustainable development respecting indigenous peoples and local communities and including them in participatory decision-making processes.

The majority of the activities of the past two years relate closely to UNESCO's support to its Member States in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda including the biennial work plan for 2019-2020. The World Heritage Convention is core to meeting the SDG 11, Target 11.4 to strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage and makes an important contribution to several other goals and targets. More specifically, Goal 11 on cities, Goal 13 on climate change, Goal 14 on oceans and seas, Goal 15 on forests and terrestrial ecosystems and also contributes to Targets on 4.7 on education for sustainable development, Goal 5 on gender equality, youth empowerment and 8.9 and 12.B on sustainable tourism and Goal 17 on global partnerships.

At the High-Level Political Forum in New York in 2018, the Culture Sector launched a publication, Culture for the 2030 Agenda with illustrative case studies including several from the 1972 Convention and the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape on the ways that cultural and natural heritage contribute to the transversal implementation of the SDGs in different regions of the world. Cultural heritage contributes to SDG 11 and a special training session was organized by the Culture Sector during the World Urban Forum in Kuala Lumpur in February 2018 on leveraging culture for inclusive and resilient cities. The World Heritage Centre also contributed to Goal 11 synthesis report presented to the 2018 High-Level Political Forum.

With a view to building resilience and partnership for responding to disasters and conflicts, UNESCO's flagship initiative Revive the Spirit of Mosul as well as the joint work programme with the World Bank included the launch of the joint publication, Culture in City Reconstruction and Recovery.

The World Heritage Centre carried out a UNESCO Member State implementation survey on the 2011 recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape from February to September 2018. The full analytical report is available on the World Heritage Centre's website for the recommendation. The results of the survey were presented to the 206th session of the Executive Board, which called for reinforcing integration with the 2030 Agenda and SDG 11, in particular, and the New Urban Agenda.

To monitor the SDG Goal 11 Target 4 the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) is developing the methodology for Indicator 11.4.1. The UNESCO Culture Sector has developed a draft complementary framework and suite of thematic indicators for culture in the 2030 Agenda to measure the contribution of culture to the 2030 Agenda. This framework includes all the six culture Conventions and other instruments including the World Heritage Convention and the Historic Urban Landscape recommendation.

A Member State consultation on the indicators was launched on 16 May 2019 and is still open and due to close on 15 July 2019, so you are all invited to respond if you haven't done so already.

A majority of the operational activities under the World Heritage Convention relate to the conservation and capacity building with some that are aimed at improving the socioeconomic conditions of local communities and post-disaster needs assessment. More support is necessary for operational activities at the local level to implement the sustainable development policy. The World Heritage Centre cooperates with the International Indigenous Peoples Forum for World Heritage on the UNESCO-led 2019 International Year of Indigenous Languages and a side event organized during the Committee's current session. Beyond document 5C, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies activities are provided in other documents in the Committee's agenda.

The Sustainable Development Policy has been mainstreamed into the Convention's processes within the ongoing work of the World Heritage Policy Compendium and in the revisions the periodic reporting framework. Reactive monitoring missions have, in some cases, identified sustainable development issues, especially with regard to unsustainable tourism. The World Heritage Centre has made structured efforts to ensure a gender-sensitive and gender-balanced approach in the implementation of its activities in conformity with the Policy and UNESCO's Priority Gender Equality and Action Plan 2014-2021. Much more needs to be done to systematically mainstream the Sustainable Development Policy into the implementation of the Convention on the one hand and into operational activities at national and local levels on the other. Additional funding is necessary for the World Heritage Centre to develop activities to operationalize its Sustainable Development Policy at the local level, developing also necessary tools and indicators and developing methodologies for localizing the Sustainable Development

Policy including pilot projects. Also necessary are efforts to promote policy coherence and synergies with the Sustainable Development Policy, with SDGs and other relevant global agreements such as those related to the Climate Change Agreement, the Paris Agreement, the Disaster Risk Reduction Sendai Framework as well as related World Heritage strategies and policies. And with that I stop here. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for a very interesting presentation. I would like to inquire about the questions and amendments, maybe comments. ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. To assist the efficiency of the World Heritage Committee's work in many relevant topics, the three Advisory Bodies have prepared joint interventions so in this case I present the intervention on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM.

The World Heritage Convention contributes to the achieving of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in many ways and therefore the Advisory Bodies strongly support the need to further operationalize the Sustainable Development Goals which can sustain and enhance the outstanding universal value of World Heritage and at the same time represent exemplary initiatives to be extended beyond World Heritage into wider concerns of local communities. Many initiatives are under way since the adoption of the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy, as is illustrated by the paper and presentation you've just heard. These contribute towards the achievement of this policy's objectives. It is crucial that synergies among their results are supported and made more robust through operationalization at site, national and regional levels giving specific attention to those World Heritage properties that are most in need of support such as those on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This aspect is addressed in more detail in the joint Advisory Bodies statement under Item 5D which is yet to come.

The Site Managers Forum held here last week in Baku underlined the importance of site-based strategies and activities embedded into management instruments for the successful operationalization of Sustainable Development Goals and implementation of good practices in this realm. As many Members of the Committee will know, ICOMOS and IUCN have recently been developing the Connecting Practice project which is now in phase three, aiming to strengthen the understanding of nature culture processes and improving management approaches. ICOMOS continues its commitment to sustainable development with a broader perspective, coordinating a diverse range of heritage work and channelling it to the global development policy platforms through the ICOMOS SDGs working group and through the implementation of its action plan, cultural heritage and localizing the SDGs. Further details on this work was presented this afternoon under agenda Item 5B and there is a dedicated ICOMOS webpage.

I must close by saying that the Advisory Bodies consider that there is much important and urgent work needed to effectively operationalize the power commitments made in the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy and its key overarching provisions for environmental sustainability, inclusive social and economic development respecting gender equity and rights-based approaches and fostering peace and security. The Advisory Bodies are committed to these long term goals in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and in their shared programmes such as World Heritage Leadership. There are a number of related side events in the Advisory Bodies space organized here in Baku and our focal points for sustainable development, climate action and rights-based approaches are available to discuss practical approaches and collaboration opportunities with participants to this session. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to Brazil.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I will be very brief, just to express how grateful we are to the World Heritage Centre and to the Advisory Bodies for the presentations of the progress reports on the implementation of the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy since the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee in Krakow in 2017. We would like to commend the support given to Member States in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda, especially with regard to the promotion of the role of culture for sustainable development. We would also like to commend especially the role of the World Heritage Centre for its support to SDG Target 8.9, devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products as well as to Target 12.B, develop and implement tools to monitor sustainable development impacts on sustainable tourism. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway appreciates all the work that has been done to implement the strategic plan for sustainable development. With or close to Norwegian World Heritage sites we face initiatives for heavy urban development, building highway roads, aquaculture production and building of large tourist facilities. We are in constant discussion with industry, local governments and stakeholders about what kind of social, economic and environmental development that is in accordance with the protection of the outstanding universal values of the sites. In this landscape of crossing interests we must remind each other that the World Heritage Convention and its instruments were established in 1972 as a tool to help States Parties to make the right choices in these situations. We need to achieve the right balance between environment, social and economic sustainability while fully respecting and protecting the OUV of the sites that state of conservation report and data listing are tools we have developed, meant to help States Parties achieve the sustainable development in accordance with conservation of the OUV.

We all face challenges, and conflicting interests must be solved not by compromising on the protection and disturbing the integrity of the sites, but by integrating conservation and management approaches for the World Heritage properties with larger regional planning frameworks. For many World Heritage properties achieving sustainable development requires acting on a scale that is much larger than the property itself. Norway would like to highlight the importance of strategic environmental assessments, which evaluate different possible locations for economic development. The policy concerning mining and oil exploration and exploitation and the Committee's position on hydropower development means that planning and development of these activities cannot be done within World Heritage sites and should be redirected to other locations.

In order to nurse ideas and projects that can coexist with World Heritage values and to redirect the chain saws that don't, we need to work closely with local communities and politicians. If they understand and recognize the values of the sites, discussions can be taken at an early stage in the planning process, and conflicts of interest can be more easily solved.

Norway supports the draft decision and the development of a clear roadmap for implementation and monitoring progress for Sustainable Development Policy. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. No other requests. May I ask the Rapporteur about information?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. No amendments for this draft decision.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Comme c'est la première fois que nous prenons la parole, nous aimerions aussi remercier et féliciter la République d'Azerbaïdjan pour la parfaite organisation de cette session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, et nous souhaitons également le succès pour la conduite de nos travaux. Nous voulons féliciter donc le Centre et les organes consultatifs pour le document qui nous a été présenté, pour souligner quelques progrès qui ont été faits depuis disons le lancement de cette réflexion autour de la conservation du patrimoine et le développement durable.

Nous aimerions ici souligner quelques aspects dans la partie III du document qui nous semblent très importants. Cette partie est intitulée « Actions prévues et voie à suivre », c'est-à-dire que ce sont les pistes pour trouver des solutions à cette tâche, que le document d'ailleurs considère comme étant ardue, mais non impossible, à exécuter. Donc c'est une note importante de savoir que trouver l'équilibre entre la conservation du patrimoine et le développement durable continue à être un exercice difficile, qui demande une réflexion ou des réflexions assez profondes pour trouver des méthodes et des approches plus adaptées, devant aider les États parties à respecter la Convention et pouvoir permettre aux populations de bénéficier de ses ressources patrimoniales, mais également de pouvoir les transmettre aux générations futures.

Donc, partant de cet exercice difficile, nous pensons que dans le prochain débat, certainement le point qui suivra, nous reviendrons particulièrement sur la priorité Afrique pour essayer d'étayer un certain nombre d'arguments qui pourront faire avancer ces réflexions. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now, please, Japan.

The Observer Delegation of Japan:

Thank you for the floor. Regarding the Sustainable Development Goals, especially the matters related to the Historic Urban Landscape, the Government of Japan would like to inform the World Heritage Committee about our plan of hosting the next expert meeting for this matter. At the recent session of the World Heritage Committee the number of cases which face some challenges in urban contexts has been increasing. Under the circumstances we consider that it is necessary to discuss and establish the methodology or tools which identify and evaluate the values of heritage sites in urban contexts as a common ground of the HIA within the context of the HUL recommendation. In order to respond to this important expectation, the Government of Japan will host an international expert meeting in Japan in January 2020. As for the detailed concept and agenda of the meeting, the Government of Japan wishes to closely collaborate with ICOMOS and other bodies and informal exchange of opinion with ICOMOS has already been started. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now the nongovernmental organization, Friends of the Earth from Indonesia. Please, you are welcome.

Observer NGO (WALHI - Friends of the Earth, Indonesia):

I'm from WALHI. We are the largest grassroots environmental network in Indonesia. Indonesia has 1000 ethnicities, which develop as a result of people rooting their identities and culture in the rich diversity and specificity of their local lands and natural resources. Historically, the environmental and social conflict within Indonesia only began in the last 50 years. This is because of the dramatic shift towards an extractive model of development. Many forget that the local and Indonesian community have already developed ways and knowledge to use resources in balance with nature. This indigenous knowledge is extremely undervalued. We cannot achieve sustainable development unless we recognize the value of indigenous knowledge in guiding and enabling development choices. WALHI has promoted a localized model of sustainable development based on this. We call it community management area. This model aims to create economic world class on customary knowledge of local resources. For instance, by drawing on their deep understanding of peatland ecosystem, communities in Tohor River in Riau choose sustainable economically beneficial alternatives to harmful palm oil plantations. Their success demonstrates that demand for economic development is not opposed to environmental conservation and that communities play a valuable role in using indigenous knowledge to identify sustainable alternatives that can enrich, instead of impoverish, local communities. The community management area model can help address threats facing heritage sites such as the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra. It can help resolve destructive project that are driving environmental and social conflict that are harming other iconic ecosystems. This includes the Tampur Dam in Leuser Ecosystem and the Batang Toru Dam in the Batang Toru ecosystem which may cause the extinction of the critically endangered Tapanuli orangutan. We respectfully call on the Committee and State Parties to consider in any approach to sustainable development, the central role that local communities must play in managing and safeguarding their natural resources. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you but I would like to request that all the speakers speak a little bit slower to make it possible for the interpreters to interpret. Thank you very much. Now we have another NGO there, if I'm not mistaken, on the right side.

Observer NGO (International Indigenous Peoples' Forum on World Heritage):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I am speaking on behalf of the International Indigenous Peoples Forum on World Heritage, which is the forum of indigenous peoples that aims to develop a coordinated, constructive and effective participation of indigenous peoples in all processes of the World Heritage Convention. We appreciate the actions and decisions mentioned in the progress report in paragraphs 37-40 and we urge the Committee, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to adopt further actions.

Among others, we missed substantive indigenous peoples' participation in reviewing the Operational Guidelines for relevant changes, most importantly the inclusion of the established international norm of free, prior and informed consent in relation to the nomination to the World Heritage List. This by itself is in contrast to the principle of IIPFWH and is not in line with UNESCO policy on indigenous peoples and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which requires United Nations agencies and organs to establish ways and means of effective participation of indigenous peoples on issues affecting us.

Concretely, Mr Chairperson, we recommend to include in the decision on this Item the facilitation of a truly participatory process to the revision of the Operational Guidelines with respect to indigenous peoples' rights. We further recommend including the following actions and way forward: first, the effective inclusion of indigenous peoples' representatives in the development of the roadmap; two, to develop a concrete strategy and programme for the World Heritage Centre in collaboration with our representatives. This is recommended since much work such as drafting reports and proposals happen at the Secretariat level. And finally, we

urge the Advisory Bodies to also develop and adopt such a strategy and programme for collaboration and effective participation. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I think we can proceed to the adoption of the draft decision 5C, which is contained in point 4 of document 5C. So we don't have any amendments so if there are no other comments I declare draft decision 43.COM 5C adopted. Before I move to the next Item I would like to give the floor to the Deputy of the Centre. Please.

The Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much. I just wanted to mention that should there be an interest for people to discuss this way forward further, Member States or others, we have a room reserved, B5 at 6 o'clock, right after this session is over, to gather for 15-20 minutes before the start of other side events to consider a little bit more concretely the ways forward and see how we want to take it further so maybe 20-30 minutes at the most. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Well noted. Now we are moving to Item 5D.

Chairperson:

Africa sustainable development and World Heritage. I would like to give the floor to Mr Moukala, Chief of the Africa Unit of the Centre to present the draft document. Please, the floor is yours.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Item 5D Priority Africa Sustainable Development and World Heritage. It was during the examination of the agenda for the 43rd session at the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee and at the request of African States Parties the Committee by Decision 42 COM 17 invited the Secretariat to report on Priority Africa, sustainable development and World Heritage. My presentation will cover the first part, focusing on state of conservation of World Heritage in Africa, in particular the cultural situation as well as the natural situation. Then I will highlight the World Heritage Sustainable Development policy application in the African continent with some concrete examples of activities we have conducted in the continent. We will be looking also at the global partnership in regard to the implementation of the policy and then I will highlight some of the challenges that the continent is facing in this regard and then propose some ways forward for the Committee's consideration.

Regarding the state of conservation of World Heritage in Africa, I would like just to indicate that as you know very well, Africa has heritage both cultural and natural that is really unique in that it testifies to the past of human civilization. It is a source of identity and livelihood for the communities and population. It strengthens the resilience of the communities and also plays a significant role in the transmission of local skills and indigenous knowledge for innovative and sustainable solutions to local needs.

Looking into the natural heritage sites, we have natural World Heritage properties which stand as a unique witness to the earth's geological and biological changes, designated protected areas of biosphere reserves in addition to World Heritage status many of these are of great importance on account of the biodiversity in the world.

The statistics situation in Africa could be summarized with the 53 States Parties out of 193. We have 42 with World Heritage sites, 11 without World Heritage sites. We have 136 World Heritage properties out of 1,092, which is 12%, underlining the underrepresentation of that

area. We have 88 cultural properties, 42 natural and six mixed. We have 22 on the List of World Heritage properties in Danger out of 54. They are all African.

The policy then addresses three dimensions of sustainable development; in particular it really focuses on the environmental sustainability, the inclusive social development, in particular ensuring that the interests of the local communities are always put at the front line when addressing conservation and safeguarding so that it will bring in benefits to the local community. It focuses on the inclusive economic development and again this third part also stresses the improved living conditions of local communities who are the first guardians of this cultural and natural heritage.

It is in full conformity with the Africa We Want Agenda 2063 that is focused on common identity and destiny for the continent. It builds on equity, poverty alleviation and inclusive development while upholding the importance of safeguarding heritage that contributes to achieving the 2030 United Nations Development Agenda.

We built on some of the concrete programmes that we have implemented in the last couple of years. It has been driven in particular through the Ngorongoro Declaration, which spearheaded programmes--some of them were earlier than the Ngorongoro Declaration like Africa Nature; COMPACT which really focuses on community development; Heritage Education which brings in the dimension of educational institutions in safeguarding heritage; transboundary peace and security as addressing also the issue of mutual cooperation through the transboundary sites by enabling cooperation, peace and also looking into the benefits to the local communities and last but not least we have been also actively cooperating with several States Parties as well as potential partners in promoting capacity building and in the latest one was the UNESCO Africa China Forum which was held recently as presented by both the Director-General and Director of the Heritage Centre.

We have flashy projects that are quite well known, covering significant key regions in Africa. The first one is CAWHFI, Central Africa World Heritage Forests Initiative that deals with the Central African region. The second one is Biosphere and Heritage of Lake Chad, which focuses on the Lake Chad region, and then we have also the cooperation with UNESCO field offices which implements a lot of programmes and activities in the region.

We have another partner, which is the Africa World Heritage Fund, a category 2 centre of UNESCO. They are the ones who take quite a large number of activities all over the continent and as you can see from the map, all the areas they cover from capacity building to training as well as workshops. There are building capacity all over the continent. We look at the challenges that the continent faces. As presented in the document, the continent faces the highest population growth, the weakest economy, high infant mortality rate, short life expectancy, high rates of illiteracy and food insecurity, which comes on top of the already existing challenges of conservation and management of World Heritage. The challenges we see: conflict, intentional destruction, looting, poaching, illegal trade, absence of national strategy for natural resources destruction, absence of governance and institutional structure for heritage management. Economic opportunity with negative impact in most cases and increased climate-related risk caused by a decline in biodiversity.

So on the way forward we would like to propose in the direction we have been working in the last couple of years, looking into alternative solutions in socioeconomic development needs, prosperity with climate resilience approach, innovative solutions for integrated World Heritage protection in national policies, community-focused development that put the community on the frontline, the interest and capacity of the communities and also the role of custodians of the heritage being at the front line so inclusion in decision-making processes as well. Green livelihoods that use local resources, capacity building of local communities, use of cultural and environmental knowledge, strengthening capacity for all stakeholders and sharing of

knowledge, experiences and good practices. This is a non-exhaustive list of some of the points that we wanted to highlight but you have most of the details already in the document that you have. So this is just a short introduction and I would like to limit it here, Mr Chairperson. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I would like to open the floor for discussions, proposals, amendments on Item 5D. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais remercier le Secrétariat de ce rapport à la fois exhaustif et qui nous met devant nos responsabilités. Je crois que les chiffres qui ont été avancés doivent nous interpeller tous. J'en rappelle quelques-uns pour la cohérence du propos : 27 % des pays membres sont africains ; 12 % uniquement des sites inscrits sont en Afrique ; et on pourrait même rajouter à ces chiffres-là probablement le nombre de sites africains sur les listes indicatives des pays membres, et on verra alors que l'écart non seulement est celui que nous voyons, mais qu'il risque de se développer davantage. C'est pour cela, Monsieur le Président, que la prise de conscience de nous tous est extrêmement importante et, au nom de la Tunisie, je souhaite la saluer. Mais cela ne suffit pas. Je crois qu'il y a des éléments qui, autour de cette situation, doivent nous interpeller aussi ici. Je parle par exemple du nombre d'experts africains sur les listes d'experts ; je parle aussi du nombre d'originaires des pays d'Afrique dans le système de la Convention dans son sens général. Ces éléments réunis nous donnent cette situation, l'expliquent et probablement fragilisent les ambitions des uns et des autres. Je souhaite ici rappeler qu'à nos yeux ce n'est pas une question uniquement technique, ce n'est pas une question uniquement liée aux moyens ou aux ressources, c'est une question éthique : est-ce que nous croyons que la valeur même du patrimoine mondial est une valeur en partage ? Si nous croyons qu'elle est une valeur en partage, eh bien nous devons, sur le plan éthique, relever ce défi, et je crois que c'est celui des décennies futures et de la crédibilité même de notre système. À chacun de nous de voir ce qu'il peut faire, ce qu'il doit faire en vue de corriger cette anomalie de notre système, et je souligne : anomalie éthique. Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil) takes the Chair.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We received with great satisfaction the Report of the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies on an item proposed by Brazil during the 42nd session of this Committee on Priority Africa, Sustainable Development and World Heritage. The Report highlights in the context of Africa the two dimensions of sustainable development, namely, environmental sustainability, inclusive social development and inclusive economic development, together with the fostering of peace and security. The Report also presents a diagnosis of the challenges and pressures proposed to the continent to envision solutions to these development needs and aspirations in ways that enhance the safeguarding of the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage properties. According to the Report, a very large number of sites in the African continent are inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger, most of them natural properties. In this regard, we welcome the cooperation of the Secretariat with strategic partners in the organization of capacity-building activities for conservation management of World Heritage properties, as well as cooperation with UNESCO's field offices for the implementation of projects to safeguard the World Heritage sites for communities through capacity building on conservation and management. We look

forward to additional efforts in order to assist African countries to remove both cultural and natural sites from the List of the World Heritage in Danger and to protect World Heritage sites taking into consideration the three dimensions of sustainable development. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, honourable Chairperson. Earlier today, Uganda pronounced the critical need for sustainable management of cultural and natural resources. The maintenance of such outstanding universal value cannot be overemphasized, especially the fact that there is enormous pressure to respond to increasing demands for urbanization and for agricultural expansion to feed the increasing population. Consequently, to protect heritage resources in circumstances where communities are in dire need of basic needs of life, the States Parties are faced with a huge challenge. As heritage managers and political stewards, we need to put in place frameworks and mechanisms that will improve the welfare of the communities and the local economies of the States at the same time without compromising the outstanding universal values. This challenge is huge and requires international action. With the above in mind, Chairperson, Uganda is fully cognizant of the fact that the world's natural and cultural heritage sites inside Africa and beyond hold a wealth of irreplaceable tangible and intangible heritage. These resources are worthy of getting full protection by concerned African States Parties that are faced with the growing challenges of balancing heritage protection with extractive infrastructure and processing activities. The delegation of Uganda is in full solidarity with fellow African States Parties in welcoming the adoption of draft decision 43.COM 5D. And I thank you very much indeed for listening to me.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, dear colleague.

Chairperson:

Now Burkina Faso, you have the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Comme c'est la première fois que je prends la parole durant cette session, permettez-moi de remercier l'État hôte, l'Azerbaïdjan, pour son accueil chaleureux et pour la brillante cérémonie d'ouverture d'hier.

Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les experts, l'invitation faite au Secrétariat du Comité de faire rapport sur la priorité Afrique, et particulièrement sur le développement durable du patrimoine mondial en Afrique, en cette 43^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial qui se tient à Bakou, est pour nous l'une des meilleures façons d'interpeller la communauté internationale sur les spécificités et les réalités africaines par rapport au reste du monde, et la nécessité d'en tenir compte dans les projets de développement. La présentation de ce rapport intervient dans un contexte où, faut-il le rappeler, il devient plus que nécessaire d'œuvrer à l'amélioration du bien-être, à l'équité et à l'équilibre tant recherchés grâce à des interventions collectives ou des changements profonds sans lesquels le développement souhaité serait probablement non durable, en d'autres termes, sans résultat positif. Or précisément, Mesdames et Messieurs, les pays africains souhaitent centrer leurs efforts de développement sur les bénéfices pour leurs communautés en encourageant leur participation aux décisions concernant leur sort, en tenant compte de leurs besoins réels à partir d'une conservation progressive et préventive du patrimoine matériel et culturel se trouvant dans les différentes régions du continent. Pour cette raison, ma délégation appuie fortement un certain nombre

d'amendements qui ont été faits au projet de décision. Je vous remercie beaucoup pour votre attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I now pass the floor to the delegation of Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Natural and cultural heritage in the African region is indeed unique and invaluable. But we also recognize the many severe challenges and threats that it faces. Funding and assistance available for properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger is not adequate and there is often a mismatch between recommended conservation measures and the funding available to address this. We therefore hope that this Report on Africa Sustainable Development and World Heritage marks the beginning of global and increased focus on the region that really deserves attention and prioritization. States Parties to the Convention should support programmes in the African region that integrate sustainable development perspectives, inter-heritage conservation. The ongoing and future projects outlined in the Annex are great opportunities to contribute to protecting African World Heritage properties while at the same time pursuing sustainable development objectives. In these efforts, we would particularly like to highlight the role of the local communities as they hold important knowledge to ensure protection of World Heritage properties. It is crucial that local communities take part in decision-making to make sure that the development is inclusive and sustainable. Norway supports the draft decision. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I now pass the floor to the distinguished delegation of Zimbabwe.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Zimbabwe is concerned that the issue of the need to have a balance between conservation and development in as far as African World Heritage sites are concerned has been on the table for a long time. We note that what has been missing up to now is action to drive this process through. We are aware and we are in support of the African Union's Agenda 2063 in our national development programmes, which are really aimed at ensuring that we manage our World Heritage sites in a sustainable manner. We are calling for action by bringing this item on the agenda for the 43rd session. We are calling for action to move from just speaking about the issue but to now start acting on it. We are calling on the Advisory Bodies together with the World Heritage Centre to look seriously into this aspect, reflect on it and devise a plan of action aimed at achieving this objective. We are in full support of the draft decision that has been made on this Item but we are looking towards action so we really appeal to all involved: the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies to come together, work with the African States Parties to come up with an action plan so that we move this process forward and achieve the balance that is required considering that the African States are facing challenges which have been outlined in the Report of the Secretariat. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I now pass the floor to Angola.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Je vous remercie. Madame la Présidente, nous aimerions avant toute chose féliciter le Centre pour le rapport qui vient de nous être soumis, et, comme le Président l'a déclaré hier dans son discours à la cérémonie d'ouverture, ce point constitue un des sujets majeurs de nos discussions parce qu'il touche les enjeux actuels de la mise en œuvre de la Convention de 1972, en parlant du développement durable de la conservation du patrimoine dans un contexte

spécifique qui est le contexte africain, et nous tenons à remercier les membres du Comité d'avoir décidé de traiter spécifiquement cette question de la priorité Afrique lors de cette session. Parler du développement durable et de la conservation du patrimoine nous renvoie au bien-être et à la qualité de vie des populations locales, surtout les plus défavorisées, si nous voulons parler de la justice sociale.

Madame la Présidente, parler du concept de développement, surtout du développement durable, dans le cadre du Programme de développement durable à l'horizon 2030 des Nations Unies, dont l'objectif principal est l'éradication de la pauvreté, nous interpelle tous pour une réflexion plus profonde, surtout dans le cas des régions les plus défavorisées du monde, telles que l'Afrique. Le concept de développement ne devrait pas être considéré de manière linéaire, à cause des inégalités aussi évidentes qui peuvent être observées entre les différentes parties du monde, les différentes régions du monde. Voilà pourquoi on parle de plusieurs catégories de pays développés, de pays en développement ou de pays émergents, ou de pays sous-développés, et, dans cette perspective, l'Afrique est un cas spécifique. Nous ne pouvons parler de développement sans prendre en compte les droits de l'homme, notamment les droits de l'homme de base : accès à l'éducation, accès à la santé, accès à l'eau potable, à l'alimentation, etc., tels que la Déclaration universelle des droits de l'homme les déclare.

Si nous analysons les indicateurs qui sont présentés dans le paragraphe 33 du document 5D, ils nous prouvent clairement que les droits de l'homme de base pour la majorité des populations africaines sont encore loin d'être assurés. Il s'agit encore d'un rêve pour ces populations, loin de pouvoir se réaliser, voire impossible. Il est vrai que dans l'esprit de la Convention la conservation du patrimoine est hautement souhaitée afin de permettre à ce dernier de servir de levier du développement durable, mais certaines questions méritent d'être posées. Est-ce que seuls les biens du patrimoine mondial bien conservés pourraient améliorer le cadre précaire du développement du continent africain, en éradiquant la pauvreté pour les communautés locales les plus défavorisées ? Pour qui les biens du patrimoine mondial sont-ils conservés ? Pour ces populations locales, dont les droits de l'homme de base ne sont pas assurés ?

Nous aimerions, avant de finir, Madame la Présidente, dire que, dans la perspective de trouver des solutions appropriées dans le cas de l'Afrique, les experts africains, avec le Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain, ont développé des documents importants, la position africaine sur le patrimoine mondial et le développement durable et l'appel à l'action d'Alger. Compte tenu de ce qu'a déclaré la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO hier, sur la solidarité internationale qui est requise pour accompagner l'Afrique dans la recherche des solutions les plus adaptées à ces compromis aussi difficiles, nous avons soumis justement des amendements au projet de décision en demandant à ce que le Comité prenne note de cette position africaine qui pourrait nous aider à réussir nos débats dans le futur. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

I now pass the floor to the distinguished delegate of Azerbaijan. Please, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. My delegation is happy to associate itself to this agenda item that was also proposed by Azerbaijan and of course support and co-sponsored by the delegation of Brazil in Bahrain. As it is the first agenda item in this Committee session we believe it is extremely important and I think that the Report presented by the Secretariat—and we are very thankful for them for this very informative report—shows that we were right in proposing this agenda item. The figures here are quite alarming and this needs, I would say, urgent action from Committee Members, from the international community to help and support African aspirations for the preservation of their cultural and I would say more or less natural

heritage. So in this regard we support the idea of capacity building and bringing more resources for capacity building and we appreciate those States who support Africa in this regard and Azerbaijan is also ready and committed to do its part and provide its also modest contribution in this regard for capacity building in Africa. We would also like to touch on a very important issue raised by many Members of the Committee and that is the balance between sustainable development and preservation. I think this is an extremely important issue and we have debated this in this Committee many times and I think this balance is particularly important in the context of Africa where there are some projects, which aim to increase the development of the countries. In that regard we are very thankful for the information provided by the Secretariat and also those challenges for the implementation of the World Heritage Sustainable Development programme in Africa. We also commend the activities of the Africa World Heritage Fund and we have very good cooperation with this Fund and according to the request or I would say advice of this World Heritage Fund, we invited site managers from Africa to participate at the Site Managers Forum this year in Azerbaijan. Finally, the partnership, partnership with the private sector--this is another area that we believe the UNESCO Secretariat needs to explore more. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the delegation of Spain. I give the floor to Spain now, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish to English] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. This morning we said how delighted we were with the focus on Priority Africa with respect to sustainable development of heritage. We agree with a number of remarks from our colleague from Norway and we would like to say that we generally support the draft decision that is before us. When it is put up on the screen we would like to make a small addition. We would like to express our gratitude for the technical support and economic support to the African continent. Unfortunately there is tremendous asymmetry between the basic needs felt by local communities in Africa and work that has to be done on the protection of outstanding universal value. We have to be able to provide the guarantee of protecting outstanding universal value and we need to have a better understanding of development in each of the countries and the role of foreign states and international organizations. We need a genuine assessment of the environmental impact of projects. This should not just be demanded of States that they protect outstanding universal value in so far as they are able to do but other advanced countries that invest in Africa have to be aware of their obligation to protect and conserve and cooperating with national states in Africa when it comes to providing environmental impact assessment of their investment projects. When the time comes, we will make a proposed addition to the draft decision to ensure that these goals are met by all and it's not just about demanding that national states in Africa conserve outstanding universal value all on their own. Thank you for your attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I now pass the floor to the delegation of Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. My delegation fully seconds Angola and Azerbaijan and aligns itself to the growing position that heritage should be viewed as an enabler rather than a compromise to sustainable development. By the same token, Madam Chairperson, we fully subscribe to a spirit of balancing economic welfare, social inclusiveness and environmental health. However, it is clear that poverty alleviation stands out prominently as one of the Priority Agenda for the Africa region in particular, especially given that it is the most hit in terms of

economic prosperity. Currently, Madam Chairperson, the African population living in absolute poverty stands at 40%, which is the highest globally.

Madam Chairperson, the point in case is that the relatively small contribution of the World Heritage properties for improving local livelihoods dismays the African region. There reason is partly embedded within the inflexibility of the implementation processes of the World Heritage Convention itself. Consequently, the otherwise wider options available for the World Heritage properties in fostering sustainable development opportunities remain unexplored. At its extreme, this strictness is manifested in strict conditionalities for some post civil socioeconomic options that could otherwise be explored with best practice, environmental and technological solutions.

Madam Chairperson, in the eyes of Tanzania and the Africa region at large, such restrictions appear to be disproportionate in nature, scope and complexity of the problem at hand. Indeed, it puts to test both the evolution of the World Heritage sustainable concept efforts undertaken so far and the relevance of the Convention itself. Given the recent technological advancements coupled with improved planning tools, the African region considers it fair to harness this socioeconomic wealth of World Heritage from an innovative and much wider scale when determining when such ambitions are reasonably environmentally benign. This is especially critical in the African context, as it will ultimately synergize the ongoing poverty alleviation efforts as foreseen in Agenda 2063.

To this end Madam Chairperson, my delegation joins Angola to submit an amendment to the draft decision. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

I now pass the floor to the delegation of Australia. Thank you.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Africa's legitimate need for development is understood and accepted. The point made by the distinguished delegate of Angola regarding access to human rights is the foundation from which this discussion emanates. The challenge of conserving World Heritage sites in Africa are related primarily to economic development challenges in the region, the balancing of economic growth, rising population and the need to protect and conserve biodiversity in ecosystem services and this is particularly the case in the face of climate change which is predicted to have disproportionate impacts in Africa. We agree with the intervention made by Norway and in particular its observation about it being critical to integrate sustainable development objectives designed to heritage protection and management. We, as a World Heritage community and States Parties, need to invest in building capacity and move into a serious action phase as called for by Zimbabwe. We need to do this, the States Parties, individually and collectively so that we can fulfil our obligations for the protection of the world's outstanding cultural and natural heritage.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

I would now pass the floor to the distinguished delegation of China. China, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I wish first of all to commend the World Heritage Centre for this very good report with which we would like to associate ourselves. We also note with great pleasure the World Heritage Centre's responsiveness to the needs of Africa in the past year. We had a successful joint meeting between UNESCO, China and African nations on World Heritage capacity building and cooperation in June. It was well received, we understand. We hope that it was helpful to African nations but also, we in China we benefitted a great deal from this experience and we should welcome other States Parties in joining in such collaborative work in the future. We also note with great pleasure the number of side events during this 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee in Baku. They are related to Africa and we think this is a very positive and important start in this endeavour and we certainly hope that this momentum can be kept and we fully endorse Azerbaijan and Angola's comment. We hope that in the long run the efforts in the future concerning the Africa region and Priority Africa will continue in capacity-building work but eventually we also hope to see the reduction of the number of African properties in the in Danger List while at the same time hoping to see an increase in the number of properties in Africa in the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now like to listen to the delegation of Senegal. Please, you have the floor.

La Déléation du Sénégal (Observateur):

Merci, Madame la Présidente. La délégation sénégalaise exprime ses remerciements au Gouvernement de l'Azerbaïdjan pour l'accueil chaleureux et la parfaite organisation de cette 43^e session. Honorables membres du Comité, Mesdames et Messieurs, l'Afrique en inscrivant ses biens culturels et naturels sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial espère apporter sa contribution à la civilisation de l'universel, et nous avons tous l'obligation de gérer ces biens pour leur grande valeur. Mais, faut-il le rappeler, nous avons inscrit ces biens avec les communautés locales, dépositaires de ce patrimoine. Nous avons l'obligation de les gérer avec ces communautés et pour ces communautés.

Mesdames et Messieurs, ces communautés qui ne peuvent pas être là, ici à Bakou, nous ont chargés, nous, experts qui les côtoyons sur le terrain, de vous transmettre ce message. Ces communautés sont plus que quiconque concernées par le fait que ce patrimoine, leur patrimoine, doit être sauvegardé, mais elles demandent simplement que le droit au mieux-être soit respecté ; que l'accès aux infrastructures sociales de base soient assuré ; que la femme qui doit accoucher ne meure pas, faute de routes ; que les jeunes puissent accéder aux nouvelles technologies dans des écoles ayant accès à l'électricité. Donc, dans ces conditions, comment peut-on leur expliquer que l'UNESCO s'oppose à la construction, par exemple, d'une route ; que des pylônes d'électricité ne doivent pas traverser un parc, ici ou là. Bref, on finit par donner l'impression que l'UNESCO et nous-mêmes, experts, sommes contre le développement et le mieux-être de ces communautés. Bien sûr que non, nous ne sommes pas contre ce développement, vous n'êtes pas contre ce développement, mais nous devons apporter des réponses aux questions existentielles que ces communautés se posent, définir des stratégies innovantes adaptées à la spécificité de l'Afrique. C'est le sens de la priorité Afrique, c'est l'avenir de notre Convention. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

We would now pass the floor to the distinguished delegation of Cuba. Thank you.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish to English] Thank you, Madam Chairperson. This is the first time we are taking the floor. We first and foremost would like to thank the host State Azerbaijan for

the wonderfully warm welcome it has provided to all of us and we'd also like to thank the Director of the World Heritage Centre. In relation to the question of Africa—this is a very key question for Cuba—Cuba has a huge debt for its own heritage to Africa and we would like to recognize the tremendous progress that has been made given the thinking that the World Heritage Centre has carried out in relation to heritage in Africa. The proceeding delegations accept the need for greater representation of regions on the World Heritage List and in Danger List. There has been progress and yet we have a huge challenge before us. We have to keep stressing Priority Africa since this region has tremendous potential and we believe the key to this matter is in the framework of heritage management and the need to find answers to the development needs, the quest for social justice and all the other goals included in the United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the delegation of Côte d'Ivoire. Côte d'Ivoire, you have the floor. Vous avez la parole.

La Délégation de la Côte d'Ivoire (Observateur) :

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Since I'm taking the floor the first time, I would like to congratulate you on your chairpersonship and extend our appreciation to the authorities of Azerbaijan for hosting this meeting.

Madame la Présidente, ma délégation aimerait appeler l'attention du Secrétariat sur les défis inhérents à la conciliation des objectifs de conservation du patrimoine mondial et de développement durable. Mon pays, la Côte d'Ivoire, dispose de quatre biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, dont trois sites naturels et un site culturel. La gestion de ces biens constitue un défi important à relever si l'on veut concilier les besoins sans cesse croissants des communautés et la préservation de ces sites, ceci dans un contexte qui est marqué par les changements climatiques, l'urbanisation rapide et la difficulté d'accéder aux parcelles à des fins agricoles. Dans cette perspective, le Gouvernement ivoirien a inscrit cette problématique au nombre des priorités dans son plan quinquennal de développement, et ceci en cohérence avec l'Agenda 2030. C'est ainsi que des mesures d'atténuation et d'adaptation ont été développées et, au titre des sites naturels, entre autres mesures, nous avons mis en œuvre des actions de préservation de la biodiversité et de valorisation des services écosystémiques. Nous avons également mis en place un programme de développement touristique axé sur les valeurs des sites naturels en mettant en avant la culture locale, ceci en collaboration avec les communautés locales.

Pour ce qui regarde les sites culturels, entre autres mesures, la ville de Grand-Bassam s'est dotée d'un agenda 21 en 2016 suite à la COP21. Les valeurs environnementales et paysagères de la même ville ont été mises en avant avec le planting d'arbres qui a été fait en relation avec les élèves de la ville et l'aménagement de voies piétonnes. Des activités socioéconomiques, notamment le tourisme et l'artisanat, ont été structurées autour des valeurs du site.

Comme il apparaît, la Côte d'Ivoire a développé une approche intégrée pour la conservation de ses biens culturels et naturels, avec des organes de gestion qui incluent les communautés locales et des outils de gouvernance, tels que les plans de développement et de gestion des risques de catastrophe qui sont appliqués. J'aimerais, Madame la Présidente, conclure en indiquant la pleine adhésion de la Côte d'Ivoire aux amendements proposés par mes prédécesseurs. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Merci infiniment. I would now pass the floor to the distinguished delegation of Ethiopia.

The Observer Delegation of Ethiopia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Since I'm taking the floor for the first time, I would like to express our delight over the hospitality extended to us by Azerbaijan. We are very, very happy and we feel at home. Madam Chairperson, I wish to join all other African delegations which expressed themselves on this issue and which is of primary importance for us as Africans. Our feeling is that the three objectives we are trying to achieve go hand-in-hand. The first objective, of course, is the preservation and transmission of our heritage; the second is for our populations to benefit from this heritage economically; and the third is, of course, to ensure economic development—having an economic policy that enables our populations to benefit from it. We are convinced that it is only by accelerating our economic development that will be able to ensure the preservation and hence the transmission of our heritage.

In this regard we feel that cooperation is needed, cooperation at all levels—at the international level with the World Heritage Centre, the Africa Union which has a strong position on this issue and which we feel this assembly should take note of—the decision of the African Union and thirdly, of course, us as Member States, we have an obligation towards our population. We feel, Madam Chairperson, that the dichotomy that we are trying to put between development and preservation of heritage is not founded; it is only by accelerating and developing our countries that we will be able to ensure the preservation and transmission of our heritage.

For us in Ethiopia, we are following a green policy; we are following a policy that ensures the participation of our population in our development and we are also striving to preserve our heritage. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to IUCN. Please, you have the floor. Thank you very much.

IUCN:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. On behalf of all the Advisory Bodies, I present this one comment. The challenges and threats facing natural and cultural World Heritage properties in Africa continue and unfortunately there is a disproportionate number of properties in Africa inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Advisory Bodies therefore welcome this new Agenda item focusing on the African continent. The Advisory Bodies recognize the particular development contexts and drives in Africa and fully acknowledge the need to mobilize additional support for sustainable development activities that can maintain and enhance the outstanding universal value of World Heritage sites.

At the same time, we should be clear that the World Heritage Convention is a global instrument and we must therefore adopt a global frame of reference applying common standards, policies and procedures that cannot differ by region. We must direct our attention to those properties that are in most need to support on World Heritage matters. Such attention for example should logically be aimed towards the properties that have been on the World Heritage in Danger List for a concerning length of time.

Bringing together the relevant stakeholders to develop costed action plans is a simple yet effective approach. IUCN for example, is willing to provide support through its strong secretariat, member and expert commission network across the African continent. Furthermore, the joint IUCN-ICCROM World Heritage Leadership Programme offers a tangible entry point on capacity building that could be tailored to the African context and ICCROM is also developing a new programme in collaboration with the African World Heritage Fund aimed at building the capacity of African youth to better protect and benefit from their heritage.

The Committee has taken a clear position on extractive industry and large-scale structure activities that are incompatible with World Heritage status globally such as oil and gas exploration and exploitation, mining and the concentration of dams with large reservoirs. It is also essential to ensure that any development outside the properties does not negatively impact on their outstanding universal value through rigorous heritage or environmental impact assessments before the project is approved. Such independent assessments for projects inside and, when relevant, outside World Heritage sites must take into consideration innovative alternatives to identify the least damaging project option and ensure that such options do not negatively impact outstanding universal value including its integrity and its wider setting. Impact assessment should therefore also consider a non-project option in those cases where damage to outstanding universal value is clearly unacceptable.

IUCN, in partnership with the World Heritage Centre, other Advisory Bodies and the International Association for Impact Assessment, is developing enhanced guidance on heritage impact assessments including providing better guidance on the increasing use of strategic environmental assessment. The Advisory Bodies individually and in partnership stand ready to give much needed priority to Africa. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to pass the floor to the distinguished delegation of Ghana.

The Observer Delegation of Ghana:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Since this is the first time we take the floor we wish to congratulate you on your election, as well as the host country for the organization of this session. Madam Chairperson, our delegation is of the view that this Item adequately encapsulates the present challenge of African heritage. While recognizing the imperative to conserve and better manage the outstanding universal value natural and cultural properties, we believe that conservation can be and should be done in a sustainable manner. The rich heritage of African countries is not only a matter of history; it is a living heritage, which should address the present challenges and serve the local communities providing social and economic development as outlined in the three dimensions of sustainable development reported in the document. We therefore call for all stakeholders to consider in tackling heritage conservation, Member States' national development needs which taps into the wealth of natural and cultural properties in a forward looking manner. Like previous speakers, Ghana fully supports the amendment proposed. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would invite Save Lamu to take the floor. Thank you.

Observer NGO (Save Lamu):

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. My name is Mohamed Athman from Lamu, Kenya, representing Save Lamu organization, a grassroots coalition of diverse indigenous communities who advocates for sustainable development.

As you have acknowledged, one of the challenges Africa faces in the pursuit to modernize is that development projects and rapid and unplanned urbanization can destroy rich cultural resources. Lamu is a key example of such a dilemma. We therefore welcome point 6, which urges States Parties and others not to permit extractive activities within World Heritage properties and point 8, which seeks to ensure that local communities benefit from development activities by including them in the decision-making process. Unfortunately, in Kenya two projects violate these points and thereby jeopardize Lamu, a World Heritage site. These are the Lamu Port - South Sudan Transport Corridor Project, called LAPSSET and the Lamu coal-power plant. While we understand that Kenya needs to develop, legal due process must be

followed. In landmark rulings the High Court of Kenya in 2018 and the National Environmental Tribunal in 2019 ruled in our favour. These Kenyan courts found that the Lamu Port and Lamu coal plant projects are in violation of required environmental management processes. Already these projects have caused tangible ongoing damage from construction and rapid unplanned urbanization and this is just the beginning. The project is expected to add 29 more berths, an industrial city, an oil refinery, resort cities, and a 1,050 megawatt coal-power plant. Political good will is determined by actions more than words. We are therefore glad that the World Heritage Committee has considered and acknowledged these realities in the draft decision. We urge the Committee to maintain the draft decision and to consider placing Lamu on the List of World Heritage in Danger and call for the Kenyan Government to review impact assessment of LAPSET and to halt the Lamu coal-power plant. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The distinguished delegate of Kenya has requested the floor. You have the floor. Please, go ahead. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Kenya:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Kenya would like to take this opportunity to appreciate the warm welcome and hospitality by the Government of Azerbaijan. Kenya commends this great initiative which seeks to address the dichotomy between sustainable development and heritage protection. Africa indeed possesses the heritage of extraordinary natural reserves and resources, cultural diversity, indigenous and local knowledge and ecosystems. Kenya recognizes that these strategic assets are key to sustainable development. To achieve the balance of socioeconomic development and the protection of OUV of World Heritage sites, we must increase investment in heritage research as an enabler of sustainable and economic development.

Heritage is not only a historical learning tool for future generations, but it's also a catalyst for socioeconomic development for the present generation. As countries develop to meet the basic human needs for their populations and satisfy their basic rights by such initiatives as infrastructure development, it is important to find mechanisms and support these endeavours. We call for the open-ended working group on the Operational Guidelines to look into exceptions for developing countries built on development indicators and for opportunities to be created and assistance provided, as these countries need to undertake the development processes together for their basic human rights and needs for their populations. Kenya, therefore, further calls for the collaborative and balanced efforts from the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, States Parties, with input from research entities and other stakeholders in finding appropriate technologies and innovative solutions for sustainable development. In this regard, Kenya recognizes and calls for collaborative and balanced efforts in heritage conservation and sustainable development especially between States Parties, Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre among other stakeholders.

Finally, Madam Chairperson, Kenya gives its support to the World Heritage Convention and recognizes that the future and credibility of the Convention is in its integral ability to be a living heritage, protecting and developing sites in a manner relevant to both the present and future generations. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the NGO that has requested to speak. Please go ahead.

Observer NGO (The Jane Goodall Institute):

Sorry for the interruption. Thank you for giving me the floor. On behalf of the Jane Goodall Institute, we thank the World Heritage Committee for introducing this important topic, and the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for the report presented that is under analysis. In accordance with the mission of our organization, which aims to understand and protect chimpanzees, other apes and their habitats through community centre conservation, environmental education and active involvement of youth, we would like to bring to the attention of this distinguished community the urgent call for improved protection of great apes and their habitats launched by UNESCO's Director-General last March during a special informative meeting for Members States and Experts in partnership with the French Museum of Natural History.

Great apes are human's closest living relative, facing serious threats. Their survival is essential for ethical and scientific reasons and as an umbrella species protecting tropical forests where they thrive are essential to address climate change and provide crucial ecological services to the people as was pointed out by IPBES status report. UNESCO has unique position within the United Nations system for the protection of great apes. Through 39 international designated areas in 23 countries, - World Heritage, biosphere reserves, or both, - 21 African countries and two Asian countries for orangutans. There are four SDGs directly or indirectly related to great apes: goals 8, 12, 13 and 15. We respectfully want to request assistance of the great apes survival partnership joined by UNESCO in 2002, a partnership among States Parties, UN bodies and conservation organizations highlighted by the Metz Declaration in the framework of the G7 Meeting for Ministers of the Environment last month of May. Thank you.

H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan) resumes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as we don't have any other proposals for intervention, I would like the Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre to make some notes.

The Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I wanted to thank all of you for your extensive comments to both 5C and 5D. We've taken careful note. Your comments and responses underline the need to look for alternative solutions that integrate OUV protection with urgent socioeconomic needs of local communities. The idea is not to further antagonize or restrict the developmental aspirations of local communities or to diminish the immense value of World Heritage properties in Africa, but to really seek innovative solutions to integrate them both more and we are here to support that. Thank you very much.

The Secretariat:

Thank you. I would like to add also to all of our partners, donor countries, especially the States Parties, the banking institutions and also other NGOs who have contributed directly or indirectly to the safeguarding of cultural and natural heritage in Africa. I just want to reiterate again our acknowledgment and our appreciation and thanks and also just to publicly indicate how much difference this brings to the work that the Centre is doing on the continent. So thank you again for the support that you will continue to offer by this intervention you just made today. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Now we move for the adoption but before that I think we have to give the floor to the Rapporteur because we have amendments to be informed about. Please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have received two sets of amendments, one from Angola and the United Republic of Tanzania and the other one from Spain. The first amendment is at paragraph 3 which would now read, takes note of the African States Parties unique biodiversity and richness and their immense wealth of cultural heritage and local knowledge that have come down to humanity so far; and that must be conserved and passed on to future generations. The next paragraph with proposed amendment is paragraph 5 and that would read, recognizes--sorry, this is a new paragraph--recognizes the specifically delicate task of balancing World Heritage and sustainable development by the least developed nations, notably of the African region, given that it is faced with a disproportionately higher level of poverty globally. There is a new proposed paragraph 6 also. Further recognizes the need to employ innovative and transformative solutions for reconciling World Heritage and sustainable development that would take into account the nature, complexity and specificity of socioeconomic constraints that these less developed countries continue to face. New paragraph 7, Takes note of the position paper on World Heritage and Sustainable Development in Africa adopted in October 2018 by the African Union through resolution STC/YCS-3/MIN/Report 67, as acknowledged in paragraph 20 d) of the document WHC/19/43.COM/6 and requests the World Heritage Centre in collaboration with the African World Heritage Fund to take into account its context with regard to implementation of the World Heritage Sustainable Development policy.

We then have an addition to the new paragraph 8, former paragraph 5 from Spain. The paragraph would now read, Reiterates the need to integrate the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties with inclusive and sustainable development needs through the effective implementation of the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The protection of the Outstanding Universal Value should be assured by including the assessment of the environmental impact in national and international development projects. The Secretariat would like to request just for consistency after "should be" instead of using the words assured to use furthermore ensured, if that's acceptable.

And I think we have a little more amendment in our final paragraph. This is again from the amendment from Angola and Tanzania. Invites the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies, in collaboration with African States Parties, to spearhead research into innovative solutions for sustainable development, providing measures at the operational level, that guide and coordinate the efforts of the African States Parties to the World Heritage Convention for the conservation of OUV in World Heritage properties, both cultural and natural, and their contribution to the sustainable development of local communities in particular; and also to establish a platform of good practices in integrating heritage conservation with sustainable development for African World Heritage properties. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Australia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. I just wanted to say that it's very difficult for Committee Members to make a decision on one of the amendments and that is the amendment that would become paragraph 7, Takes note of the position paper on World Heritage and Sustainable Development in Africa adopted in October 2018 by the African Union and so on. The difficulty that many of

us have who are not members of the African Union is that we have got no visibility of this Resolution and we are being asked to take a vote on something we know nothing about. So I would just like to foreshadow that Australia will not be in a position to make a vote on that particular recommendation and it may be necessary to adjourn debate on that particular item should we not be able to consider its substance.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would just like to support the comments made by Australia. We had asked to speak to say exactly the same thing about not knowing enough about this document and that via our amendment in item 8, the new 8 we wanted to set out this aspect of protection because we cannot take note of something that we are not actually familiar with so we would agree with what Australia has said.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We are in the same situation as Australia and Spain. This is a document that we are not familiar with. Sorry.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just for the sake of the procedure and clarity, may I ask you to proceed paragraph-by-paragraph in order for you to start from the first paragraph and then we will come up to the issue raised by several delegations. I would appreciate it if we would start the discussions of this decision paragraph-by-paragraph. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you for your proposal. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Hungary would like to join Australia and the other States Parties saying yes, number 7 saying we should wait for the document presented by Tanzania in order to make a clear and good decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Monsieur le Président, j'aimerais apporter quelques précisions par rapport à ce point. Nous avons été approchés par l'Australie, la Hongrie et d'autres pays évidemment pour rendre disponible ce document. Donc, à l'heure actuelle, je viens juste de recevoir le courrier. En fait, le courrier a été adressé à l'ADG priorité Afrique et relations extérieures ; il a été signé le 25 juin par l'Union africaine. Donc officiellement le courrier a été adressé à l'UNESCO depuis le 25 juin, quand la lettre a été signée. Nous avons accès à ce document et nous pouvons le partager avec ceux qui aimeraient en prendre connaissance. Ce qu'on peut suggérer peut-

être est que le membre qui souhaite prendre connaissance de ce document le fasse savoir et nous le rendrons disponible, comme ça on pourra revenir sur l'approbation des amendements que nous avons proposés, peut-être demain, oui, demain, pour leur donner le temps de regarder les documents et de se prononcer. En tout cas, le document est disponible, on l'a reçu, on vient de le recevoir ; la lettre a été signée et a été soumise à l'UNESCO. C'était l'élément supplémentaire que je voulais ajouter. Merci.

Chairperson:

So, any other comments? There were two proposals on the adoption of the whole text and with the amendments and the other one is to go point-by-point, so paragraph-by-paragraph. I think it will be better for us to have everything to be discussed paragraph-by-paragraph moving forward because some paragraphs are still under the question. I have another question: can the delegate from Angola provide the text to be submitted today to all delegations? Okay, thank you. Now we will start adopting the text of 43. COM 5D paragraph-by-paragraph. So The World Heritage Committee, number 1. No objections on point number 1, examined documents. Approved? Approved. Second, recalling decisions. No change. Approved. Number 3, with the amendments proposed by the Republic of Tanzania and Angola. The latest version. Can we accept it? No objections? Thank you. Number 4, no changes or amendments. Adopted. Thank you. Number 5, new number 5 so according to the new amendments. Can we accept it in the version proposed by Angola and the Republic of Tanzania? You don't see any objections? I don't see any also. Approved.

Number 6, again the new version proposed by the United Republic of Tanzania and Angola. Further recognizes. Members of Committee. We can admit it. Thank you. Number 7, I would like to propose the following: we will apply to the delegations of Angola and the Republic of Tanzania to submit by the end of the day, the end of the working session, the full document to be reconsidered by the Members of the Committee. We will return only to position 7 of this document tomorrow at the end of the day. If you don't mind we will leave it like that. Can we accept it? Thank you for your understanding. Thank you. Next, number 7 or 8 now? Okay, 8 will be the question so like number 8, new version. No it is not the new version. The old version—simply the number changed due to the inclusion of two additional positions. No changes at all. Thank you. Next item, 9, new 9, recalls its decision 37 COM 7. No objections? Thank you.

Number 10. Calls upon the African States Parties. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

So the draft amendment submitted by Spain is approved? Because you said no changes but there are changes. Spain submitted an addition for the environmental impact assessment.

Chairperson:

Sorry, sorry, it was my fault because I was following the documents in front of me. So we accept number 8 with the amendments proposed by Spain. Any objections? Thank you, Kuwait. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We also support Spain's amendment but we would suggest considering changing the terminology slightly to be aligned with UNESCO terminology with specific reference to heritage impact assessment: strategic, environmental assessments and so on. And we also think that it would be sensible to include a reference to the Operational Guidelines paragraph 172. I humbly request that some native English speaker would help with the terminology too, to make this a good paragraph. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Please, Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. As I understand it the distinguished delegate from Norway would like to refer in this paragraph both to paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and to heritage impact assessments and strategic environmental impact assessments. What I might suggest that given that we are also leaving the new proposed paragraph 7 for tomorrow that the Rapporteur will have a go at drafting that and we can look at it tomorrow.

Chairperson:

No objections? Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

This is a major change and development project, especially if you look from the practical point of view where you have some sides or some cultural interboundaries between civil countries where you have if you cannot do the environmental impact study in a country where you have development but it will affect other countries and there is no agreement, I think that might delay the projects so I think it's still in the gray area to have environmental I mean environmental impact assessment for each project, I think this may cause problems in implementation stages later on, especially with projects that might affect several countries. That is my point. I don't mind having—I mean it's great thing to have environmental impact assessment but from the point of view of implementing it, it might have problems.

Chairperson:

There are some decisions as far as I know, I am informed, already existing. So if we will take into consideration the proposal of the Rapporteur to leave this wording for tomorrow along with paragraph 7 which we decided to discuss tomorrow evening so we will leave adoption of this paragraph also for tomorrow evening along with the previous one. If you don't mind, we will leave it like that. Thank you. Number 9, we approved. Number 10, calls upon the African States. We approved. 11, further calls for African States. No changes, no amendments. Thank you, approved. 12, calls upon all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention. No changes. Thank you very much. 13, thanks the States Parties and partners. I don't see any objections. Thank you very much. Approved. Number 14. You have a comment, please. World Heritage Centre.

The Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I just wanted to propose whether you would like to consider where it says, invites the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies, to say in consultation with stakeholders which would include the African States Parties rather than only African States Parties. So we could use the wording, consult with stakeholders, and the rest of the amendment proposed.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I would like to inquire the opinion of Angola and Tanzania, if you don't mind such wording because it is more reasonable from my point of view also with the consultation of all the States Parties not only representing certain geographical regions. Please, Angola.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

La phrase devient ambiguë, mais je vais essayer d'aider quand même. On disait donc « invite le Secrétariat et les organisations consultatives, en collaboration avec les États parties africains et d'autres parties prenantes ». Peut-être que ça pourrait marcher.

Chairperson:

How do you think—I think we can accept such wording? So it's going—the new version, please Rapporteur can you make the amendment.

Rapporteur:

Yes. So that paragraph would now read, invites the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, in collaboration with African States Parties and other stakeholders to spearhead research, etc.

Chairperson:

Thank you. No objections? So we can accept paragraph 14, new version. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

We cannot approve this document in whole until tomorrow evening so we will proceed to the discussion of this matter at the end of the day tomorrow before closing our afternoon session. If you don't mind, we will proceed but please be sure—I would like to ask the Secretariat to ensure that the text of the paragraph that we are going to discuss tomorrow will be submitted to all the Committee Members. Thank you very much. So now we are moving to Item 5E, document 5E.

Chairperson:

I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler to introduce this Item.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. This is the report of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies Item 5 and here 5E is the report on strengthening dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties so this will be presented by the Advisory Bodies. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

ICCROM, the presenter from ICCROM, please.

ICCROM:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. This short presentation is going to be on document 5E, which is the report on strengthening of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties.

You have document 5E in your document pack but just by way of background this report comes specifically from a request by the Committee last year as part of Decision 42 COM 5B to specifically request this agenda item on dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties. Having said that, it's useful to recall that there have been a number of Committee decisions over the years especially in recent years, let's say which do deal in one way or another with the strengthening and improving of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties and you will note that in the Annex to this document there is a list of those decision which talk about dialogue.

In preparing this short paper, the question we asked ourselves was what is the scope that is necessary to be able to enhance the dialogue? I think the first issue that came to our mind or the first idea that came to our mind was that it's clear that dialogue is most needed between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties but at the same time the Advisory Bodies also recognized that there was a need for greater dialogue not just with States Parties but with all stakeholders who are involved in the conservation of World Heritage properties in one way or another. Now it's clear that the strongest desire for dialogue, the strongest request for dialogue comes particularly in the nomination process and of course, during reactive monitoring process, especially around reactive monitoring missions but in preparing also state of conservation reports for the Committee.

But I guess the other point that the Advisory Bodies wanted to emphasize was that while those two areas, state of conservation and nominations are the places that the Committee has the largest requests, let's say for dialogue, but the fact of the matter is that this dialogue would probably be useful in all processes of the World Heritage Convention. That would include Tentative Lists, that would include the periodic reporting process and even let's call them smaller things like International Assistance requests if we could start a process of dialogue earlier on I think that would probably be useful. And in fact that is the other point underlined here is that the Advisory Bodies are also of the opinion that the sooner we can begin these dialogue processes the better that we are. We often get into a situation where decisions have already been taken and then the idea is to move into dialogue. It would be much easier to move into that dialogue phase and to exchange ideas before decisions are taken on the ground. Those are important things to keep in mind.

So what are the principles that we tried to highlight? The first is that dialogue is most likely to be effective if there is clear communication and mutual respect. So it is important for all parties in a dialogue process to be able to communicate as well as they possible can with each other and do so in a respectful manner. Having said that, we wanted to underline the point that the concept of a dialogue is different from the concept of negotiation. We don't view dialogue as a point of sitting down among two parties and trying to negotiate an outcome. Instead, we view dialogue as a means of ensuring an exchange of information, as a means of clarifying issues, as a means of bringing out new issues that maybe were not known in the past, as a means of exchange and clarifying of information more so than specifically for negotiation. And again, as I already underlined to a certain extent, dialogue should actually play an important role in various processes of the Convention to make sure that all the information is known, everyone is clear about the scope of that information and how the processes are moving along in their timelines.

So what are the subjects for dialogue? We sort of divided this into two. Some aspects of dialogue would be more on processes themselves so on the modalities of an evaluation or the modalities of the monitoring procedures. So that's one subject for dialogue. And the second area for dialogue clearly is more related to issues related to a specific site, which may be raised during the evaluation mission or during the monitoring procedure. So there are two areas of dialogue. More general, let's say and more specifically related to sites. But having said that, it's important to underline that the Convention needs to maintain its technical credibility and it needs to ensure its consistency among different properties, so this concept of dialogue is something that should not undermine, let's say that consistency or that credibility across multiple sites and across the Convention itself. Taking that one step further, it's also clear that dialogue is not always going to resolve an issue especially one where there is a fundamental difference of opinion in relation to a scientific issue related to the Convention. So these are things that we need to keep in mind in understanding how far dialogue can be effective.

So what is the way forward? The way forward is that we need to start dialogue as soon as possible and we need to do that for the nomination process and for the reactive monitoring process but we also need to do that for all other processes of the Convention where there is a

benefit to having a consultation at an earlier stage. It is important to recognize also that time is an issue in relation to dialogue, that the Advisory Bodies I can say are very much interested in promoting dialogue and having better dialogue with Committee Members and States Parties in general but it is important for us to take into account that when you enter into a dialogue it's something that has a tendency to take more time and so we have to look at the processes of the Convention themselves, look at the timelines of the Convention itself to see how we can insert this dialogue in a way that it's able to function in a positive way because if there is not enough time it becomes difficult to actually have that meaningful dialogue. It is also important to point out that the issue of dialogue can create more opportunities for capacity building. Part of the issue of dialogue especially if you are not dealing just with a single site but when you are dealing in the larger sense, can be accomplished through capacity building and through exchange of ideas in a variety of venues which can help States Parties to better understand the Convention which can help the Advisory Bodies to better understand the points of views of the States Parties in relation to certain issue and that can be done in a capacity-building framework and it's something that we can work on together between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies.

Finally, the last point is just to say that we are looking for innovative ideas to be explored, to look at the most effective ways to promote dialogue and that it's important that as we continue to promote these ideas of dialogue that we carry them out on a trial basis first to ensure that they are actually efficient and that they actually work and also to make sure that they don't create any sort of unintended negative consequences for the procedures of the World Heritage Convention. I think those are the key ways forward.

Just conclude, I think it's useful to point out that there have been a lot of steps towards the improvement of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties and Committee Members over time, certainly within the nomination process, within the evaluation process there have been added steps to allow for that kind of dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies in question. I think certainly in reactive monitoring there has been more of an attempt to have better dialogue but even also in other forms like the ad hoc working group, in other working groups that come out—I think that also promotes dialogue so hopefully we can move forward with this and we can find new and innovative ways to continue to promote this dialogue over time. I'll stop the presentation here because the point of this was actually just to sort of get people thinking about it because the idea of dialogue is actually a two-way street. So it shouldn't be me preaching to you what is dialogue, it should be me sort of opening this as an agenda item and then actually we can start having a dialogue and for that reason I'm actually also happy to say that IUCN and ICOMOS are right next to me and I think all three of us as well as the World Heritage Centre will be happy to have this dialogue with you even now in this venue. So thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you for the presentation. We have two options: either to further with our work but I think it is a bit late to start discussions. We can propose that now we will put the list of those who want to make amendments to this presentation and do it tomorrow, start this matter tomorrow morning. The other way if you wish is we can go further. We have Australia, Norway, Tanzania, Indonesia, Bahrain, Brazil, Hungary, Azerbaijan, Guatemala, Kuwait, and Tunisia. So we have 11 interventions. I think that we must not possess our agreement concerning that we try to finish the work at 6 o'clock. We are not at the stage which urges us to do it today on the first day of our working session. We would like to propose to move the discussion and exchange of opinions on this Item for tomorrow morning's session at 10 o'clock and I hope that we will finalize it soon within half an hour and then we will move to the next Item noting that the decision on the two Items on 5D will be done at the end of the day, not in the morning. Can you agree? Okay. Thank you very much so I think that we had a very productive and fruitful discussion today. I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler for some announcements.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I hope you will see on the screens there is a side event from 6-7 p.m. Thematic Studies for Natural Heritage, an update by IUCN, which is in the AB space which is Room B3 and then we have a number of exhibitions which you can see here on the screen which you are welcome to visit. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I would like to apply to all the participants; you all have in your bags a Baku cultural guide. I would like you to look through it and find the entertainments, concerts, exhibitions that you are interested in. You are mostly welcome there. Your badges I hope will be the pass to these events. So welcome. Thank you very much. See you tomorrow at 10 o'clock. We will start at 10, not later, please. Sorry, Bureau is at 9:30 a.m. but working of the session is 10 o'clock. Thank you. Have a nice evening.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.

SECOND DAY – Tuesday 2 July 2019

THIRD MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Dear colleagues, honorable delegates, members of delegations, please take your seats.

Dear colleagues, let us now return to our agenda. As far as you remember, yesterday we started the examination of Item 5E. Document WHC/19/43.COM/5E, report on strengthening of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties. You remember that the presentation was done and completed the list of speakers who wanted to give comments on this matter. So I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler to introduce the Item. Please, you're welcome.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. As you remember, we had a number of speakers on our speaker's list and I'm now just reading them out so that you can get prepared with your statements. Norway, Tanzania, Indonesia, Bahrain, Brazil, Hungary, Guatemala, Kuwait, Tunisia and Australia. Maybe, Mr Chairperson you would like to say who else wants to speak? Thank you.

Chairperson:

Azerbaijan. China. Burkina Faso. Thank you. The first speaker, Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson, for giving Norway the floor. We welcome this important document and subsequent discussion. This is a matter of building and maintaining mutual trust, the sharing of knowledge and experience of building capacities, reducing politicization and avoiding the creation of expectations, which may be hard to fulfil. Dialogues should increase transparency, improve decision-making, enhance the credibility of the Convention and improve conservation. Dialogue must include all relevant stakeholders including site managers, civil society, local communities and indigenous peoples among others.

For Norway, it's crucial that a technical evaluation of nominations and a monitoring of properties are based on scientific evidence and consistent procedures in line with the Operational Guidelines and the Rules of Procedure. The results of the technical processes must be credible, valid, transparent and consistent. Processes and advice must be institutional, documented and transparent. We strongly support the measures already put in place to improve dialogue under the processes related to nominations, state of conservation and the open approach towards accepting any initiation from any State Party for dialogue by both the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.

We recognize the need for States Parties to this Convention to better understand how and why certain recommendations are being made. At the same time, we all have an obligation as outlined in the Operational Guidelines to provide information within the established statutory processes and timelines. More specifically, paragraphs 171, 172 and 174 of the Operational Guidelines lay out a foundation for earlier communication and dialogue to ensure a timely response and appropriate solutions for various issues.

A significant potential to increase dialogue has been undertaken since last year's meeting in Manama. In this regard, we wish to sincerely thank our host and the delegation of Azerbaijan and in particular our colleague Mr Rashad Baratli for leading the Ad Hoc Working Group through the highly complex task of initiating the reform of the nomination process. Azerbaijan's wise leadership has structured our work, allowing exceptional results towards the future nomination process which will increase dialogue and collaboration between States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, build capacity in the States Parties, strengthen the quality of nominations and streamline the many processes related to nominations. These significant achievements to be further discussed and decided under Item 12 could be the legacy of Baku. In our collective memory it could be a qualitative turning point for dialogue, referenced in the future. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Norway. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. This is an interesting agenda item that the Tanzanian delegation wishes to associate with. Chairperson, the Tanzanian delegation commends ICCROM for the good report presented. Chairperson, the Tanzania delegation agrees with ICCROM that dialogue is not negotiation. Indeed, effective dialogue is mostly needed between the Advisory Bodies and the concerned States Parties but also among all stakeholders of the World Heritage Convention.

Chairperson, effective dialogue should be constructive for the purpose of increasing transparency, accountability and optimizing future decisions to be made by the World Heritage Committee.

Chairperson, the Tanzanian delegation believes that the issue of effective dialogue needs a special strategy. The Tanzanian delegation proposes this special strategy because an effective dialogue does not have a simple answer or simple solution. It is a complex business with a specific agenda, timeframe and expected results. For example, for the issue that had been discussed in the previous Committee's session as areas of concern for States Parties, these issues keep on reappearing up-to-date. The delegation of Tanzania notes that in some cases, properties are put on the Danger List without clearly identified corrective measures. As a result, therefore, without the desired state of conservation for removal from the Danger List as enshrined in the Operational Guidelines, paragraph 183-189. Chairperson, ignoring the use of approved tools leads to personalization of advice and judgement.

Chairperson, the Tanzanian delegation notes sites in Africa and other parts of the world where sites have been on the Danger List for more than 15 years and indeed, even where corrective measures were identified, they keep on changing necessary updates creating an endless chain.

Chairperson, Tanzania feels that the lobbying for inscription by States Parties, the lobbying for their sites not to be put on the Danger List and the lobbying for their sites not to be deleted are very clear indicators of inadequate or lack of effective dialogue.

Chairperson, leaving these elements to the end of the day threatens the integrity of the Committee itself. Hence a strategy to develop an effective dialogue is a necessity and should be put in place. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your comments. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Thank you for your leadership. Effective and constructive dialogue between Advisory Bodies, the States Parties and related parties must occur at all stages. It should not be limited to the nomination and monitoring processes only, but should be at all times as needed. Effective dialogue should be able to maintain the credibility of the World Heritage Convention while at the same time it should be able to bring and give solutions to the specific needs and circumstances of the States Parties. It should be able to strike a balance between parties without compromising the World Heritage Convention.

Chairperson, we are expected to mainstream the principles of sustainable development into our national process including and not limited to the outstanding universal values of World Heritage. In order to do so, we should be able to keep harmony between protection and conservation purposes, as well as the rights to develop the States Parties. World Heritage General Assembly, a mechanism that has been in existence, should be optimized as an open dialogue forum between States Parties, World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and other stakeholders including local communities, experts and NGOs. Thank you, Sir.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Chairperson. I would also like to start by thanking ICCROM and the Advisory Bodies for the presentation yesterday, which was quite illuminating and has touched on many issues that will help alleviate misunderstanding and mistrust between Advisory Bodies and States Parties. We appreciate most of the proposed actions and the dialogue between Advisory Bodies and States Parties, which has been long awaited actually. It has been mentioned in many previous Committee meetings. We also noted with appreciation that capacity building through ICCROM and the category 2 centres will help more in understanding the nomination process and the requirements in subsequent actions and post-inscription.

Allow me however, to comment on the capacity-building component and training. In view of the Arab region and category 2 centres which has long experience in this field in partnership and cooperation with Advisory Bodies and obviously with the World Heritage Centre that we consider ourselves as a relay for the Centre. We also note that we have also, at the initiative from the World Heritage Centre, we are cooperating as category 2 centres in the periodic reporting for each region starting with the Arab countries this year.

However, one thing I find missing is in the relationship which could help the mistrust that exists between--I'm not sure about how the Advisory Bodies feel, but I think States Parties have some grievances and feeling that they haven't been involved, I think mainly in the evaluation process and what follow before the inscription and after the inscription, to help them be involved in that we have with ICOMOS initiated a new training and capacity building to train professionals in the region starting with our region in the Arab world, to train professionals in the evaluation process and train them in the field and theoretically. We started last year with the first 15 and we have more training this year and we will have two courses next year. I think this will help them understand the process, help them to participate with the Advisory Bodies in the evaluation process, but more so to help their own countries in understanding how the evaluation process works and before they nominate a site they will understand what would be required of them.

I know I am running out of time but I would like to say that I consider the report from ICCROM and Advisory Bodies quite positive but I would like to add a component to the training and capacity building and that is the evaluation process. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now the floor goes to Brazil.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We warmly welcome the draft decision and the strengthening of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. We understand that the strengthening of this dialogue is extremely important to ensure transparency and inclusivity with the purpose of reinforcing the credibility of the World Heritage List. We also welcome with satisfaction the request of the Advisory Bodies to prepare specific capacity-building modules on the nomination and management planning processes. With reverence to the scope of this dialogue, which should contribute to the improvement of the decision-making process, we understand that dialogue is needed at all phases of the process and should start as early as possible. We, however, believe that an instance of dialogue between Advisory Bodies and States Parties should be considered especially before negative recommendations are published by the World Heritage Centre. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your comments. Please, Hungary, now welcome.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like to wish a good morning to all colleagues. We would like to thank the Advisory Bodies for their presentation and we also want to thank the delegation of Cuba because we remember that it was upon their proposal that this very important and pertinent item was inscribed on our agenda.

We have read this report with great attention and as it is acknowledged in the paper itself and as we have heard several times, the need for better dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties has been more and more prominent in our discussions in recent years. Dialogue is crucial and important in all processes of the Convention. We would also like to take a moment and commend the document, which we find of very high quality. Most of all we wanted to say as has already been expressed by others--Norway in particular, but we would still like to say that dialogue helps to improve transparency and understanding the procedures.

We ourselves have often felt that many issues actually stem from the fact that there is a lack of knowledge about the Advisory Bodies methods of work, and further efforts have to be made in this regard. We would also like to highlight and agree with paragraph 18 of the Report, which mentions the discussion held in the framework of the Ad Hoc Working Group regarding the two-phase nomination approach, which would allow dialogue at the earliest stages of the nomination process. In our view, this is of crucial importance because in relation to nominations, in order for the advice of the Advisory Bodies, delivered through dialogue, to be effective and to be able to be implemented resulting in higher quality nominations, this discussion has to happen early.

We also agree with some of Bahrain's comments about the unfortunately existing mistrust, which needs to be addressed as well, and we are hopeful that early dialogue will also help in this regard. We also share the view expressed during the presentation about the importance of creating more opportunities for capacity building to address specific issues identified through dialogue. So in closing, we would like to thank once again the Advisory Bodies for this presentation. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Hungary. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We'd like to thank the Secretariat for the Report on strengthening of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. We agree with other Committee Members about the fundamental importance of dialogue to make the Convention more effective but there should be an ongoing dialogue that should also allow for strengthening local capacities keeping in mind the capacities of local communities and how essential this is for World Heritage and category 2 centres can play an important role in this process of constructive dialogue. We need permanent and ongoing dialogue.

The Convention is based on the need to protect and conserve sites that represent the most valuable elements of nature and human creation and dialogue is therefore the main form of communication in the Convention and this goes from identification, nomination up to inscription of properties and sites but also to ensure sustainable preservation into the long-term and we have to protect these heritage sites and their outstanding universal value. We shouldn't require crisis situations to require this strengthened dialogue between all stakeholders in the Convention. We agree with the Advisory Bodies when they say that dialogue should not replace technical processes but on the contrary should enrich the entire process involving all stakeholders providing accurate information. For all stakeholders dialogue is important and fundamental but we should also understand that dialogue has to be constructive, respectful and ongoing. Therefore, we have to take a new look at the channels of communication to find the best possible ways to conduct this dialogue. As such, given the number of administrative and technical terms related to the Convention, Guatemala feels that we have to have an ongoing review of all facets of implementation in order to standardize language for improved dialogue.

We recognize that World Heritage is a cross-cutting issue of our societies that involves researchers, experts, public bodies, private sector actors, civil society, indigenous peoples, local communities, young people, the users, so it's necessary therefore to strengthen dialogue but we also have to ensure that all of us are able to speak the same language. This is essential for effective communication, so our language has to be clear between those providing the information and those receiving it. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Please, Kuwait is welcome.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the Advisory Bodies for their Report. To me, the report was a very, very general report. I didn't get much detail out of it. There are no two people in this room that would disagree that dialogue is important. All of it was very general terminology in the Report. I was wondering when the Report was done was it done through a dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties so the dialogue can have meaningful outcomes? There is a point that really strikes me going through the Report when it says that dialogue will not change the outcomes and I think, no dialogue might change the outcomes because through dialogue you clarify things; dialogue doesn't mean speaking in general terms. Dialogue means specific technical points from the States Parties and Advisory Bodies and if those arguments are valid it will change the outcome. So if the Advisory Bodies who wrote the Report have concrete thinking that dialogue will not change the outcomes I think we have a major lack of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies, a major lack of understanding of the meaning of dialogue because dialogue might change outcomes. I also would like to see specific ways of promoting dialogue. I would love for the Advisory Bodies to share their experience with concrete specific ways to improve dialogue, not just saying that dialogue is important and that it's important at the beginning and most important at the end.

And as my colleague from Brazil says, especially when there is not negative, I want to say, but potential rejection of the dossier. Thank you.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier l'ICCROM et toutes les instances consultatives de leur rapport, qui est extrêmement important, et je crois que ce point à l'ordre du jour de nos travaux est probablement l'un des plus importants que l'on va traiter, parce qu'il ne concerne pas une situation factuelle, il concerne l'avenir de notre système dans sa globalité et on se pose ici des questions de viabilité, de cohérence et de crédibilité. C'est pour ça que je voudrais renouveler mes remerciements pour la qualité du rapport, mais je rejoins beaucoup de mes prédécesseurs qui ont pris la parole pour dire que le dialogue est extrêmement important, il doit avoir lieu à toutes les étapes du processus pour qu'il prenne la totalité et la plénitude de son sens. Je crois qu'il y a un état d'esprit qui s'installe par moment pour dire qu'il y a une relativité ici et un absolu là. Je crois que nous devons tous être mus par l'idée que nous sommes tous faillibles, que nous avons des appréciations et que les appréciations doivent être confrontées et confortées par le dialogue.

La finalité de ce processus devrait nous ramener à rejoindre davantage de crédibilité, de viabilité, d'égalité, mais aussi de solidarité. Je crois que l'idée même du système d'inscription repose sur l'idée que le génie de la nature et le génie de l'être humain doivent être reconnus par notre système. Ce génie va s'exprimer différemment et va s'exprimer de manière différente d'une région et d'une culture à une autre. Il nous faut créer les canaux, les mécanismes, pour que cela soit le mieux reconnu et le plus largement diversifié.

Il nous importe également, Monsieur le Président, de souligner que l'enjeu de la qualité des candidatures est un enjeu important, mais aussi qu'il faut mettre en place des systèmes d'accompagnement pour que ce droit à présenter des candidatures soit le plus largement, et de la manière la plus égalitaire, partagé par l'ensemble des États parties. Bien évidemment, au cœur de cette discussion il y a le respect indiscutable que nous devons à la science et aux scientifiques mais, dans un contexte comme le nôtre, l'appréciation doit être inclusive et toutes les parties doivent se mettre autour d'une table avant, pendant et même après une inscription en vue d'une meilleure conservation. Je crois que cela ne doit échapper à personne, et il est de notre intérêt que nous concevions nos rapports comme des rapports de convergence et non pas d'opposition entre deux bords, cela ne serait dans l'intérêt de personne. Merci beaucoup de votre attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your position. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Australia welcomes this report on strengthening of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. Our comments on this Item are focused on the conservation of properties on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Mindful of the separate report on reactive monitoring to be discussed under agenda Item 7, that Report is inseparable from any discussion on strengthening dialogue with the Advisory Bodies. Its many recommendations are substantive, important and go a long way towards identifying the changes we need to orient the Committee's deliberation more towards the conservation of existing properties on the World Heritage List.

Agenda paper 5E emphasizes the Committee's decisions and deliberations being focused on constructive dialogue, which in the words of the paper implies open, transparent and two-way exchange to enable States Parties to better understand how and why certain

recommendations are being made and to provide additional information that may not have been considered previously within the established statutory processes and timelines. We agree with this objective and the importance of transparency in these processes. We are beginning to see the benefits of this sort of exchange in the nomination process with the upstream process and other measures that are emerging from the nomination reform discussions and the Ad Hoc Working Group for which we thank Azerbaijan for its leadership.

These positive developments provide strong incentive for the community to consider how we might similarly improve exchange and dialogue in the state of conservation process. Australia's own experience is that there opportunities to improve how and when dialogue occurs between the Advisory Bodies, States Parties and the World Heritage Centre and I do underline that we have accepted many opportunities to have that dialogue and it has been beneficial certainly for us as a State Party. But the States Parties, we reach a point in the state of conservation process where we lose visibility of what the report will conclude and recommend. At best we can try to deduce what will be concluded based on our prior discussions during reactive monitoring missions, information requests and engagement with civil society.

We believe the current practice of States Parties receiving mission reports and SOC reports when they are published on the UNESCO website is inconsistent with the objectives outlined in this paper. We worry that this lack of visibility at the end of the SOC cycle, the absence of a no-surprises approach results in States Parties being disenfranchised at a time when their engagement is most critical. And let me emphasize here that no surprises does not in any way imply no critical analysis and advice. State of conservation reports should be viewed as constructive documents that provide evidence-based advice to States Parties to assist them in dealing effectively with the challenges they face, often of their own making, often of our own making but also often not.

We need the SOC process to work constructively with and for States Parties. Continuous improvement is the name of the game and we have no doubt that this is a shared objective between States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the Centre.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please. You are welcome.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Azerbaijan also joins the previous speakers in highlighting the important role of dialogue and the impact of the dialogue on the overall process. In this regard, we welcome the Report of the Advisory Bodies and ICCROM in highlighting these important elements in their Report. But we believe that dialogue must be inclusive; it's a prerequisite of the credibility and when we speak all the time about credibility I think that dialogue comes first and we have to ensure the dialogue between Advisory Bodies and States Parties and this in turn will contribute to credibility. So credibility now starts from the evaluation process and goes to the next phases.

We also support the idea that the dialogue should be in all phases of the process starting from the Tentative List to the evaluation process and so on. In that regard I am very thankful for the members of the Ad Hoc Working Group. We extensively discussed this issue and there is already one instrument or mechanism proposed by the Ad Hoc Working Group, the preliminary assessment, which we believe will contribute to strengthening the dialogue. The recommendation will be discussed soon on this issue. We also would like to highlight that the mechanism that we need to put in place that make the dialogue a mandatory part of the process, not depending on the willingness of Advisory Bodies or States Parties but it should be mandatory which will define the framework, timetable and really concrete elements that will strengthen the communication between States Parties and Advisory Bodies.

There were some ideas which we really disagree with that dialogue cannot change the scientific evaluation of the Advisory Bodies. We believe that this is actually the sense of the dialogue, that we can discuss with the Advisory Bodies the way in which they see because we believe that the scientific evaluation of the value of the sites always has room for interpretation. In that regard, we need to have more opportunities for the States Parties to explain the way in which they see the value of the sites. I thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. China, the floor is yours. Welcome.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. First of all, China welcomes this document prepared by the professional bodies, ICCROM on behalf of the three. China has always been encouraging and supporting dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. We believe that we have benefitted a great deal from the process. We are of the view that the principle of dialogue is equality of the parties and that the foundation of dialogue is mutual respect; the goal of dialogue is to better preserve and conserve World Heritage and promote the sustainable development of communities. We also agree and wish to echo the distinguished Ambassador of Azerbaijan that this process of dialogue should be institutionalized. There should be a formal process throughout, meaning that there should be great chance for opportunities to discuss. We also believe that it is crucially important that the two parties concerned, on the one hand the States Parties should try their best to understand and meet the needs of conservation and the Operational Guidelines, and on the other hand the Advisory Bodies should try their best to understand and respect the local knowledge and traditions of heritage sites. This knowledge and these traditions are the result of hundreds of years of development and are the upholders of the national spirit and reflection of socioeconomic development. Most of all this knowledge and these traditions are often the cornerstone to States Parties to protect and conserve the World Heritage. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le Burkina Faso remercie le Secrétariat pour le rapport soumis sur ce thème important, comme l'ont relevé la plupart des intervenants. Un dialogue constructif et efficace, c'est ce à quoi toutes les parties prenantes doivent s'engager. C'est pourquoi nous soutenons la réflexion en cours sur la réforme du processus de nomination, qui prend en compte le renforcement du dialogue entre les États parties, les organes consultatifs et le Secrétariat. Pour cela, nous pensons que l'on devrait travailler à l'amélioration de la communication avec les États parties dans une approche constructive et non d'opposition et d'adversité, pour éviter les incompréhensions et les mauvaises appréciations des recommandations. Nous considérons que le Secrétariat et les organes consultatifs ont un rôle d'accompagnement des États parties.

Monsieur le Président, pour notre part, nous souhaitons remercier le Secrétariat et les organes consultatifs pour la disponibilité dont ils font preuve et les exhortons à toujours œuvrer à améliorer la qualité du dialogue. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have finalized the list of speakers now. Maybe the Advisory Bodies' representative will have some comments—a couple of minutes, please.

ICCROM:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and I would ask you indulgence. I'd like to respond to some of the questions but it's very possible that my sister Advisory Bodies might also want to take the floor to answer specific questions, if you will.

So first of all let me thank very much all the delegates, Members of the World Heritage Committee for their very interesting and useful interventions in regards to this agenda item. Just as a first comment because this was one of the questions asked, the document that you have before you was put together in a discussion between the Advisory Bodies and also shared with the World Heritage Centre. But as I think as I mentioned in my first intervention on this issue, the idea was to have this dialogue with you the Members of the Committee at this point and judging from the responses and the comments that you have made right now in fact this paper has served to actually, well, I won't say open the dialogue because there has been dialogue in the past, but it has served to essential bring out some of these key issues of dialogue so I'm hoping that the paper was at least useful enough to spur the thoughts of the Committee Members in regard to this important issue.

Now going on more specifically to some of the comments that were made. I think it is important, several of the delegations have pointed out that indeed these dialogue processes have been going on for some time now and they are part of some of the various processes we have already been discussing in different venues at different points in time. Already in the past, the whole upstream process came about as a means to allow the Advisory Bodies particularly in the nomination process to begin having dialogue with the States Parties at an earlier moment, the moment in the process of nominations where there is a first panel and then there is a dialogue with States Parties before going to a second panel is also a process that has already been put in place to enhance this dialogue.

We have also now been talking about other reform efforts and it's important to link this agenda item with some of the other agenda items that we have before us. It was mentioned by Azerbaijan and a number of other delegations, the Ad Hoc Working Group is indeed talking exactly about that, setting up a phased nomination process. All of those things are meant to help us in a more concrete way to move forward with dialogue—this agenda item being a more general discussion but the idea is that throughout our various processes there are possibilities to improve the process. Having said that, I would really like to thank the Australian delegation for mentioning the fact that it is true most of our efforts at dialogue up until now have been done for the nomination process and I realize that that is a very important process for Members of the Committee and for States Parties in general. But I think it is definitely time for us to think a little bit more about how to strengthen that in the SOC process. Obviously that is something that ICCROM is much closer to than the nomination process and we--and I think along with the other Advisory Bodies--would very much welcome the idea of actually trying to take what we learned from the nomination process and trying to install this dialogue and actually move it into SOC and actually really create a much stronger dialogue also for the SOC process. Having said that, I think it's important to recognize that these working methods for dialogue do need to be explained better.

The working methods of the Advisory Bodies themselves need to be explained better so that means better communication. It's going to mean working to institutionalize these issues in a better way. I think one of the Committee Members also mentioned language issues—standardizing language. That is something that we need to look at a little bit more. And capacity building—this is something Bahrain emphasized very strongly, the idea of developing capacity-building modules and working more closely with the category 2 centres. I think all of that is something that we need to do.

The final comment that I would like to make is perhaps a misunderstanding and maybe the document wasn't written clearly enough on this. I don't think the idea was to say that dialogue

can never lead to a change of opinion or clarification of opinion. I think what we said was that we shouldn't be viewing dialogue as a negotiation, that is we go into a process, I'm in one position you're in another position and we try to reach a little I give a little, you give a little, etc. because the basis of this Convention is a rigorous scientific outcome to our results so I think we have to maintain that rigorous scientific outcome. I think however, having said that, it is possible that decisions might change or might be altered as new evidence is being presented and if, you know the idea of dialogue is to have transparency, is to allow new facts or new issues come to light in such a way that it allows for a better understanding of the site in question whether it be SOC or whether it be nomination so the idea is not to say that dialogue can never lead to changes in thinking it's to say that it's not a negotiation process. It's a process whereby all of the information necessary actually comes to light and everyone is able to take everyone, the Advisory Bodies, States Parties, eventually you as a Committee are able to have full information and full transparency to be able to ultimately take the right decision. So I just wanted to clarify that. I think I reached the end of my intervention but I'm fairly certain that IUCN and ICOMOS are going to want to say something also. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any other comments from ICOMOS? IUCN.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all let me echo my colleague Joe King's comments-- everything that he said aligns with IUCN's view. IUCN is fully open to dialogue at all times and I think has expressed that willingness through our history of working as an Advisory Body. We have been open to reforms to our working processes; we have subjected ourselves to many, many external and independent reviews that have helped us to evolve those processes including the dialogue issue. We do currently have numerous opportunities for those exchanges and we work hard to ensure that we have an open door always to those processes so within the evaluation process as you know and as we have outlined quite clearly. We are also quite committed to the upstream process and the reforms that are going on in connection with that including the support to the Ad Hoc Working Group and we also welcome the additional budget proposals which are suggested in Item 9A concerning upstream support.

For IUCN as has been said already, dialogue is a two-way process. We do recognize that it is currently constrained quite severely by timelines and budget issues and I think we all must recognize this. We welcome the efforts to redeploy budgets from the reduction and the focus on nominations into conservation. However, the proposals that are before this Committee for the new biennium of funding in 2020-2021 include a reduction of 7% to IUCN's budget and I would point out that there are no budget lines provided to us to deal with regional support or global capacity-building strategies. So I just make that point not to harp on the budgeting issue but it is absolutely central, I think to our capacity to expand our support as willing as we are and really just to close by stressing again and re-pledging our willingness to work with you to really enhance this process within the frameworks that are I think are quite clearly articulated in the paper. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Je vais me faire aussi également l'écho des commentaires de mes collègues de l'ICCROM et l'UICN et je vais peut-être ajouter donc la perspective de l'ICOMOS en des mots un peu différents.

L'ICOMOS ces dernières années a surtout concentré ses efforts en termes d'amélioration du dialogue, notamment en ce qui concerne le processus d'évaluation, les processus en amont et le conseil qui est donné sur l'état de conservation des biens, et ce dans un souci d'améliorer à la fois l'efficacité des processus mais aussi de les rendre plus transparents tout en travaillant dans un environnement contraint en termes de calendrier et de ressources. Pour vous donner des exemples un tout petit peu plus précis, en termes de processus d'évaluation on a introduit, durant le panel des réunions avec les États parties, le rapport intermédiaire, et ça a permis, de notre point de vue en tous cas, une bonne base de compréhension mutuelle sur ce qui concerne les valeurs des biens qui sont présentés et les challenges de gestion et de protection des biens, donc afin de permettre une meilleure compréhension mutuelle de part et d'autre sur ces dossiers.

En ce qui concerne le processus en amont, on a établi un mécanisme qui institutionnalise le conseil qui est donné.

En ce qui concerne les conseils qui sont donnés à travers les missions sur l'état de conservation des biens, ça permet finalement une approche plus collaborative avec les États afin de discuter la façon dont les décisions du Comité peuvent être mises en œuvre.

Donc juste pour souligner, s'agissant du dialogue, et du point de vue de l'ICOMOS sur ce dialogue, il est nécessaire qu'il touche tous les aspects de la mise en œuvre de la Convention et qu'il ne se focalise pas uniquement sur le processus d'évaluation et le suivi de l'état de conservation ; il est constructif quand il implique un échange ouvert et qui est basé sur une volonté mutuelle, et il est efficace quand il est conduit le plus en amont possible. Je voudrais rebondir également sur ce qu'a dit l'honorable délégué du Bahreïn en ce qui concerne le renforcement des capacités, et l'ICOMOS voit là une réelle opportunité de partenariat gagnant-gagnant avec les États parties, d'une part afin de permettre à l'ICOMOS de renforcer son réseau d'experts au niveau régional, mais aussi de faire mieux comprendre ce que les organisations consultatives attendent finalement en termes d'évaluation et de suivi de l'état de conservation, ce qui permet également de renforcer les capacités au niveau des experts de la région. Et enfin, pour conclure, l'ICOMOS est ouvert à cette discussion et ouvert à l'amélioration de ce qui peut être fait dans la mesure du possible en ce qui concerne le dialogue. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. Now we have all comments. I would like to ask the Rapporteur whether there are some amendments. We have one as far as I know on the draft decision.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have received one amendment proposed by the delegation of Azerbaijan. It is for new paragraph 9 at the end of the decision. So the new paragraph would read, Invites the Advisory Bodies to engage more in dialogue with the States Parties and Committee Members in the nomination process, reactive monitoring missions and preparation of Tentative Lists with the aim of achieving more credibility, transparency, and better implementation of the Convention. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any comments on this Item? Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Indonesia would like to second the proposed amendment by Azerbaijan. I would like to make an insertion however. Let me read it Mr Chairperson. Invites the Advisory Bodies to engage effective and constructive dialogue, so we delete in here and

Committee Members in as in line with Indonesia's interventions conveyed by Ambassador of Indonesia, that dialogue has to occur at all stages. So, inscriptions to the World Heritage is not the end goal, it's not the ultimate goal. What is more important is to maintain the status of World Heritage post-inscription. We would like to add post-inscriptions in the order. So first I would like to add post-inscriptions in the order and then the second I would like to change the order so Invites the Advisory Bodies to engage effective and constructive dialogue with States Parties and Committee Members in the post-inscription, nominations process, monitoring missions, and post-inscriptions—sorry, let me repeat it. In the preparation of the Tentative Lists, second, nominations process, reactive monitoring missions, and post-inscriptions with the aim of achieving more credibility, transparency, and better implementation of the Convention and the Sustainable Development Goals because of course we respect the Convention, we fully are committed to the Convention—what we also need is to adapt to the current development of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Let us look at the final version. Any comments? So, Indonesia.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

I thank you to take the floor again, Mr Chairperson. At the end of the paragraph, I would like to insert and better innovations of the Conventions and the Sustainable Development Goals. I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Are there any other opinions? Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have submitted an amendment in writing to the Rapporteur. And it's an amendment that is supported by Brazil, Tunisia and Kuwait to the Azerbaijani proposal. The proposal mainly consists of including in the text maybe after nomination process, including before the publication of negative recommendations, and then the rest can read as it is. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Any objections? Any other opinions? I think that it is reflecting the general view. Guatemala, please. Guatemala.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. Guatemala would also like to support this proposed amendment especially because we think there are many States Parties who are not yet in the nomination process and yet they need to maintain a dialogue with the Advisory Bodies and other entities of the Convention in order to safeguard their properties which are already inscribed on the List and which are facing threats to their OUV and so that is why we would like to support this proposed amendment and we fully agree with the idea of continued dialogue particularly when it comes to safeguarding and managing the sites.

Chairperson:

Saint Kitts and Nevis, please.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just a question of semantics--paragraph as it stands now is a little bit unwieldy, difficult to follow. My suggestion would be streamlining it a bit. Invites the Advisory

Bodies to engage *in* effective and constructive dialogue and further down, post-inscriptions, monitoring missions with the aim of achieving more effective credibility, transparency, etc. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. First of all, we should express our thanks and to say that we perfectly agree with the way that this topic has been discussed. In the previous session of the Committee, Cuba did actually want this to happen and we are delighted that it has happened. This is an issue that has come up again and again in all of our discussions; the importance of dialogue and that is why we think that the dialogue between the States Parties and all the other entities within the Convention is of crucial importance. We are very pleased with the analysis that has been undertaken and we are also pleased with the proposed amendment but we would just like to change the wording. We do think that paragraph 8 is more of a general nature. In other words we think that paragraph actually calls on all parties to maintain and nurture dialogue and we are very pleased with it that way.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We do not oppose the proposal by Brazil, it's just that the word negative can be very subjective and we believe that all recommendations brought forward by the Advisory Bodies are based on scientific evaluations, many of them are supported by quite comprehensive reviews done so it's just the matter of the word negative and keeping it as general recommendations.

Chairperson:

I can agree. We can take the word negative from there including before the publication of recommendations in general. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Monsieur le Président, c'est juste une remarque de forme dans la version française. À la fin du point 9, « dans le but d'obtenir plus de crédibilité, *efficacement* », je crois que ça ne colle pas, donc on dirait plutôt « de crédibilité, d'efficacité et de transparence dans une meilleure mise en œuvre », ou « en vue d'une meilleure mise en œuvre de la Convention ». « Efficacement » ne convient pas, « d'efficacité », merci.

Chairperson:

China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China is not proposing any wording changes but we support the addition of paragraph 9 as a whole. I think every country, all the proposals have raised with regard to the detailed wording they essentially mean the same thing so we support all the texts. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you, China. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous soutenons également ce projet d'amendement. Nous voulons toutefois demander s'il est nécessaire de maintenir « membres du Comité », puisque les États parties, les membres du Comité, sont également États parties. Nous pensons que le langage le plus simple serait de garder uniquement « à engager un dialogue effectif et constructif avec les États parties ».

Chairperson:

I think we can agree.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

I thank you, Chairperson. Just in line with Indonesia's input to add and the Sustainable Development Goals in the English text, Indonesia would like to see the insertion of and Sustainable Development Goals in the French text as well. I thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

You are correct. Thank you. I hope we are coming to an agreement. We have to finalize this 5E. If you don't mind we come to the approval of the draft decision 5E in general. Rapporteur, please. Any comments?

Rapporteur:

I will just read out the final, I think, paragraph 9 with a very small suggestion. So it would read, Invites the Advisory Bodies to engage in effective and constructive dialogue in the preparation of Tentative Lists in the nomination process including before the publication of recommendations and I would change here just to say, and post-inscription—just a language thing. And then perhaps including monitoring missions, with the indulgence of the Committee. And then it would read, including monitoring missions with the aim of achieving more effective credibility, transparency and better implementation of the Convention and Sustainable Development Goals.

Chairperson:

So the final version is professional so I hope that no other proposals are on the table so can we approve it? No objections? So we approve draft decision 5E in common. Thank you.

Dear colleagues, we have a major Agenda item to examine, namely Item 7 on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. This year, there are three draft Decisions proposed for adoption within this document: Decision 43 COM 7.1 on statutory matters related to the reactive monitoring process; Decision 43 COM 7.2 on pressing conservation issues, and Decision 43 COM 7.3 on other conservation issues.

I would like to inform you that, as for the past years, this item will remain open to possibly take into account the debates held under Agenda Items 7A and 7B. The Draft decisions 7.2 and 7.3 will therefore only be adopted once we have completed the examination of Items 7A and 7B.

Before we proceed with this item, I would like to inform you that the World Heritage community at large was saddened this year again by the loss of human lives. In Mali, and particularly within and around the World Heritage property of the Cliffs of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons), inter-community conflicts observed in recent months led to acts of violence and deadly attacks, notably on 23 March 2019 in the Fulani village of Ogossogou, resulting in the death of more than 150 people, and on 9 June 2019 in the Dogon village of Sobane-Da, which killed at least 25 people. In addition, since our previous session, again three park staff were tragically killed in the Virunga National Park (DRC) while on duty, fighting against illegal activities within the park. Therefore, I would like to propose that tribute be paid to them, and that we all observe one minute of silence in the memory.

[one minute of silence]

Thank you very much.

I would like to give the floor to our colleague the Minister of Culture from Mali. Please.

La Délégation du Mali (Observateur):

Thank you. Please excuse my emotion. Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les membres du Comité, je voudrais tout d'abord remercier M. Abulfas Garayev, Ministre de la culture de l'Azerbaïdjan, pour l'excellente qualité de l'organisation de cette 43^e session du Comité, et davantage pour la chaleur et la fraternité de l'accueil réservé à la délégation du Mali. Je vous remercie pour cette opportunité que vous donnez à ma délégation de vous faire le point sur l'état de conservation des falaises de Bandiagara.

L'occupation du Mali en 2012 par les groupes terroristes et leur présence depuis 2018 dans le centre du Mali où se trouve cet important bien est en grande partie à l'origine du conflit qui, en plus des pertes en vies humaines sans précédent dans notre histoire contemporaine, a des conséquences sur l'ensemble du patrimoine culturel qui caractérise ce site.

Monsieur le Président, mon pays n'a aucun doute que les destructions et les dégradations observées dans les différents villages sont le résultat des manœuvres de déstabilisation des communautés peules et dogon par les groupes terroristes, notamment dans les villages Koulogoun, Ogossagou, Sobane Da et Yoro qui ont été attaqués, pour ne citer que ces exemples. Hier encore, Monsieur le Président, pendant que nous dinions, Ouenkoro a été la cible des terroristes. Mon pays, en plus d'apporter des réponses aux situations sécuritaire et humanitaire que provoquent ces conflits, voudrait réaffirmer son engagement à assurer la protection de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle des falaises de Bandiagara. Tous les villages attaqués possédaient des greniers, des cases de femmes menstruées, des cases à palabre « togouna », des lieux de culte qui ont été dégradés ou entièrement détruits. Ces éléments sont non seulement des attributs importants de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, mais ils structurent le tissu social des communautés vivant en paix malgré leur grande diversité culturelle et culturelle.

Suite à l'appel lancé au Comité du patrimoine mondial par le Gouvernement du Mali, le Conseil de sécurité s'est mobilisé pour apporter des réponses à ce nouveau cycle de violence en décidant, dans sa résolution 2480, d'étendre le mandat de la MINUSMA au Mali.

Monsieur le Président, chers membres du Comité, je suis ici à Bakou pour lancer un appel au Comité du patrimoine mondial en vue d'aider le Mali à préserver le patrimoine culturel des falaises de Bandiagara contre les terroristes obscurantistes. Je suis ici, sous le leadership de

Son Excellence Ibrahim Boubacar Keïta, Président de la République du Mali, qui est aussi le coordinateur de l'Union africaine pour les arts, la culture et le patrimoine, pour demander au Comité du patrimoine mondial de nous soutenir dans nos efforts de construction d'une paix durable.

Monsieur le Président, le cas malien est un cas d'école pour le Comité, comme l'a si bien dit le Président du Conseil exécutif lors de l'ouverture officielle de cette session. Le Mali est reconnaissant de votre appel, de votre appui à la reconstruction des mausolées de Tombouctou. Aussi mon pays est-il prêt à partager son expérience de réhabilitation du patrimoine culturel intentionnellement endommagé pour qu'elle serve de source d'inspiration dans un monde en crise où le Comité doit trouver de nouvelles réponses.

Pour terminer, je voudrais réitérer les remerciements du Président de la République du Mali, champion de l'Union africaine pour la culture, les arts et le patrimoine et les remerciements du Gouvernement du Mali à l'UNESCO, à l'ensemble des partenaires ici présents et aux experts maliens et internationaux qui ont accompagné et qui accompagnent le Mali pour relever les défis auxquels nous faisons face. Des défis face auxquels le Mali reste et restera debout. Debout pour protéger ; debout pour reconstruire, debout pour réhabiliter son patrimoine, notre patrimoine commun au nom des valeurs que nous avons en partage et au nom de notre humanité partagée.

C'est dans l'adversité, dit-on chez moi, que l'on reconnaît ses amis. Et je suis confiante, Monsieur le Président, chers membres du Comité, qu'aucun défi quel que soit sa taille, aussi grand soit-il, n'est au-dessus de notre créativité, de notre intelligence collective et de notre capacité à faire triompher l'art et la culture sur la barbarie et l'obscurantisme. Je vous remercie de votre bienveillante attention et je vous dis, selon la formule consacrée chez moi, que la paix d'Allah soit avec vous, *wa salam*.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, honourable Minister. Dear Committee Members, before we start the examination of Item 7, I would like to inform you that we had the 3rd World Heritage Site Forum that started before our Committee Meeting on 26 June. The capacity-building event had gathered nearly 70 site managers from all over the world. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the local organizers, the board of the administration of the Old Town Icherisheher, Gobustan Preserve to the World Heritage Centre, the three Advisory Bodies and of course the World Heritage Leadership Programme for organizing this Forum with such great enthusiasm and success. Thank you very much to all of you for having made this event possible.

I am particularly pleased that this year for the first time ever both the Young Professionals Forum and the Site Managers Forum participants were able to meet and exchange during a full working session dedicated to the nature-culture inter-linkage. So, if you don't mind I would like now to give the floor to Ms Jennifer Sekang Olegeriil site manager of the Rock Islands Southern Lagoon, Palau, and to Mr Ghassan Chemali, site manager of the Pearling Testimony of an Island Economy, Bahrain to give us a few words on the Forum. Please. Welcome, you have the floor.

Representative of the 3rd World Heritage Site Managers Forum (Mr Ghassan Chemali):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We are honored to be the representatives of this year's Site Managers Forum. The 3rd World Heritage Site Managers Forum was held in Baku, Azerbaijan, from 26 June to today. The Forum was enriched by presentations and exchanges between site managers, representatives of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. The Forum brought together 60 site managers, coordinators and practitioners from 41 countries: Afghanistan, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cuba, Ethiopia, Germany, Haiti, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Malawi, Malaysia, Namibia, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Palestine, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Participants would like to thank the Republic of Azerbaijan for convening the meeting, supporting and facilitating the participation of site managers from SIDS and LDCs, and for providing resources and assistance in making the Forum a representative space for discussion and knowledge sharing.

Introducing the interaction between the Site Managers Forum, the Young Professionals' Forum together with the Icherisheher Administration of Azerbaijan sparked mutually beneficial ideas for sustainable heritage management practices for the city of Baku as well for the respective sites of all participants. World Heritage sites face multiple challenges and changes, while being required to promote the sustainable development agenda. At the same time, site managers are also exploring and experiencing new opportunities for sharing benefits with a diverse range of communities and environments through key concepts such as effective management, impact assessment, climate change adaptation and mitigation. The World Heritage Site Managers Forum is a shared space for site managers to meet and exchange, and to better understand the World Heritage system. The Site Managers Forum has become a space for discussion about pressing challenges and emerging concepts to promote sustainable heritage management practices.

Representative of the 3rd World Heritage Site Managers Forum (Ms Jennifer Olegeriil):

We, the participants of the 3rd World Heritage Site Managers Forum, recall the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2011 through Decision 39 COM 9B. We call upon States Parties to commit to the implementation of the strategy, which should be used as a guiding document towards operationalizing capacity building policies at the national, regional and local levels. These policies should recognize that capacity building is required at all levels of site management, addressing institutions and communities, including States Parties representatives, national focal points, and site managers operating at national, regional and local levels. Capacity building will require the allocation of adequate resources, time and expertise.

We, the site managers, through our knowledge and experience, are committed to support States Parties in initiating, developing and implementing capacity-building opportunities for diverse actors. We can and should be involved as key resources for these activities. We recall the 2018 statement of the Site Managers Forum that emphasized that the term “site manager” does not fully capture the complexity of coordinated efforts of diverse people involved in this work, which incorrectly implies that it is a task undertaken by a single person rather than as a collaborative process of all those involved.

As site managers, we aspire at being continuously involved and included throughout World Heritage decision-making processes, for improving management practices and to be more effective in the implementation and use of resources. We would highlight the importance of formally recognizing in the Operational Guidelines the crucial role site managers play in all processes of the World Heritage Convention, and to empower and support site managers working in different levels, functions and capacities.

We call upon States Parties to include site managers in their delegations to the World Heritage Committee. The creation of effective policies and improvement of management practices is achievable only through the involvement of those included in the wider site management team. A fair representation of diverse site managers should be the driving force when new policies and guidelines are developed within the World Heritage context.

Communication is a fundamental component of capacity building and can be enhanced through active web of networks established between site managers and other actors in diverse levels. Capacity-building policies should include networking partners, such as category 2 centres and other regional platforms, to better understand World Heritage processes and decisions in working languages of the sites. We must also find ways to simplify the technical terminology used within the framework of the World Heritage Convention to enable better and easier translations. The information must reach not only the site managers but also the wider extent of society to ensure that World Heritage can have an active role in sustainable development and at the same time can share benefits of heritage with the wider society.

We call upon the future host countries to continue convening the Site Managers Forum in conjunction with the annual session of the World Heritage Committee. We also encourage States Parties to explore the possibility of organizing regional Site Managers Fora to extend the positive impacts of this initiative. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much [*applause*]. The document reflecting the work of the Site Managers Forum is provided to everyone. You can easily find in the documents and on the site. We will take it into the notes and we will now proceed to our agenda Item 7. Before we start the discussion on this matter we proceed to Item 7, I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler, Director of the World Heritage Centre, to introduce this Item and after that we will pass to the discussion. Please, welcome.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. So document 7 is in front of you and you all know that the World Heritage Convention is one of the most successful international instruments for the conservation of natural and cultural heritage sites. Its unique reactive monitoring process highly contributes to the efficient monitoring of threats affecting the properties and to their mitigation.

Document 7 is a key document on global World Heritage conservation issues and contains different parts. In the introduction, Document 7 provides a snapshot of the factors impacting the OUV of properties. As you can see in the next slide, the most reported factors continue to be the lack of management plans or their inadequacy, ill-advised housing, illegal activities, tourism-related activities, ground transport-related development projects, and of course, the conflict situations in various parts of the world.

The introduction also provides information on the state of conservation reports submitted by States Parties. I am very pleased to say that this year, for the very first time, we have received 99% of all reports requested by the Committee from States Parties. There is also some information from the Site Managers Forum, which you have just heard and I think we are all very appreciative of the great work they have been doing during this Forum.

Part I, Document 7 proposes a summary of the results of the very comprehensive evaluation of the reactive monitoring process you had requested at the 40th session in 2016. The two independent experts contracted to conduct this evaluation, Mr. David Sheppard and Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya, are with us today and will present their findings in a few minutes. The first part of the document also addresses one of the Committee's concern of the previous years: the List of World Heritage in Danger, and the need to both overcome the negative perception of this List and to identify ways to better assist States Parties with properties on this List and with the development of Costed Action Plans.

As you can see in the Document, the State Party of Romania had requested funding in October 2018, through the UNESCO Participation Programme, to organize an International meeting of

World Heritage in Danger stakeholders, in 2019 in Bucharest. According to the last information we have received from the State Party, this meeting could take place towards the end of September 2019, but we will keep you posted in due course.

Last but not least, the first section addresses a request made by the Committee last year regarding the selection of the World Heritage properties to be included for discussion. Indeed, you had requested us to consider geographical and thematic distribution of properties as additional criteria when determining which properties should be opened for discussion. Considering one of the recommendations of the Evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process and discussion with the Advisory Bodies, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies concluded that the selection of reports to be discussed by the Committee should continue to be guided by scientific criteria and by the urgency of the threats facing the property, as has always been the case since 2003. Therefore, as you saw in Document INF.7, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies only proposed for discussion properties were sites for the removal from the Danger List, sites proposed for inscription on the Danger List and if in case any deletion would be proposed.

In Part II, more comprehensive information is provided on emergency situations in conflict areas. This part of Document 7 alerts you to the tragic loss of human life--and we have just heard from the Minister of Culture from Mali on the devastating damage and continuing threats facing cultural and natural heritage in general. It also provides detailed information on UNESCO's actions to advocate and mobilize the international community for the protection of the endangered cultural and natural sites.

The destruction, over the past few years, brought the question of reconstruction sharply into focus. Since the last session of the Committee and the adoption of the Warsaw Recommendation on the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Cultural Heritage, several activities have taken place to disseminate this Recommendation. A joint 60-page policy document entitled, Culture in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of cities, between UNESCO and the World Bank was officially launched in Paris with our Assistant Director-General in November 2018 and aims at helping development practitioners, national and local authorities and international organizations to integrate culture into all phases of urban reconstruction and rehabilitation processes in urban crisis situations, following conflict or natural disaster.

ICCROM and ICOMOS also launched in May 2019, a call for expressions of interest for the preparation of a case study as part of a joint project, Analysis of Case Studies on Recovery and Reconstruction. Regarding Climate Change—you already made comments yesterday--and the updating of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage properties, the World Heritage Centre has identified two senior consultants with extensive experience in both natural and cultural heritage. They have started reviewing all relevant background documents and outcomes of recent meetings held on this issue, as well as contacting other international experts in the field of climate change. They are also designing a questionnaire for a widespread online consultation to be undertaken shortly, in order to gather inputs from States Parties, Advisory Bodies, NGOs, civil society and other major stakeholders and interested parties. We will put in all efforts to have the final document ready for your adoption at the next session in 2020. And of course we will continue to work on the ground in terms of adapting to climate change.

Dear Committee members, in Part II of this comprehensive document, we have also decided with the Advisory Bodies to address the issue of Management Plans in the context of urban development. The state of conservation reports examined this year revealed that many properties have difficulties in implementing management plans as they are not sufficiently well integrated into a supportive planning framework. There is therefore an urgent need to connect management plans, for properties located in and around cities and towns, within the institutional and regulatory framework of development of their urban setting. The obligation to

protect OUV should also be integrated into statutory plans and processes in line with the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.

With international tourist arrivals worldwide reaching 1.4 billion in 2018, tourism is one of the world's largest economic sectors. However, if poorly planned and/or mismanaged, tourism could have profound negative impacts on World Heritage values, conservation and host communities. Indeed, over-tourism may place cultural and natural heritage at risk and directly threaten OUV, leave communities marginalized, and threaten the future attraction and appeal of the destination. New tools and strategies are needed to help site managers monitor and manage tourism more sustainably. Our Sustainable Tourism Programme provides a global platform to promote and disseminate tools, strategies and good practices.

A visitor management assessment tool is also currently under development to enable site managers to rapidly and efficiently assess how tourism is being managed according to a set of sustainability indicators. Tourism was actually one of the key topics discussed during the Site Managers Forum here in Baku. And there is also a side event on this matter tonight.

Last but not least Mr. Chairperson, as apparent when looking at all the SOC reports we prepared together, there has been a significant number of HIAs and EIAs requested for World Heritage sites over the past few years. The ICCROM/IUCN World Heritage Leadership Programme, the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, IUCN and the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) have therefore embarked on the production of an integrated guidance on impact assessment for World Heritage properties, with the aim of providing a sound basis for improved decision-making in World Heritage management.

As you indicated Mr. Chairperson, draft Decisions 7.2 and 7.3 will only be adopted at the end of the session to take on any further reflections you have in your discussion on the reports under Items 7A and 7B. And therefore we propose only draft decision 7.1 on statutory matters be adopted immediately following the presentation of the outcomes of the reactive monitoring process and the debate. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor now to the Advisory Bodies for additional statements on this Item. You have the floor, please.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just to build on the very good points I think made by the Director of the World Heritage Centre in the report she has just given, let me highlight a number of issues of particular concern for IUCN.

In 2019, we continue to see the impacts of a rapidly changing climate on World Heritage areas around the world. The island of Socotra has experienced three cyclones in four years. Declining sea ice in Shiretoko, Japan is threatening the integrity of this property. The list of tangible on-ground evidence continues to grow. Recognizing that the 2017 IUCN Outlook Report highlights climate change as one of the top three threats to natural World Heritage and the fastest growing and largest potential future threat. IUCN is very pleased to be launching the 3rd Global Assessments in 2020 and we invite all to attend a side event on this topic this Thursday as well as related side events that are occurring on climate change regarding the climate vulnerability index and building leadership in climate adaptation events.

Furthermore, the IUCN World Conservation Congress in June 2020 will address accelerating climate change mitigation and adaptation as one of seven core themes. In light of the IPCC and IPBES reports which I mentioned yesterday and reinforced by field reports IUCN reiterates that urgent and rapid action to reduce global warming is essential and the highest degree of

ambition and leadership by all countries is needed to secure the full implementation of the Paris Agreement. It is important that best practice science is combined with global leadership to improve the understanding of impacts and also the vulnerability of World Heritage areas to climate change.

IUCN is also very pleased to support the review of the Policy on Climate Change, which is occurring for the next Committee meeting. Mr Chairperson, we are seeing a continued decline in biodiversity around the world. This year notable cases include the critically low numbers of the vaquita porpoise in the Gulf of California and key mammal species that underpin the outstanding universal value of Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park in the Central African Republic. IUCN draws the Committee's attention to the critical importance of the next 12 months for the global community to set the future agenda for biodiversity conservation under the Convention of Biological Diversity post 2020 agenda.

IUCN also notes that expanding tourism numbers and infrastructure development are exerting increasing pressures on the world's natural systems in the absence of effective governance and management frameworks. In line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development we must ensure sustainable and equitable development of communities while at the same time ensuring that the OUV of World Heritage is not compromised.

In closing, IUCN takes this opportunity to emphasize the important role of building stronger, strategic partnerships across States Parties and civil society to protect our global heritage. Evidence-based metrics such as IUCN's Outlook are made possible through partnerships and agreement with civil society. IUCN remains strongly committed to providing independent technical advice and it's through our on-ground partnerships that we have the opportunity to build that shared capacity. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. ICOMOS would like to comment briefly on three themes within the paper before the Committee.

First in relation to reconstruction--ICOMOS would like to draw attention to its work with ICCROM in compiling case studies on recovery and reconstruction based on analysis that shares a common framework. These case studies, which come from all regions, aim to allow site managers and others to share experience on projects in recovery and reconstruction in order to help better understand the challenges of this work within a World Heritage context. These studies will be available on line within the end of the year and we hope as a follow-up to this work if funds allow, there will be an expansion in the number of case studies to allow for an even greater global reach for this project. This work is part of a continuing reflection by ICOMOS on the issues of reconstruction in World Heritage properties.

Secondly, in relation to management the section on management plans in the context of urban development has been mentioned. This focuses crucially on the difficulties of implementing these plans in urban areas where the plans are not tied in to a wider planning framework and thus and not in line necessarily, with local development needs. Management plans should be the key tools for World Heritage properties but as can be seen from examples in SOC reports in recent years, they are often just not strong enough to be respected in relation to development projects. ICOMOS considers that there is a need for further reflection on how the objectives and requirements and management plans in urban areas might be delivered to better address the prevailing pressures that many urban properties face so that management can be seen to contribute positively to the wider sustainable development processes and the need to protect

outstanding universal value. We would welcome the opportunity to promote and pursue this important work in order to strengthen the tools that are available to property managers.

Finally, in relation to climate change, ICOMOS would like to say that its climate change and heritage-working group is collaborating with IUCN WCPA Climate Change Specialist group on a joint proposal for a session at the World Conservation Congress in Marseille in June next year focused on the inter-linkages between nature and culture in relation to climate change. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have to proceed to the other matter. I would like now to give the floor to Mr David Sheppard and Mr Gamini Wijesuriya to present to the Committee the findings of their evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process of the World Heritage Convention. Please, you are welcome.

The Reactive Monitoring Review Team (Mr David Sheppard):

Thank you, Chairperson. The Reactive Monitoring Review Team would like to thank the Government of Azerbaijan for their outstanding hosting of this meeting. This Review Team comprises of Gamini Wijesuriya and myself. Gamini has worked with ICCROM for more than 16 years, extensive experience in capacity building and reactive monitoring. Myself, I was head of IUCN's World Heritage from 1998-2008. It's great to be back, great to see familiar faces in the audience, really indicating the considerable institutional knowledge within the World Heritage family.

Gamini and I have worked as a team and we will jointly present this Power Point this morning. We will cover background, process, key observations, recommendations but the Report is substantial, about 150 pages. We will try to focus on the salient points.

This slide is showing the growth of the World Heritage List provides the context for our project and the context for many of the challenges that have been discussed over the last day and a half. Many have mentioned the issue of sustainability with on the one hand the growth in the List and the other, the limited in fact, static resources available through key organs of the World Heritage Convention to address the challenges.

This slide shows the number of SOC reports. It shows the increasing trend mirroring the growth in the World Heritage List until a period when the SOC reports were kept at 150. This flattening out shown in the graph does not accurately reflect the growth of threats to World Heritage properties, which have continued and in fact, have accelerated as outlined by Mechtild just now. An issue of cumulative impacts mentioned yesterday is particularly important. These are threats that exist not being adequately addressed and substantially increased over time.

Reactive monitoring has evolved substantially from an ad hoc to a quite extensive process that exists now. In fact the first paper to this Committee was in 1983 about 40 years ago and this indicates that the issue has been around for a long time and I refer everyone in the room to the History of the World Heritage Convention by Christina Cameron and Mechtild for more background on this topic of the evolution of reactive monitoring.

The process. The aim of the Reactive Monitoring Team was to be open, consultative, to give everyone who wished to the opportunity to participate. One key part was an online survey. We had 90 responses for a good regional and gender balance. The majority of survey respondents were from States Parties, 36% from site managers. The mix though not shown in this slide was about 74% from cultural sites, 26% natural sites and mixed sites actually pretty well reflecting the break up of sites on the World Heritage List. We've been advised from UNESCO World Heritage Centre that the response to this survey was relatively high compared to comparable

survey activities. Next, please. The second part was interviews with key stakeholders: 53 persons interviewed covering all of the key World Heritage stakeholders. Those interviewed comprising 65% cultural, 35% natural sites representative of, 32% male, 68% female. Questions in the interviews mirrored the terms of reference, which were outlined and also those in the online survey.

Other inputs were provided by the Site Managers Forum. It was quite an extensive presentation on this project specifically at last year's Forum. I note that the results of that Forum as it relates to reactive monitoring are outlined in an Annex to our Report. We obviously reviewed key documents—many, many documents and attending last year's Committee. In short, we believed that this review is based on an extensive, comprehensive consultation process and we hope that this is delivered a credible report to the World Heritage Committee.

Some key observations. The first and reinforced yesterday and also by virtually all participants is that reactive monitoring is an essential element to the Convention and a key feature that strengthens the Convention. This was a consistent message throughout. Many mentioned that this reactive monitoring is in fact the most important process under the Convention as it is essential if properties are to survive for the future underlining the importance of the increasing focus on conservation of the World's unique heritage, in fact, if you like, the best of the best and in fact if the world can't protect and save these sites what hope do we have for the rest of the world's heritage?

The Reactive Monitoring Team would also note that we did look at similar monitoring schemes of other related conventions and it is our view that reactive monitoring under the World Heritage Convention is the largest and most effective monitoring system existing under any of the conventions, particularly the site-based biodiversity conventions.

We asked the question of positive and what we call less positive aspects. Some of the positive aspects: the clear and demonstrated success stories for conservation. Just one example, the salt mine of El Vizcaino, which was halted through the Committee based on 30,000 letters generated through civil society and others in Mexico, which was halted in a significant conservation outcome. Secondly, drawing attention of decision-makers, politicians to key issues relating to heritage; thirdly supporting dialogue and we have heard a lot about that and we feel that reactive monitoring does provide an excellent framework for dialogue. Clearly, from World Heritage Committee comments there are areas that can be improved but it does provide a significant and important framework; fourthly, the positive aspect of identifying knowledge gaps and supporting the development of tools and thematic studies and Mechtild just mentioned to heritage impact assessment.

Some of the less positive aspects: the issue of resources, the issue of inadequate time for reporting against volume. One of our respondents compared addressing the volume of material at a World Heritage Committee like trying to drink water from a fire hydrant that's been open to the full position. Very challenging. The issues identified related to reactive monitoring missions. I'd refer delegates to our report for more elaboration. Consistent comments coming through was the issue of politicization, also mentioned in the 2011 internal audit of the Committee with the World Heritage Committee overturning, weakening or softening recommendations of the Advisory Body. It was mentioned yesterday that last year's World Heritage Committee meeting entered into history as the first time that two sites that were recommended for non-inscription were actually inscribed and 87% of Advisory Body recommendations on nominations were changed or overturned. This does pose challenges for the credibility of the Convention. And it's noted that inscription of properties contrary to the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies often these recommendations are based on integrity management issues. If they are inscribed we very quickly see them back either on the SOC or the Danger List at subsequent World Heritage Committee meetings.

We reviewed the statutory framework, the Operational Guidelines and the Rules of Procedures. Respondents generally found that these provided an adequate framework. Some noted that in fact substantial review or editing could potentially weaken the guidelines and should be avoided. The process of review of Operational Guidelines is very extensive and time consuming. I see those in the audience that participated in the 2000-2005 review nodding their heads on that point. The real fundamental message was it's not the guidelines, it's the way in which they are implemented is the main issue and challenge.

Some changes were recommended. These are outlined in the Report, the issue of terminology of the Danger List. Some found that negative and suggestions were made, outlined in the Report. The need for the development of costed action plans for danger-listed properties and attention to properties that have been on the Danger List for more than 10 years. The understanding from discussions from key parties is that these could be addressed through review of internal policies and procedure rather than major changes to the Operational Guidelines.

We looked at the role of the different actors. The results of the survey and interview underline the particularly high credibility of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and Reactive Monitoring. It noted as mentioned, the high level of pressure these bodies faced particularly with the increasing number of World Heritage properties added. This graph is point 39 in the Report. I won't go through it but it does underline the high regard of elements of the World Heritage family, particularly the Centre, Advisory Bodies and also a very high rating for the Committee itself.

We were asked to look at the individual components of the World Heritage Convention. We looked at the World Heritage Committee based on results from the survey and interviews and I guess the consistent message is the importance of decisions reflecting on ground realities and the need for clear explanations to stakeholders, particularly site managers and particularly those responsible for implementation. This issue of a clear explanation was also mentioned in the context of translation to local language, which was also mentioned by the delegate from World Heritage Site Managers Forum from Palau. And the second point was the importance of decisions based on objective and scientific considerations.

The World Heritage Centre—participants noted their key role and a quote encapsulates many of the comments we received that the Centre is very professional, hardworking, helpful to States Parties and other stakeholders. Areas of improvement noted the need for perhaps better dialogue between some of the UNESCO regional offices and relevant States Parties in relation to reactive monitoring. An issue raised was also the need for enhanced collaboration with other conventions. That was mentioned yesterday by Mechthild in her alphabet soup of acronyms, the BLG meeting with the CCLG basically meeting World Heritage Convention meeting with biodiversity and cultural Conventions so action is taking place.

World Heritage and States Parties. The issue of capacity building was emphasized and particularly the role of States Parties in strengthening of site managers. It was felt that States Parties should try to ensure the continuity of staff engaged in reactive monitoring and the importance of World Heritage orientation sessions including more attention to reactive monitoring was noted. A point that was also made is that every World Heritage Committee, there are many States Parties in the room as today with a great deal of cultural and natural heritage expertise and the suggestions were made that options to make better use of this expertise should be considered including options for support of key regions and issues as outlined for the African presentation yesterday and for underrepresented regions and areas such as SIDS. Next, please. Advisory Bodies. The feeling was the need that they are doing excellent work but the areas for improvement related to missions, particularly the need for continual and effective assessment of performance of mission experts, improving collaborative work between Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Having come back to this forum

after 10 years, I think that collaboration has improved but there is still more than can be done, and exploring smarter approaches for undertaking reactive monitoring missions. The example given in our Report is the use of IT and drones for monitoring natural sites as a Part 1 recommendation.

Some specific recommendations from IUCN was to look at ways to increase involvement of other programmes and also regional and national offices with World Heritage. For ICOMOS to look at ways to strengthen networks perhaps looking at some of the approaches of IUCN and the suggestion made was for looking at options to better use expertise within national committees on reactive monitoring. For ICCROM the recommendation is to explore options to expand activities with ICOMOS and to also make better use of its worldwide alumni network.

Civil society is a very important part of the World Heritage Convention. The responses indicated the need for civil society to be more involved and to work more closely with World Heritage States Parties and Advisory Bodies while noting that does exist at the moment and that there are interesting frameworks such as the IUCN-World Heritage Outlook Process which could be examined for possible wider application within States Parties and other Advisory Bodies. I'll pass it to Gamini to continue. Thank you.

The Reactive Monitoring Review Team (Mr Gamini Wijesuriya):

Thank you. Thank you, Chairperson, thank you, David. Yes, I am sitting in this Committee somewhere some corner for the seventeenth year this time but my work on World Heritage goes back to 1982 when, as a part of the State Party when we wrote the Tentative List in five minutes and two or three nominations overnight. Why I am saying this is that World Heritage is an evolving process and the word we heard is improvements is the key to that. So all of our work has been for the sake of improvement of this process. Let me continue with out observations regarding procedures being followed in the World Heritage process.

As highlighted before, Operational Guidelines and Rule of Procedure provide an adequate framework for the Reactive Monitoring System. However, there were some suggestions for instance, for improved criteria for opening up SOC's during the Committee meetings. There were positive comments as you heard about the work of the Centre and Advisory Bodies mentioned before. We observed certain concerns with regard to the Reactive Monitoring Mission. This is also confusion about this whole system but also there are also other reactive monitoring missions and also now there are advisory missions and there is some confusion and ambiguity regarding advisory missions.

The reactive monitoring procedures was considered the most effective means to encourage constructive dialogue which you heard this morning between key World Heritage stakeholders and the post-inscription stage. However, there are concerns about missions and selection of mission experts and so on. I will go quickly for the sake of time. We observed that the Danger Listing is still a major issue although the majority agreed that we it was beneficial to the properties. I will show you the details later on. Here is the increase of the Danger Listings and you can see this overwhelming support or expression of views that people believe that the Danger Listing is beneficial. There were suggestions for an awareness campaign for Danger Listing highlighting success stories such as the Belize we discussed last year and of course increased funding was also discussed.

Noting the importance of adequate funding and International Assistance to address threats to properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger it is considered necessary to have a fully costed action plan before sites are inscribed on the Danger List. It was observed that the removal of properties from the Danger List can be a moment for celebrations that can be shared widely.

The survey interview noted areas of concern regarding the deletion of properties considering its impact on the credibility of the Convention. The other concerns were the level of engagement and dialogue with the States Parties and the need to explore all options available before any deletion happens. There were divided views on the adequacy of current procedures for deleting properties. There were proposals for improved procedures for deleting sites.

We also looked at the reinforced monitoring procedures, which were little known to many, and our observations were that it could only be used in exceptional circumstances. We have made some recommendations.

The Reactive Monitoring Review Team (Mr David Sheppard):

So the Report outlines 34 recommendations. The review team suggested high, medium or low priority with 19 recommendations recommended as high. Priorities are based on the judgement of the Reactive Monitoring Review Team and are based on six criteria in point 1.18. The Review Team recommends an implementation plan which is outlined as recommendation 34.

The Review Team feels the recommendations, if adopted, will considerably strengthen and improve the reactive monitoring process and the World Heritage Convention. We believe the Report and recommendations should be considered as part of an integrated reform process along with aspects such as the review of nominations leading from the Tunis Meeting earlier this year.

The Team would like to thank the World Heritage Committee for your trust in us to undertake this evaluation, States Parties, all other World Heritage stakeholders and particularly the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for support, guidance and general direction throughout this process. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

I would like to thank you for this presentation, dedicated and very thorough. Let me also congratulate you for the excellent and comprehensive work you have accomplished over the past few years. As far as I know, the ICCROM representative wants to make some comments on this Report.

ICCROM:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. In this intervention, I am speaking as a joint statement on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM. The Advisory Bodies would first and foremost like to thank the expert team, which carried out the evaluation study on the reactive monitoring process. The process used was very complete and took into account the views of a variety of the key stakeholders in the process. The recommendations are appropriate and will be very useful as we continue to move forward to reform this important part of the World Heritage Convention. The Report is overall very positive and highlights that existing procedures are straightforward and clear. We find several of the recommendations of great importance including the need to ensure better dialogue and communication between States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies and following on, the need to clearly communicate the respective roles of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies in the reactive monitoring process to States Parties and also to other stakeholders. We also support the need to involve civil society and other stakeholders in an enhanced and more consistent manner in all World Heritage processes but specifically the reactive monitoring process.

The importance of capacity building to improve the state of conservation of World Heritage properties is also something to be stressed. The focus of properties on the World Heritage List in Danger as a priority area for work of the Convention is also significant. We particularly support the idea of ensuring that all properties on the List in Danger have costed action plans

along with desired states of conservation for removal of the property from the World Heritage List in Danger although we do recognize that that may be difficult for highly complex sites or highly complex danger situations. In this regard, we also need to ensure to do a better job at communicating that the List in Danger is a call for international solidarity, rather than a punishment. We further note that the pressures on the reactive monitoring process continue to grow. As more properties are inscribed on the World Heritage List, it is obvious that more properties will need to come under the state of conservation process. We need to ensure that we can plan for this increased workload over the coming years to ensure that we maintain the credibility of the World Heritage List in the long term. While supporting the recommendations, we feel that there is still work to be done to unpack the recommendations and turn them into the necessary policies and operational procedures in order to be implemented. These recommendations should also be linked to other reform processes currently underway on the nomination process and more generally on the issues of dialogue that we discussed early this morning.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies will need to take the time to consider the range of recommendations and to plan for their implementation in an effective way. As importantly, it must be recognized that the implementation of these recommendations and the reform processes in general will take a considerable amount of resources both in terms of human resources and also financial resources. For this reason we need to work together with the World Heritage Centre and to work together with you the World Heritage Committee to develop a costed plan to ensure that these recommendations can be fully implemented in an efficient and effective manner. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson for giving me the floor on behalf of the Advisory Bodies.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Thank you very much for these comments. Now I would like to apply to the Committee Members, any comments, interventions, proposals. I see Australia, please. And then Norway.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. I would like to thank the Centre and the authors for the preparation of this substantive Report which we welcome and support. We agree with the substance of the Report that the conservation of the world's natural and cultural heritage is vital and as a consequence it is essential that the statutory processes of the Committee underpinning these activities are effective.

The Report makes a number of recommendations that we considered are all sensible and important but we also make the observation that in its comprehensiveness it sets out a massive body of work that needs to be undertaken by the Centre, the Advisory Bodies and States Parties, so it will be a big collective effort over the next few years, I suggest, in order to achieve it.

From Australia's perspective and with a view to assisting the Centre and Advisory Bodies with the work ahead of them we consider that there are several thematic groups of recommendations that logically should be addressed first and to us these are: the really critical task of developing criteria by which we can all confidently identify those state of conservation reports that we would like to see open for discussion here in the Committee each year and mission reports and state of conservation decisions that need to prioritize actions and clearly link to potential funding sources and calibrated to the capacity of States Parties to actually deliver on those actions over time; improving the engagement of site managers and technical experts in reactive monitoring—they need to know what is going on and we need to hear from site managers their perspectives on things; and that comes to the challenges of enhancing States Parties' understanding and coordination of reactive monitoring missions within country.

And then considering how to better manage issues related to timing such as ensuring States Parties have time to respond to recommendations and circumstances where there is a mismatch between the time of receipt of the reactive monitoring report, mission report and then through the good action and response of States Parties to those recommendations, the actual on-ground situation at the time of the Committee meeting. We need this capacity to understand what has been done in response to recommendations from monitoring missions after they have been received. We have submitted, Mr Chairperson, a small amendment to the draft decision to this effect. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving me the floor. The delegation of Norway would like to thank the Secretariat for the comprehensive Report and the Advisory Bodies for their thorough scientific analysis on sites and their threat. This provides a strong evidence-based foundation for the important decisions on the state of conservation we are now about to make. The recent global assessment conducted by IPBES presents a gloomy picture of the health of our ecosystems. IPBES chairperson warns that we are eroding the very foundation of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide. Unfortunately, World Heritage properties are, in many cases, no exception. Natural World Heritage sites are recognized as the planet's most important protected areas providing life-supporting benefits to millions of people. It is critical that these remain protected for future generations. They should set the example for best practice ensuring their integrity and contribution to nature conservation and sustainable development.

The States Parties have themselves nominated their World Heritage properties based on their outstanding universal value. However, we have a collective responsibility to safeguard our common heritage. The extensive illegal wildlife trade and the investment of large infrastructure projects that damage World Heritage properties clearly demonstrate this. As such, adherence to Article 6.3 of the Convention stating that, States Parties shall not take any deliberate measures that might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage situated on the territory of other States Parties to this Convention. This becomes ever more important.

By making the right decisions, the Committee has the power to contribute to reversing the negative impacts that are currently unfolding for people and the ecosystem on which we depend. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We can now proceed to the...I don't have any interventions from the Committee Members so...I'm giving the floor to Switzerland, please.

La Délégation de la Suisse (Observateur):

Merci, Monsieur le Président. C'est la Suisse qui va parler et faire une déclaration au nom d'un certain nombre de pays : la Belgique, le Danemark, la Finlande, la Jamaïque, la Lituanie, le Luxembourg, le Monténégro, les Pays-Bas, la Slovénie, la Suède et la Tchèque.

Monsieur le Président, le changement climatique, l'urbanisation croissante, la perte de biodiversité, les besoins énergétiques ou encore le tourisme de masse sont quelques-uns des défis auxquels la conservation de notre patrimoine est confrontée. La protection de ce patrimoine représente en même temps une opportunité pour répondre à ces défis, une opportunité politique à saisir. Nous pouvons faire de la Convention et de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle des instruments phares pour la réalisation de l'Agenda 2030 et aider à répondre

aux situations de fragilité au lieu de cultiver la perception des contraintes qui aboutissent à des décisions dans lesquelles beaucoup d'États parties ne se reconnaissent pas toujours. À l'heure d'entamer les travaux d'examen des rapports d'état de conservation, nous souhaitons, en amont des discussions, encourager les membres du Comité à répondre à cette responsabilité.

Monsieur le Président, nous restons convaincus que, pour avoir un impact significatif, le Comité a le devoir de considérer ce qu'il peut apporter pour renforcer la crédibilité de la Convention sur la substance, sachant que les questions statutaires sont traitées par d'autres initiatives, comme le groupe de travail ad hoc. Nous saluons les efforts engagés par les États parties en collaboration avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives pour renforcer la protection et la gestion des biens sur leurs territoires à l'appui des décisions du Comité. Nous rappelons que le système d'état de conservation est là pour soutenir et guider l'action et non pour accuser ou punir. Une majorité des dossiers soumis à la considération du Comité, qu'il s'agisse des rapports d'état de conservation ou des dossiers d'inscription, démontrent largement qu'il est non seulement mais aussi adéquat de suivre les processus établis. Nous espérons fortement qu'à la fin de la session de Bakou, le dialogue sur la substance l'aura emporté sur les intérêts particuliers.

Monsieur le Président, nombreux sont ceux ici présents, les États comme d'ailleurs les professionnels, la société civile et les jeunes, qui travaillent d'arrache-pied et soutiennent le renforcement des capacités pour la conservation et la gestion des biens. À long terme, c'est leur motivation qui est menacée par une approche trop souvent inconsistante de nos travaux. Cela doit nous préoccuper toutes et tous et il est primordial d'assurer la confiance et de les assurer de notre confiance. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Now, Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and I apologize for not raising our plate earlier. I was hoping the head of our delegation could deliver a very short statement on this Item. We would like to thank the Secretariat for the this very clear Report which is one of the most important reports we need to look at. It's an important tool to help us with our key role, which is assessing the conservation of sites already on the World Heritage List. As a general remark, we would like to say that we respect the right to pursue economic development but that the impact on the outstanding universal value of World Heritage sites should not and cannot be a matter of compromise. We need to support socioeconomic development to help uplift and alleviate the problems of poverty many regions are facing. But we strongly believe that socioeconomic development and World Heritage status are not mutually exclusive. They can and have been successfully reconciled by many States Parties and this should be the way to go for all of us. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now, Greece, please.

The Observer Delegation of Greece:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving me the floor. First of all I would like to thank the host country for the excellent organization of this Committee session. In the context of the thorough presentation by the Director of the World Heritage Centre and especially concerning Part II of the relevant document, which refers to pressing conservation issues, I would like to take this opportunity to inform on a scientific international conference which was held in Athens on 21-22 June entitled, Climate Change Impacts on Cultural Heritage: Facing the Challenge. The

aim of this conference was to draw the attention of the international community to the severe impacts of climate change on all aspects of World Cultural Heritage and in particular on the integrity of monuments and sites of outstanding universal value. The conference offered an opportunity to explore a framework of viable and concrete action regarding monitoring and protecting and strengthening the resilience of the world's cultural and natural heritage against the destructive effects of climate change. We hope that the conclusions of the conference, which are available on line, will contribute to the overall discussion on this timely and pressing issue also in view of the United Nations Climate Change Summit in New York in September. In this regard, Greece is looking forward to closely working with UNESCO and its consultative bodies building on the work already done so far. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have one nongovernmental organization, the World Heritage Watch. Please, you're welcome.

Observer NGO (World Heritage Watch):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. World Heritage Watch is a global network of more than 150 civil society actors and indigenous peoples from 59 countries. In our annual reports we have covered over 100 World Heritage properties. Based on this experience we would like to share some observations and recommendations on the state of conservation reports of States Parties. We have seen many cases of States Parties' state of conservation reports, which do not provide the comprehensive correct, and/or up-to-date information required to allow the Committee a fully informed assessment of the property. Inconvenient developments are whitewashed and unreported, questionable plans and projects are not disclosed in time, some reports have been copy-pasted from year to year and forms up to five years old have been used. Such conduct undermines the Convention, seriously impedes the work of the Centre and Advisory Bodies and must have tangible consequences. Numerous documents call for the participation of civil society in all processes of the Convention. Much progress has been made to put this goal into practice, most recently through the proposed amendments to the Operational Guidelines. However, full and effective participation depends on transparency and full access to information. All States Parties conservation reports must be made public in full and in a timely manner in order for civil society to make meaningful contributions. There are cases where States Parties seem to ignore requests for information from the World Heritage Centre, do not submit state of conservation reports over several years or refuse their reports to be made public in full. A repeated failure by States Parties to submit truthful, comprehensive, reflective, relevant and up-to-date state of conservation reports should be sufficient to establish an uncertain risk to the property and be sanctioned accordingly. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So as far as I know there are no other comments. I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler for a brief answer to the climate change matter and then we will apply to the Rapporteur to start discussion on the draft decision.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. There were no really specific questions on the parts of the document but on climate change, and I would like to thank Greece for its comment.

Chairperson:

Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Sorry, Mr Chairperson, just a point of order to help us understand how this agenda item is going to proceed. We are looking today to make a decision in relation to the statutory elements but Australia would certainly want to make an intervention in relation to climate change so I am working on the assumption that there will be an opportunity later in the Committee meeting to do so. If there's not then Australia would want to make that intervention at this time but we are happy to wait for the next opportunity.

Chairperson:

Are you ready to make this intervention? No?

The Delegation of Australia:

Yes, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Welcome.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia wishes to express its disappointment with the slow progress made on the review of the policy on climate change. We have lost the sense of urgency that was established in Krakow and reinforced in Manama last year. We must recover that momentum and sense of urgency, and recover them quickly. We need a contemporary, evidence-based policy that sets the foundation for tractable climate action in a World Heritage system. So perhaps the best thing that Australia can do here in Baku as a State Party with an extensive natural World Heritage estate already being impacted by climate change is to set out what we expect to see in the revised climate change policy.

First, we want the policy to clearly articulate the existential threat climate change poses to many World Heritage properties. For an increasing number of properties, there is no greater threat.

Second, the policy must recognize the Paris Agreement as the primary intergovernmental framework for climate change mitigation and adaptation by States Parties. This is where the climate change heavy lifting needs to be done. This does not mean the policy should be silent on mitigation. We need our World Heritage properties to be showcases of exemplary conservation management and they can be showcases of local and central mitigation efforts too. Carbon-neutral tourism is an obvious example.

Third, the policy should focus on the comparative advantage of the World Heritage system in management and that means adaptation and a renewed emphasis on managing for resilience. The 2007 Policy makes the point that States' specific nature climate change impacts make these properties ideal as laboratories for testing innovative adaptation solutions. There is a growing body of evidence about the criticality of managing for resilience in natural systems. In short, it means eliminating as many pressures as possible in order to strengthen the capacity of World Heritage properties to adapt to climate change.

Fourth, we would want to see a clear articulation of how a revised policy will engage the Operational Guidelines and be embedded in the key processes of the Convention. On this point we would not expect to see propositions that climate change threats would form the basis for in Danger Listing individual properties because this is a global problem not amenable to site-level intervention. But we do need to find a way to recognize the reality that whole categories of World Heritage properties globally are threatened by climate change--coral reefs, glaciers and mountain-forest ecosystems to name three examples.

Fifth, we need to understand the vulnerability of World Heritage properties to climate change so our site managers are empowered to adaptively manage those vulnerabilities which differ from property to property and have critical socioeconomic dimensions.

Sixth, the Vilnius workshop made recommendations on the structure of a revised policy that was sound and logical including periodic review and critically an implementation plan. There is no point in having a policy if it's not backed by action.

Seventh, and last, the 2007 Policy has a brief legal annex that quite inadequately addresses questions about what happens if the outstanding universal value of a property is affected permanently by climate change. This is one of the most significant questions facing the Convention over the coming decade and we need the revised policy to seriously address it. I have no doubt we will find ourselves in circumstances where the baseline of how we define OUV shifts and we must be ready to deal with it. This is our new reality. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Well noted. Now we have again, one apply for two-minute intervention, New Zealand.

The Observer Delegation of New Zealand:

[Māori spoken].

[English spoken] Greetings from New Zealand and in Māori our indigenous language, to translate, behold the breath of life to the leaders, to the orators, to the many that have gathered, greetings, greetings, greetings to you all.

Mr Chairperson, congratulations to the Republic of Azerbaijan for you hosting of this important meeting and thank you for this opportunity to speak at the outset of this meeting to express New Zealand's views as an Observer State Party on the importance of the deliberations of this meeting. In New Zealand we see our World Heritage properties as our share of the most remarkable places on earth. They are our contribution to our global shared heritage. We join with our colleagues represented by Switzerland in acknowledging the role shared heritage has as a flagship opportunity to lead the way in responding to the many universal challenges and pressures that the conservation of our heritage is facing. This includes climate change, sustainable management and tourism pressures. To attain this flagship status World Heritage is dependent on many deliberations and decisions that look to strengthen the credibility of the World Heritage List. In our view the credibility of the List rests on decisions of the Committee that commit to the principles, methods and processes that have been agreed to by parties to the Convention over time and are set out in the Operational Guidelines. We look forward to the deliberations at this meeting acknowledging particularly the role of Committee Members and decisions that will mark the future for World Heritage for all parties. We also take the opportunity to acknowledge the efforts of all parties, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in preparing the nomination documentation and advice on protection and management that the Committee will consider at this very important meeting. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Ms Rössler.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Just to briefly reply on all the debate on climate change. Of course we need to keep in mind the different processes. We have the UNESCO Climate Change Policy. We will prepare for the next session the policy document on the impacts of

climate change on World Heritage properties as per your decision. And I found it very useful that Australia shared with us the points you just made so that the consultants that are already hired—one of them is in the room—can take this on board and I find this very constructive and very useful and to answer the question from Greece, we also need to ensure that the different processes do not go into different directions because you mentioned also the United Nations Summit in September 2019. So that is all I would like to say. I'm very happy that this debate is taking place and we will certainly bring it forward. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ms Rössler. Now I would like to ask the Rapporteur about the draft decision.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have received one amendment from the delegation of Australia for 43 COM 7.1. It's a proposal for a new paragraph, which would be inserted, at paragraph 7. So a new paragraph 7. It reads, Agrees that the World Heritage Centre should prioritize implementation of the high priority recommendations, with an initial focus on those relevant to communication, capacity building, including for site managers, and finance. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Committee Members, any comments on this item? Any objections? I don't see any. Can we accept it like that? You know we are going to approve today certain parts of the decision until two Items will be left after the discussion approval. So it will come to the draft decision 43 COM 7.1. The full text is in front of you with an amendment from Australia which I found doesn't have any objections. So can we approve it as a whole until number 13? Thank you very much. Approved.

So I would like to remind you that the other two positions of this draft resolution are open to changes, discussions, amendments during this period of time until we finalize discussion of all the sites. Thank you very much. We are moving now to the next Item. I would like to inform all the participants that in the morning we had a Bureau meeting and I have to deliver the recommendation of this morning to the Plenary. They are connected to some specific items and I hope that you will support with full understanding our advice. We would like proceed, first in advance with the examination of draft decisions concerned with 7A.22 concerning the state of conservation of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls and 7A.29 to be proposed under the state of conservation of Hebron/AI-Khalil Old Town immediately now and I will therefore proceed with this draft decision.

As you know, draft decision 7A.22 has been proposed under the state of conservation of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls. This draft decision can be found in 7A.Add.3. This draft decision was the subject of very intensive negotiations and has been agreed upon by all the parties concerned. I would like to propose therefore this matter to be adopted without debate. Furthermore, I would like also to inform that consensus implies no statements or declarations be made after the adoption of this draft decision. I count on your understanding and support on this matter.

Chairperson:

I see no objections. I declare draft decision 43 COM 7A.22 adopted. Thank you.

Draft Decision 43 COM 7A.29 has been proposed under the state of conservation of Hebron/AI-Khalil Old Town. This draft decision can be found in document 7A.Add.3.Corr. This draft decision was the subject of other intensive negotiations and has been agreed upon by all the

parties concerned. So again, I request Committee Members to approve this item without debate and I request all of us to avoid any statements or declarations to be made after the adoption of this draft decision.

Chairperson:

I see no objections and I'm thankful for your understanding. So draft decision 43 COM 7A.29 is adopted. Thank you very much. We are moving correctly on our schedule so we have time to start consideration of the items of the matters proposed for discussion. According to paragraph 119 of the Operational Guidelines the Committee shall review annually the state of conservation of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. We have now reached this crucial part of our agenda, which is at the heart of the Convention. Before we start with the examination of individual state of conservation reports, I would like to give the floor to Ms Mechthild Rössler, Director of the World Heritage Centre to introduce this item. Welcome.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre :

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. As we discussed this morning in the Bureau for these sites which are open for discussion, there was one addition which I announced a proposal from Indonesia for a site in Viet Nam so we issued a new INF.7.Rev.3 and Mr Chairperson, the order of discussion is first the natural sites for 7A and then we go into the cultural sites for 7A so we go according to your book but we start with natural heritage sites and the team is already there to look into that. Thank you.

Chairperson:

I now invite Mr Debonnet, Chief of the Nature, Sustainable Tourism and Outreach Unit (NTO) of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the properties of the Asia-Pacific Region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Please, you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. So we have two properties from the Asia-Pacific Region that are proposed for adoption without discussion. One is the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra in Indonesia and the second one is East Rennell in the Solomon Islands. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So there are two sites, Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra in Indonesia and East Rennell in the Solomon Islands. Thank you--if there are any objections to these items? We propose to approve it without any discussion.

Chairperson:

So we approve these items. Thank you very much. Now the floor goes to Mr Debonnet for the next information.

The Secretariat:

Thank you. So the next region is the Europe and North America region and we have one property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, which is also proposed for adoption without discussion and this is the Everglades National Park in the United States of America. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Committee Members, any objections? NGOs? Do you want to speak? Please, welcome.

Observer NGO:

I am from Sumatra. We work to protect the Leuser Ecosystem, the last place on earth where orangutan, tiger, elephant and rhino coexist in the wild. The Leuser ecosystem is a critical part of the tropical rainforest heritage of Sumatra. I would like to applaud the Indonesian government for its work with civil society to increase patrols in this area. However, we need to redouble our efforts to further to reduce poaching, illegal logging and encroachment. But even worse, large hydro-dams are proposed within the Leuser Ecosystem National Strategic Area. Each of these dams would destroy the habitat of critical endangered orangutan and elephants. The Tampur Leuser Dam in particular would have a devastating impact. It would stand nearly 200m high in an earthquake zone. If built it would cut the migration route for elephants disrupting their movements too and from the property; this fragmentation of elephant habitat cause severe impact on the outstanding universal value of the property. I thank the Committee for the requesting rigorous environmental impact assessment that examines the impact of these dams. This necessitates a moratorium on all dam works while this assessment occurs. There are fewer than 200 elephants left in this area and we cannot allow this dam to push the Sumatran elephant closer to extinction. I also point out the impact of the proposed Batang Toro dam on the world's only population of Tapanuli orangutan first described as a new species in 2017. It is the world's most endangered member of the family of great apes. This unique habitat should be added to the World Heritage property not fragmented by dam works. In the medium-term we need to work together to extend this World Heritage property to incorporate the entire Leuser Ecosystem the richest habitat for critically endangered orangutans, rhinos, tigers and elephants. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for these comments. I would like to apply to all those who are interested in the comments with the files. Please give us your information about your intervention before we pass to another question to avoid misunderstandings. So thank you very much. We now return to the Europe and North America Region with only one site the Everglades National Park in the United States of America. Any objections to approve this decision from Committee Members? I don't see any. Thank you very much. Approved. Any comments from NGOs or others? I don't see any. Thank you very much. Mr Debonnet, please. Now we move to Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We also have one property in the Latin America and the Caribbean Region on the Danger List which is proposed for adoption without discussion and this is Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve in Honduras. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have one site the Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve in Honduras. If there are any objections to the Committee Members to approve the decision draft which is supplied to you, delivered to you. I don't see any. Thank you very much. We approved.

We would like to start the examination of the natural properties located in the Africa Region. I would like to now give the floor to the Delegation of Burkina Faso to present to the Committee the reason why it requested to open the state of conservation report on the Lake Turkana National Parks in Kenya. Please. *[time elapses]* Maybe we are going ahead of schedule, some delegations are not ready.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Oui, nous demandons de passer la parole à un autre État partie, le temps que Son Excellence revienne. Merci.

Chairperson:

Okay. We have next Tanzania. Is the delegation of Tanzania ready to present the Committee the reason why it requested to open the state of conservation report on the Selous Game Reserve in the United Republic of Tanzania? Are you ready to provide the documents? Ms Rössler, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Just to recall what the procedure is. Members of the Committee requested to open a state of conservation reports, which originally were not opened, proposed to be open for discussion by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. So what the Chairperson is asking is that the delegation who wished to open the item explains the reason why the item should be opened and then you all have a discussion about it and the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies give explanations, answer any questions if required. So that's the process we are looking at at the moment. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Tanzania, are you ready to give us an explanation or should we approve it like that? You are welcome.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. We examined the draft decision and the situation on the ground with Selous Game Reserve project and we thought there were issues in the draft decision that could not go hand-in-hand with what is happening on the ground. Chairperson, we submitted also our observation in writing and this situation of not reconciling with the observations, some of those observations of the Advisory Bodies necessitated that to submit a request to re-examine the whole draft decision. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to ask Mr Debonnet and IUCN any answer for this proposal from Tanzania.

The Secretariat:

Chairperson, at this stage Tanzania has not asked us any specific questions so they just mentioned that they have amendments to the draft decision so I don't know if we would then have to go through these amendments but we have not been asked any specific question to react to.

Chairperson:

They proposed to open the discussion due to this fact that is why we are putting it to discussion. If there is no reason for that let's proceed as we are supposed to do it in advance. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. En fait l'Angola aimerait intervenir sur le cas de Selous pour apporter certains éléments qui devaient être considérés par le membre du Comité. Donc j'aimerais ici présenter quelques éléments pour votre considération.

Chairperson, while we admit that the analysis made by the Advisory Body on this site presents a fair view, we would also like to note that the issue of heritage conservation versus development has reached a new high within the history of the Committee. As debated in detail

yesterday through Item 5D Tanzania and other African countries are increasingly at odds as they strive to balance between the concept of heritage and conservation. We are aware that plans for Stiegler's Gorge hydro project by Tanzania are well underway. And our position is to encourage and continuous constructive dialogue between the State Party of Tanzania and the Advisory Bodies that will ensure the preservation of the OUV of this important property. To this end, Chairperson, we propose that the State Party of Tanzania be given once more a chance to clarify its position in view of implementation of this project and we have also submitted an amendment on the draft decision. Thank you very much, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. According to our understanding, the construction of the Stiegler's Gorge was started last year without taking into account the previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee, which were made at its 36th and 40th sessions. This February an Egyptian company has been contracted to design and construct the dam and power plant in October 2018. Construction of the facility involves the building of a main dam of about 134m high creating and expected reservoir with the length of 100km covering an area of about 1350km² meaning that the average width of the reservoir would be more than 13km. these figures indicate that this project will have a serious negative impact on the OUV of the site even if you forget about the expected influences on the upstream and downstream sections of the river water regime as well as on the whole catchment area. As a consequence, Hungary supports the draft decision without any serious or relevant amendments. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. Keeping in mind what has been stated for China's position for 5E, China would second the position of the distinguished delegate from Angola and would like to support the reasonable request from Tanzania. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. Norway understands that Tanzania wishes to achieve its energy objectives, but Norway also strongly supports the Committee's position that the construction of dams with large reservoirs within the boundaries of World Heritage properties is incompatible with World Heritage status. This position should apply to any World Heritage property regardless of the size of the property. The knowledge that we now possess about the environmental risks and impacts of hydropower development as well as the importance of biodiversity and ecosystems services for sustainable development makes an even stronger case that this should be the standard in the most important protected areas in World Heritage properties. Our role and mission as Committee Members is to ensure that OUV is conserved and protected.

Last year the Committee requested Tanzania to consider alternative options to meet its energy needs, urged the State Party not to proceed with the project prior to an SEA review by IUCN and requested an invitation for a reactive monitoring mission. Norway commends the positive

results in reducing poaching in the property; however, the situation described in this year's document is of utmost concern. The Stiegler's Gorge hydropower project is proceeding. According to IUCN at least 25km² of forest has already been cleared. The logging started prior to the completion of an SEA and without a reactive monitoring mission. Moreover, the EIA is considered below acceptable standards and as such does not provide credible assessment of the potential impact of the property's OUV. Norway finds the draft decision accurate with regard to the current situation. The situation is critical and evolving and reinforced monitoring mechanism should be applied.

Norway hopes that the draft decision demonstrates that the international community cares about Selous and that there is a will to assist Tanzania in finding solutions that will not have detrimental impact on vulnerable Africa's most important protected areas, an area with outstanding universal value for all of us. Norway supports the draft decision. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La réserve de gibier de Selous de l'État partie de la République-Unie de Tanzanie, inscrite sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 1982, suivant les critères 9 et 10 de la Convention a subi d'importantes menaces, dont le braconnage exacerbé qui a conduit à son inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en 2014. Le suivi de la dynamique des populations animales de ces deux dernières années a montré une diminution du braconnage, soit environ quatre carcasses d'éléphant. Cependant, le rapport du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'UICN recommande d'appliquer le mécanisme de suivi renforcé au bien compte tenu de certaines des incohérences constatées et susceptibles d'affecter la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

Monsieur le Président, malgré ces menaces avérées, la réserve de gibier de Selous demeure une des plus grandes zones protégées de l'une des plus vastes zones sauvages présentes en Afrique. La présence d'importantes populations d'éléphants de savane d'Afrique, de rhinocéros noirs, de lycaons, d'hippopotames, de buffles et de nombreux ongulés tels que l'hippopotame noir, le bubale, le grand koudou, l'élan, le gnou, ainsi que les crocodiles du Nil et plusieurs espèces d'oiseaux, notamment ceux endémiques de Tanzanie témoignent de l'importance du bien pour l'Afrique et pour le monde entier. En outre, la réserve de biosphère de Selous est liée fonctionnellement à la réserve de gibier de Niassa au Mozambique, et cela constitue un facteur important pour le maintien de l'intégrité de l'écosystème des deux réserves.

Monsieur le Président, partant de ce constat, notre délégation souscrit à l'amendement apporté sur le projet de décision par l'État partie de l'Angola et encourage le Comité du patrimoine mondial et l'IUCN à poursuivre la communication avec l'État partie de la République-Unie de Tanzanie pour une préservation de ce bien d'importance capitale pour la communauté scientifique et surtout pour l'humanité. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Before going to give the floor to another speaker I would like to have a consultation with the Committee Members. We are going into serious discussion, which requires certain time. Now according to the schedule of the conference we have in three minutes to have a rest for the interpreters and all of us so I propose to break now and maybe if you will permit me, if you will permit, we will go further with this discussion immediately after lunch. But we have three minutes, if you don't mind. There are some lists of the Heritage in

Danger located in Africa region for adoption without discussion. Mr Debonnet please, can you give us the information?

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. So indeed, there are a number of sites that are proposed for adoption without discussion. These are the Manovo Gounda St Floris National Park in the Central African Republic, Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve a transboundary site between Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea, the Garamba National Park in Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Kahuzi-Biega National Park in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Okapi Wildlife Reserve also in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Salonga National Park in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Virunga National Park in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Further, we have the Rainforests of the Atsinanana in Madagascar, the Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves in Niger and the Niokolo-Koba National Park in Senegal. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as I understand, these items have been consulted to be left in the Danger List without any consultation and debates during the Committee. If you don't have any objections we can approve this Item and then immediately after lunch we will return the discussion of the previous matter concerning Tanzania. I don't see any objections. Thank you very much. We approve this item. Have a good time during lunch. In two hours we resume our discussions. Thank you.

The meeting rose at 12.58 a.m.

SECOND DAY – Tuesday 2 July 2019

FOURTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 5.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev
later: H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil)
later: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, please proceed to your seats. We are starting the afternoon session. We are still missing some Committee Members. Fine, I see everyone. No, Zimbabwe is not there. We have Spain now. And Uganda. Good afternoon once more. We are returning to the discussion of the matter concerned with the Selous Game Reserve in the United Republic of Tanzania. We have already had some speaker interventions. So now the floor is going to Spain. Please, you are welcome.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Yesterday when we ended we decided that we firmly supported the initiatives in development in Africa and we were looking in particular at this balance between development and ecology and yet when we look at what is happening in this site for Tanzania we see that on the one hand we are perfectly in agreement with what we heard this morning about doing everything fast and not taking up too much time. But I do think that we need to look at local community and development and yet we can't go and get carried away. I think what we have to do is to strike a balance between the resources that are need for local community development on the one hand and the maintenance and safeguarding of heritage on the other hand. Then that is why we would like to propose some amendments that we think will go towards striking that balance but we can't talk about the right of development being used as some kind of excuse saying that major companies and in particular with these hydro-electric power companies and the projects that they are doing are actually going to get off the hook. So I think we have got to be a little bit flexible when it comes to some of these development projects. What we talked about earlier with oil exploration goes in this regard. So we've got to make sure that we are ensuring that we can use environmentally friendly technologies for generating electricity and we've got to be careful about the kinds of parameters that we are setting for striking that balance between development and major projects of this nature. That is why we have some proposed amendments and we would like it to make consensus because we are mindful of that balance. Remember when we asked for all kinds of environmental impact assessments under the monitoring mechanisms of this Convention, there is a reason for that so that's why we have to avoid getting into situations where we get a post facto declarations of projects that have been implemented with irreversible effects on heritage and that is why we'd like to go along with Norway's ideas and we'll be coming to the amendment soon. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. I think at this stage we are not ready as yet. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Then Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like to express that the Brazilian delegation supports the amendments proposed by the distinguished delegation of Angola and concerning the recent intervention by the delegation of Spain I understand that his concerns are contained in the amendment proposed in Article 10. Thank you so much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson for giving us the floor. Guatemala would like to express its support for what Norway, Hungary and Spain have said in the original text be maintained although some alternative wording is needed for paragraph 10 because we don't think it's relevant to make specific mention of other States. Given that very text of the Convention itself calls upon all States Parties and private sector investors to not lend support to any projects that could have deleterious effects on heritage sites. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson for giving us the floor. The Cuban delegation would like to thank the Angolan amendments and reiterate everything that Spain has said. We also wanted to place emphasis on everything that Guatemala has said concerning the specific mention of other States Parties. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Uganda, are you ready now?

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. We will be very brief to say that we support the amendment. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia thanks Angola for their proposed amendments. Australia's concerns are contained in some further amendments to amendments proposed by Angola. Our proposed changes are supported by Hungary and Norway.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chair. This is very simple. We wish to echo the sentiment expressed by Cuba and also Guatemala without the specific mentioning of States Parties not quite involved.

Chairperson:

Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would also like to put our voice with the delegation of China, not to have the specific States Parties mentioned in the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan avails itself of the opportunity to thank Azerbaijan for hosting us and as for the amendment suggested by Angola we would like to ask the question why Angola doesn't like to have the last sentence in paragraph 5 stating that alternative options for power generation should be considered and we also agree with other countries that specific States Parties shouldn't be mentioned in the final decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Zimbabwe would like to support the amendments proposed by Angola. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie souhaite venir en appui au projet d'amendement présenté par l'Angola. Tout de même, sur la question de l'utilisation de la désignation directe de l'État, je crois, en tenant bien compte d'ailleurs de notre discussion de ce matin, nous avons convenu d'aller dans cette direction, qu'il vaut mieux éviter de citer les États parties de cette manière. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you. No other Committee Members? Thank you. Now IUCN, please. Your comments.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. IUCN is ready of course to answer any specific questions you might have but we would also like to provide a little summary of our considerations. First of all IUCN wishes to highlight that it of course fully appreciates the legitimate energy needs of the State Party and wishes to recall the role it has which is to provide the Committee with technical advice against the backdrop of the Operational Guidelines, past Committee decisions, etc. rather than offering opinions on governmental decision-making. It is very useful to understand the development of the discussion on hydropower in this context. After initial enthusiasm from the 1930s to maybe the late 70s to earlier 80s the discussion has become increasingly nuanced. It is not disputed anymore even by proponents of hydropower that dams fundamentally alter rivers and associated ecosystems and socioeconomic systems. This is acknowledged by industry associations such as the International Hydropower Association but also by important multi-stakeholder processes involving the governments and namely the World Commission on Dams, which has published its report, Dams and Development.

The question is therefore is not whether there are impacts. There are always benefits and costs and the larger the project the larger stakes at hand. The question is about the tradeoffs. Are

the tradeoffs attractive and acceptable for governments and societies in a given case? This in turn critically depends on adequate information in accordance with the scale and complexity of the proposed project under consideration. IUCN notes that there appears to be no adequate basis for informed decision-making at a time when preparatory works on the way. IUCN considers this problematic for any project of this scale and complexity and particularly problematic when this is taking place on a World Heritage property, which is already on the World Heritage in Danger List and where the Committee is on record for considering the project under consideration to be incompatible with World Heritage status.

Selous is not just another property. Selous Game Reserve stands out by its scale and its intactness globally even by the very selective standards of the World Heritage Convention. The absence of adequate assessment confirmed in an independent assessment commissioned by the IUCN, which is publically available on the IUCN website is a reason for concern. It could result in significant impacts on the OUV of this extraordinarily important site but proceeding with the project would also convey a highly problematic message in terms of the World Heritage Convention more broadly. IUCN is fully confident that it provided sound advice in line with its mandate and stands ready to further provide advice both to the State Party and to the Committee. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Angola, please.

The Delegation of Angola:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As we say that we need to allow the State Party, Tanzania, to give some insights on the implementation of this project on the ground. But we are insisting that a continuous consultative dialogue between the State Party and the Advisory Bodies is essential so that we can improve this situation on the ground. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would just like to repeat the question asked by the distinguished delegate of Kyrgyzstan about why the State Party of Tanzania does not consider alternative ways of energy production. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Of course we understand this a very difficult topic but at the same time we should accept that the right to infrastructure development is a right for all States Parties but all States Parties should use this opportunity for sustainable use of biodiversity ecosystems and so on. When it comes to the efforts of the State Party about the preparation of documents, management plan and hydropower plan, at the same time we should understand that the State Party should continue these efforts. In conclusion, Mr Chairperson, we would like to support the amendments proposed by Angola and Spain. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I think that we have to summarize the draft and I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have indeed received amendments from Angola supported by other States Parties and also from Spain. So I'll just wait for it to come on to the screen—thank you. So the first amendment is a suggested amendment to paragraph 3, which is a relatively minor one. I can read the whole thing now if you'd like or I can flag the whole series. I might flag the whole series and we can do it paragraph-by-paragraph. Also paragraph 4, fixing a typographical error and also changing the word credible to fair. In paragraph 5, I will read this one: Expresses its utmost concern about reports confirmed by satellite image analysis that the site clearance of 91,400 hectares of vegetation within the future dam area has started and strongly urges the State Party not to undertake activities that will affect the property's OUV and will be difficult to reverse. The next proposed amendments paragraph 8 and that is to delete the end of that paragraph which says with a view to reviewing whether the conditions for deleting the property from the World Heritage List are met. Paragraph 10 and I think is a final proposed amendment and this is the one that Spain has also proposed to amend. So that would read, Referring to the Preamble of the World Heritage Convention, which considers that "deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world", and to Article 6.3 of the Convention, urges all States Parties that support development projects related to World Heritage sites to observe best environmental practices or as Spain proposes, to include the environmental impact assessment. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

So this is the proposal or the amendments. May I have Angola again?

The Delegation of Angola:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As I said there were some questions raised by Committee Members here so that we can give the floor to Tanzania to clarify some issues before coming back to the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia has forwarded some amendments to the Rapporteur. Under the circumstances, I think we will deal with them paragraph-by-paragraph all the way through?

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tanzania. Are you ready to answer the questions? Should I give the floor to you?

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. There was one question raised asking why we are not considering alternatives in the power generation that we are undertaking. We would like to report that hydropower is part of a broad strategy for power generation that includes a range of other sources such as wind, geothermal and solar. Therefore, the Tanzania power generation strategy takes into account consideration of its national plans that is a broad base. Chairperson, it's not dominated by one type of power generation. It's a repertoire of many other sources and therefore hydropower is within the national plans that should also be considered. And it takes into consideration, Mr Chairperson, the socioeconomic and ecological conditions of the country. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So the proposal is to start considering the decision item by item. Is it like that? Article by article. So please, Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

We have no amendments for paragraph 1.

Chairperson:

Approved. Second, recalling decisions. There are no questions. Number 3, while noting the report...Objections to this reduction, to this wording? I don't see any. So 2012, not to undertake any development—like that. Thank you. Number 4, take notes of...instead of credible the word fair. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Instead of the word fair we would like to propose best practice, please.

Chairperson:

Any objections to this wording? So we can accept it, not to provide it does not provide best practice assessment of the potential impact. IUCN.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Perhaps a clarification is useful why—what the background of this term credible is. I made reference to the independent review, which IUCN commissioned which as I noted is publically available. The conclusions, and that is also stated in the executive summary of the report, specifically note that there is an absence of a credible basis for informed decision-making and that why it was considered adequate to use this language. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you for this clarification. We can approve the latest version with the best practices? If there are no objections we can move forward. Thank you. Number 5, please. That the site clearance and instead of forest vegetation within the future dam area. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

We'd like to propose that 5 read, so we accept the change site clearance but where it says vegetation we'd like it to say vegetation including forests and then we have suggestions to the last part of the sentence. Do you want to consider our suggestion about including forests first or would you like us to go...

Chairperson:

Make all the text you propose.

The Delegation of Australia:

Okay. So our text reads, vegetation included forests within the future dam area has started and strongly urges the State Party to immediately halt all activities that will affect the property's OUV and will be difficult to reverse.

Chairperson:

Thank you for the proposal.

Chairperson:

IUCN, please.

IUCN:

Thank you Mr Chairperson. On the question of definition, globally the most common forest definition is offered by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) at the United Nations level and Tanzania has adopted that definition at the national level in December 2016 under the Clean Development Mechanism. Under this definition the area under consideration clearly qualifies as forest from a technical perspective notwithstanding that there might be areas, which may not qualify as forest, but overall we are talking certainly about a forest vegetation so there is no technical question about this. Thank you.

I would ask if permitted by the Chairperson that the World Heritage Centre may wish to add to these comments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. We will take into consideration your clarification. Any other comments? Angola, Tanzania, your proposal? So we can accept the sentence like the last version proposed by Australia to immediately halt all activities or not? I don't see any conflict in these words, which will cause some misunderstanding. Can we approve it? No. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. We can live with it.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So item number 5, no need for further discussion I consider. Thank you very much. Number 6 is without any change, number 7 without any change. Number 8 the proposal of Angola, to take the wording, with a view to reviewing whether the conditions for deleting. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

We have some suggested change to number 6, please. Considers that the deforestation and other cumulative damage to such a large area.

Chairperson:

Should I return to number 6?

The Delegation of Australia:

Yes, please.

Chairperson:

Honorable Members of the Committee, you don't mind the new amendment?

The Delegation of Australia:

So the new amendment is consider the deforestation and other...

Chairperson:

...and other cumulative damage. I don't see any objections. Okay, so we will not return again to the previous items please, as soon as we approve it. Thank you. Number 6 and number 7.

So we are coming again to number 8, with a view of reviewing whether the conditions for deleting, so I think that we can accept the wording proposed by Angola to delete this part of the sentence. By all means we understand the danger; by all means we know the measures, which we are going to implement. But this is very strict definition, which I think can be deleted. Don't you mind it? Thank you very much. 8 approved.

9, decides therefore to apply the Reinforce the Monitoring Mechanism to the property. 10, Angola's proposal. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

In addition we'd like it to say, urges all States Parties that support development projects related to World Heritage sites to observe best environmental practices including best practice environmental impact assessment.

Chairperson:

So, it sounds like this now: Urges all States Parties that support development projects related to World Heritage sites to observe best environmental practices including best practice environmental impact assessment. To include the environmental practices...no. We take it out.

The Delegation of Australia:

And then the second can come out.

Chairperson:

I see. Opinions, please. No objections? Any other proposals? Wording? Clarifications? Not needed. Spain, sorry.

The Delegation of Spain:

We just wanted to know why our amendment is actually being removed when we think that it's actually clearer. We are asking for an environmental impact assessment to be included. That's quite clear so we are asking why there is actually opposition to that?

Chairperson:

The opinion is the following that there is no conflict between the two phrases. This is included in the Australian phrase; it has the same meaning. It's simply that the wording is slight changed in the sentence. Instead of to include we are putting including the same best practice. Can we accept it like this? The meaning is the same. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Well, we don't actually want to take up more time—we just thought that our suggestion was perhaps a bit more decisive. We are saying exactly what we want, an environmental impact assessment, which is perfectly well defined. Why add best practice? The question is really whether or not there is even one at all and if so, then of course it's going to be done according to best practices so that's why we thought it was slightly confusing to include that. If we say an environmental impact assessment everyone knows what that is and what requirements that has. Either it is one or it's not one because it cannot be an environmental impact assessment if it's not done according to best practices. So we thought that perhaps that might be a way of modifying the meaning of what kind of environmental impact assessment we want to include and we don't want to ask people to actually engage in some sort of an attempt to define on their own what those terms might mean.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. Hungary has the opinion that the two versions are almost the same. The only difference is in the wording. The only thing is that we should mention by the Australian delegation best practices. But it doesn't matter, it's about the same so I would propose including best practice and environmental impact assessment should taken but after Australia mention also Spain because the proposal is almost the same both sides and there is no need for further discussion. Thanks.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So the new proposal in support of Spain's vision and wording if Australia doesn't mind to remove the words best practice.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia doesn't mind.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for understanding and your support. Thank you. So number 10 is now World Heritage site to observe best environmental practices, to include project related to the World Heritage sites, to observe best environmental practices, to include the environmental...and to include the environmental impact assessment. So we can accept it like that? Thank you. Thank you very much. Approved.

Number 11. No changes. Number 11. Thank you. Number 12. No comments, no changes. Number 13. thank you very much. 14. The same. Thank you. And 15. Also decides to retain Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) on the List of World Heritage in Danger. So thank you very much. Approved.

Now we are returning to the matter raised by Burkina Faso concerning the Lake Turkana National Parks in Kenya. Please, Burkina Faso, give us your vision, why should we put it to discussion?

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais, avant mon propos, m'excuser pour notre absence momentanée ce matin. Concernant le dossier du lac Turkana, la demande d'ouverture des débats par l'État concerné se justifie par les difficultés que cet État rencontre à mettre en œuvre les dispositions de la décision en l'Etat. En l'occurrence, l'article 5 du projet de décision invite l'État à demander une mission d'observation qui couvre à la fois son territoire et celui d'un État tiers, ce pourquoi l'État concerné rencontre des difficultés. Il y a par ailleurs la nécessité pour le Centre du patrimoine mondial de se mettre à jour sur les engagements pris par l'État concerné en relation avec un État frontalier concernant l'étude d'impact environnemental en cours. Voilà, Monsieur le Président, l'essentiel des raisons qui ont conduit à la demande ainsi formulée. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as I know, there were no special amendments done to the draft decision until now. So how should we proceed? Should we leave this question to the later discussion and the draft decision will be provided with amendments or should we leave the document as it is?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We've received at this stage no amendments to this decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Mr Chair, I was going to agree with you on your first proposal, sir, that we defer until later, the discussion on this matter, sir.

Chairperson:

Thank you. How long should we wait for the amendments? Because we have to follow the agenda as planned? Please, Uganda.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Twenty-four hours should be sufficient.

Chairperson:

Colleagues, Members of the Committee, you don't mind that we will leave this question for...because we didn't have any clarification. Whatever has been done is not reflected in the amendments so we need—originally we have to accept what we have but paying tribute to the opinion of one of our colleagues, I'm just asking you. China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. We are prepared to make very small amendments to the text. But if your decision is to postpone it to a little later we have no problem but if there is a need to go through the text then at that stage we would like to propose little amendments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So we have an alternative proposal. Maybe we will go through the list and if there are some positions, which will not be clarified, we will approve them point-by-point and then at the difficult points leave it for later just to pass it through. You don't mind? Please, Rapporteur put it on the screen.

Number 1, I hope doesn't have any questions. Number 2, the same. Number 3. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Chairperson, on number 3, instead of regretting we think this should be notes, notes that the State Party provided not only limited but there is an update to that actually, the State Party provided so it shouldn't be limited unless it is justified especially in providing what information the State Party should provide them that is going to become limited. Chairperson, we feel also that at the end of the decision all that needs to be deleted and the next whether it is to strengthen the protection. That also needs to be deleted because it's actually related to the eviction of communities and these communities are outside the buffer zone so you are not going to evict communities who are on their legitimate lands. I think that needs to be deleted. Chair, I submit.

Chairperson:

I am really very sorry but you are talking a little bit connected to the other file. This is not the matter. May Ms Rössler give us clarification?

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

I just wonder, dear delegate from Uganda, are you talking about Lake Turkana? I wonder if you are talking about another decision? At the moment we are at Lake Turkana National Park in Kenya. Are you talking about the Rift Valley?

The Delegation of Uganda:

Yes, Chairperson. Sorry.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

You see, that's my feeling that we may not be talking about the same sites. At the moment the Chairperson looks at the decision of Lake Turkana National Park in Kenya and the understanding was that China has slight amendments to this. Thank you.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Apologies, Chair.

Chairperson:

It's okay, it happens sometimes. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. On this site of Lake Turkana, Tanzania notes that Kenya finalized the Lake Turkana National Park management plan that runs 2018-2028. The plan addressed the recommendations of the 2012 and 2015 Reactive Missions. These include carrying out a biodiversity survey, establishing key species status, developing a baseline to monitor their recovery, consultations with the local pastoral communities in drawing up comprehensive grazing plans that effectively deal with illegal grazing and access to property as well as developing corrective measures to address the problem of poaching. All of these have been considered. Tanzania notes that the proposed strategic environmental assessment study has been agreed upon bilaterally and that the scoping study on the same will be in the initial step. Chairperson, Tanzania proposes that the Reactive Monitoring Mission to inform the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger be undertaken post this scoping study. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask China in which paragraph you propose to make amendments?

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. We would like to come to paragraph 8 if we may. The current wording—we would like to suggest—I mean it doesn't really change the content of the whole thing but the new proposed amendment would be, Urges the State Party of Ethiopia to complete an Environmental Impact Assessment in relation to the Kuraz Sugar development project including a comprehensive assessment of potential downstream impacts on the OUV of the property and then here the original version says, has been completed and so the meat of this has been completed, and add, to be reviewed by the World Heritage Centre. It doesn't really change the nature of this paragraph; it's just a little change of wording. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any other comments? Please.

IUCN:

Thank you. I would just like to briefly react to this point. As the Committee will remember the issue of the strategic environmental assessment has been pending for a long time. Already the mission in 2011 requested for this strategic environmental assessment. A strategic environmental assessment is essentially a decision-making tool to allow the State Party and the authorities to ensure that the right decisions are made in terms of planning development activities. The problem has been with this site that since 2011 all the development activities have been going forward. In 2011 the Kuraz Sugar development was not yet implemented and also the Gibe Dam was not yet operational. The problem has been that through the delay of the strategic environmental assessment the option is always still to identify the appropriate mitigating measures always become more and more less possible and the Kuraz Sugar development will be a major user of water from the river and therefore will impact significantly on the water levels of Lake Turkana and the seasonal variation. That is why the Committee last year decided to include this very same paragraph. This is a paragraph that was already in the Decision last year and is just being repeated here. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you for this clarification. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. Norway would like to retain the original draft. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. In agreement with Norway we also would like to keep the original text.

Chairperson:

Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia would also like to retain the original, please.

Chairperson:

Any other opinions? Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

We would also like to support maintaining the draft decision as it is. Thank you.

Chairperson:

So as far as I see the original draft decision is supported by some countries. So China, if you don't mind leaving it like that so we will proceed. Please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. I would like to propose that the because it involves States Parties not Members of the Committee but I think there are some sentiments expresses—I would propose that we could discuss with those States Parties, Norway, Hungary, Australia, Bahrain to reach an agreement on the specific wording. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So we have only a question concerning paragraph 8 in the whole draft decision. So can we approve it and leave it for further clarification for tomorrow morning? Is it sufficient time to come to some consensus on the wording of this paragraph? What do you think, honourable colleagues? I think it's enough, if you don't mind. So then my proposal is the following: we will accept the draft decision as a whole but paragraph 8 will be left for discussion in brackets until confirmation and approval tomorrow morning at the beginning of the session. Can we approve it like that? I don't see any objections. Thank you for your understanding. The paragraph is approved wholly, in whole but bracket paragraph 8. Thank you very much. I think there is no need to arrange a special group for the discussion. China will consult with the countries themselves. No need to arrange a special group for consultation on this matter.

The Delegation of China:

No. Thank you.

Chairperson:

NGO, please, please introduce yourself. You are welcome.

Observer NGO (World Heritage Watch Network and Rivers without Boundaries International Coalition):

Thank you, your Excellency. I'm speaking on behalf of World Heritage Watch Network and Rivers without Boundaries International Coalition. Originally we were requesting to talk on Selous but it's completely relevant to the topic just discussed. I'm actually glad you gave me the floor now. Thank you. We see World Heritage protection as the core part of sustainable development concept and where diverse conservation is the key sustainable development goal supporting many other SDGs. River ecosystems support livelihoods of millions of people and are the most endangered component of global biodiversity. Civil society networks compiled for you report called "Heritage Damned" analyzing threats from water infrastructure to world heritage globally. The report also suggests how to make the Convention more effective at conservation on river and lake ecosystems and sustainable management of river basins.

The examples on the table, Lake Turkana, the largest desert lake in the world or Selous Game Reserve, which is among the largest conservation areas in Africa with high biodiversity represent exactly the cases where such conflicts take place and should be resolved. Much of the biodiversity of the Selous depends on the Rufiji River; much biodiversity of Turkana depends on the Omo River. From 50 cases of water infrastructure conflicts that we analysed in the report, these two cases namely the Gibe Dams in Omo River and Stiegler's Gorge Dam in the Rufiji River are associated with the greatest threats to reversible damage to World Heritage values as well as with potential violations of key decisions made by the Committee as we've seen now, it's also associated with procrastination with decisions that are not being timely enforced and as a result the irreversible damage is caused. This should be confronted by strategic environmental assessments of development options and best ways to go about the basin-wide management, which will help to avoid this conflict, and we ask you to retain to those tools especially in the light that many development alternatives to dam building are available. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will take your intervention into consideration. Now I would like to go back to the discussion proposed by Tunisia on the Old Town of Ghadamès in Libya. I would like to give the floor to the delegation of Tunisia to present to the Committee the reason why it is requested to open the state of conservation report on Old Town of Ghadamès. The floor is yours, Tunisian delegation.

La Délégation de la Tunisie:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La demande faite par la Tunisie pour ouvrir le débat quant au site de l'ancienne ville de Ghadamès est extrêmement important à nos yeux parce que, comme cela ne vous a pas échappé, l'ensemble des sites des classés par la Libye sont aujourd'hui au titre des sites figurant sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, et la situation qui s'améliore dans certaines régions de la Libye permet d'envisager un processus par étapes et un processus vertueux pour mener le site de Ghadamès vers la sortie de la Liste en péril. Je crois qu'il faut encourager les efforts de l'État partie qui, dans des conditions difficiles, fournit des efforts pour améliorer les conditions de protection et de conservation de ce site. C'est pour cela que nous considérons que ce point de départ que constitue la 43^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial est un point de départ vers un processus qui aboutirait à terme à la sortie de ce site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Je crois qu'il y a là une démarche importante, pédagogique et vertueuse, et il faut appuyer et soutenir l'État partie dans cette direction. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. With the recognition of the Advisory Body for the progress made by the State Party on the ground demonstrating commitment to the conservation of the property despite the prevailing situation we would like to commend Libya for the efforts made in protecting the OUV of the properties through general improvement and threatening factors and increasing awareness by civil society, local, national authorities and the high-level decision-makers about the necessity to protect the cultural heritage of Libya. In addition to the establishment of the committee that its task is implementing a strategies, elaborating management plans for all five of its World Heritage properties in addition to allocate necessary resources. Having said that we encourage the international community to provide the technical and financial support to achieve these objectives. We also encourage the State Party to invite a joint reactive monitoring mission to have *in-situ* a evaluation and start drafting the state of conservation report for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger and put in corrective measures and place Ghadamès at least as a positive start that could be applied to the rest of the sites in the future. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Chairperson, the Republic of Tanzania commends the State Party of Libya for its commitment to protect and conserve the Old Town of Ghadamès, despite the current situation in the country we all hear about. The delegation of Tanzania commends the World Heritage Committee, Advisory Bodies for the continued support of the State Party despite the conflict.

Chairperson, the delegation of Tanzania welcomes the efforts done by the State Party to address conservation issues well reported notably the measures taken to maintain the restoration of the buildings damaged during heavy rains of 2017, the documentation of the entire city's heritage according to specific criteria, as well as the design of an open Geographic Information System (GIS) for the documentation, inventory and presentation of the property.

Chairperson, Tanzania encourages the State Party of Libya to continue its consultation with the World Heritage Committee and Advisory Bodies to clarify the property boundaries, which is an essential step towards effective protection and management of the property.

Chairperson, the delegation of Tanzania supports the proposal of Tunisia. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any other interventions? So I would like to give the floor to ICOMOS, please or Committee, please.

The Secretariat

Thank you very much for the interventions. In fact, the site was listed on the World Heritage List in Danger, the desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List in Danger was not established. These and other measures together with the organization of the joint reactive monitoring mission with the Advisory Bodies would be necessary steps for ensuring the adequate protection and management systems are in place for the eventual removal of the property from the List in Danger. The efforts made by the State Party and together with the commitment of all local communities of Ghadamès is highly commended and further encouraged. We are very grateful for the invitation of the State Party to conduct a reactive monitoring mission as soon as the situation allows. In the meantime, we are very pleased to begin the process for establishing corrective measures together with the State Party and with the Advisory Bodies in order to begin the process that would eventually and hopefully contribute to removing the site from the World Heritage List in Danger. I would like now to give the floor to ICOMOS for any further comments they may have. Thank you.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. ICOMOS fully understands that the State Party considers that they would like to move towards removal of the site from the World Heritage List in Danger, as a prelude to considering how the other remaining four sites on the List might also be removed. We would like to note that when the Committee inscribed all the Libyan properties on the List in Danger, it requested the State Party to gather information relating to damages to the property on the state of conservation and to develop an action plan for restoration. It also requested that the State Party in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies should prepare corrective measures as well as the desired state of conservation as soon as the situation allows and once the return to the civility in the country is effective. The State Party is now suggesting that we have reached the point where the security situation would allow discussion on the preparation of the desired state of conservation for the Old Town of Ghadamès and ICOMOS would be very ready and willing to begin the process of dialogue with the State Party on developing this document and the necessary corrective measures. As all the properties in Libya were put on the in Danger List because protection and conservation of outstanding universal value were considered to be no longer in place, the desired state of conservation needs to reflect primarily on these aspects as well as on the other two aspects of adequate documentation and an action plan for restoration. We welcome the progress, which has so far been made, and look forward to collaborating with the State Party over the development of the desired state of conservation. Thank you.

H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil) takes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any Committee Member would like to take the floor? If not I pass the floor now to the delegation of Libya. Please, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Libya:

Thank you very much. The State Party of Libya is of the opinion that the archeological site of Ghadamès has reached the desired state of conservation and protection for the preparation for its removal for the World Heritage List in Danger and Libya would work with the World Heritage Committee to develop a set of corrective measures for the property of Ghadamès and to be completed within a set timeframe. The purpose of the corrective measures is to prepare the site to be removed from the in Danger List. Libya has invited the reactive monitoring mission to visit Ghadamès as soon as the security situation permits. Ghadamès residents enjoy a rare sense of closeness and accessibility to one another on both social and physical levels. This has held the civil society and the city institutions to protect and preserve the properties within the walls of the city.

The State of Libya has made active efforts to develop a clear strategy for the protection of the World Heritage site and has been commended by the World Heritage Committee. The short-term plans for the site include CCTV security and fire systems in the core area of the Old Town. The development authority of the Old City of Ghadamès has taken the first step by commissioning a visibility study in order to get the most appropriate system for the site. There has been no impact on the World Heritage site of Ghadamès as a result of the current conflict, I must assure you. The site has been secured by tourist police and the local community since 2011. Libya has implemented conservation actions and the corrective measures for the property of unexpected heavy rainfall in December 2017, which actually is due to climate change. The State of Libya wishes to thank the World Heritage Committee for its effort to help Libya to protect and secure its sites. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your comments and explanations. I would like to remark that we receive great satisfaction your announcement of your willingness to receive a mission and be sure that the mission will be willing to attend your invitation as soon as security conditions permit. Thank you very much. Now the delegation of Hungary has the floor. Thank you very much.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Hungary supports the opinion of Libya. It is in a region that is quite peaceful in Libya and also the circumstances in every respect are prospective and good for the World Heritage site. I support a positive decision and as soon as possible making a statement to take it down from the World Heritage List in Danger would be a good sign for Libya and other States Parties in the region that in the case of peaceful conditions world heritage and cultural heritage can be protected as in older times. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

The distinguished delegation of Tunisia has the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation de la Tunisie:

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je ne vous cache pas que nous sommes extrêmement heureux de voir s'installer ce débat cet après-midi. Il dégage beaucoup d'ondes positives, j'allais dire, ce qui est en écho avec notre discussion de ce matin, qui était d'un ordre conceptuel. Donc le placement sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril n'est pas une fatalité, qu'il y ait un dépassement dès que les conditions sont réunies. Nous avons vu l'État partie réagir positivement face aux propositions et à la main tendue par les instances consultatives, quoi

de plus heureux pour nous, et cela correspond tout à fait à l'esprit de la discussion de ce matin. Je crois que c'est extrêmement important de souligner ce moment positif et d'aider l'État partie à aller vers une direction positive, en commençant par le site de Ghadamès qui offre probablement les conditions de sortie les plus proches des conditions exigées par notre Convention. Je crois donc que c'est un moment heureux que nous vivons cet après-midi en cette 43e session. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup, la Tunisie, pour votre intervention tout à fait dans l'esprit de ce Comité d'aider les États parties. Merci beaucoup.

If there are no more interventions on the side of Member States are there any others? Yes, I can see an Observer. Please, identify yourself before you take the floor. Thank you very much.

Observer NGO (World Heritage Watch):

Thank you, Madam Chairperson for giving us the floor. I am from World Heritage Watch. Please allow me to highlight a few important points regarding the Libyan World Heritage sites. Despite the fact that Libya is currently suffering severe conflict, political instability and economic crisis, a lot of work has been done to preserve the sites. I hereby bring your attention to the Old City of Ghadamès. The Libyan State Party together with civil society have implemented a management plan and ever since its condition has improved. Therefore, we recommend that it is lifted from the in Danger List and we request that the UNESCO World Heritage Committee should work with the United Nations Headquarters to reassess the security situation in Ghadamès in order to create pre-conditions for a reactive monitoring mission being sent to the Libyan World Heritage sites. The World Heritage Committee should work with the Libyan State Party to develop a management plan for the five Libyan World Heritage sites following consultation with the Libyan authorities, local community and civil society. Thank you for your attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. If there aren't any further interventions I think we can now move to analyse the draft decision and I would now pass the floor to our Rapporteur. Thank you very much.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Rapporteur:

As flagged by the distinguished delegate from Kuwait, we have received an amendment from Tunisia, Kuwait and Bahrain. This is for an addition to paragraph 9. It will read, Also requests the State Party to develop a set of corrective measures and a timeframe for their implementation as well as the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies and to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2020 an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Since this is the only amendment to the decision presented by the delegation of Tunisia I understand that all the previous paragraphs can be taken as approved

and I submit for your consideration only paragraph 9. Are there any amendments to this paragraph? I see none. So I think we can take this decision as adopted. Thank you very much.

So the whole decision is approved I understand. May I count on your agreement? No disagreements, so done. Thank you very much.

Now we move to the examination of decision on Item 28, Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem. I now invite Ms Shaer of the Arab States Unit of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties located in the Arab States region and open for discussion. Please, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The report on the property Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem in Palestine is open for discussion as it is proposed for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The report is available in document WHC/19/43.COM/7A on page 28 of the English version and 29 of the French version. Since the adoption of the desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger during the Committee's 29th session progress in implementing the corrective measures have mainly focused on the high-quality conservation works as well as the finalization of the conservation management plan. The World Heritage Centre has received full details of the works undertaken in accordance with the Committee's previous requests. The management plan is well organized and has been completed through a consultative process. All of this has been achieved through the commitment of the State Party and its agencies in ensuring best practices in the conservation of the property, which is very commendable. Overall, it can be concluded that the desired state of conservation and the needed corrective measures have been achieved. Therefore, we are pleased to say that the recommendation is to have the property removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you for your attention and now I would like to give the floor to ICOMOS for their comments. Thank you.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Conservation work of the Church of the Nativity and its narthex undertaken since 2013 include restoration of the roof, the narthex, joinery, external stone facades, internal wall plastering, wall mosaics and columns. And this work is of a high technical standard. As requested by the Committee, the documentation submitted by the State Party includes an analysis of the historical research and physical evidence revealed during conservation works regarding the dates of particular building components. The building has been much altered over the centuries and despite the investigations completed, it is not possible to reach specific conclusions about the chronology of the extant fabric. The integrated conservation management plan for the property demonstrates commitment to conserving the property and has been revised in response to ICOMOS' advice. The cancellation of the Manger Square Village Tunnel project is welcome and additional technical advice has been provided to the State Party regarding plans for the revival of Star Street. ICOMOS is pleased to advice that the corrective measures adopted by the Committee are now complete and the desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger has been achieved. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. My dear colleagues, I now invite you to adopt the draft decision 43 COM 7A.28 concerning this property. But before doing so, I would like to ask the Rapporteur if she has received any amendments on the draft decision. You have the floor, please. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. We have received no amendments to this decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on this topic? Yes, Brazil, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The Brazilian delegation fully supports the draft decision relating to the removal of the Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem from the List of the World Heritage in Danger. We commend the Palestinian committee for its restoration of the Nativity Church and the successful coordination of the restoration works which counts on the support of countries from different regions. Brazil was very pleased to participate in this effort by contributing to the restoration of byzantine mosaics in the southern nave of the basilica. We should celebrate the fact that the basilica of the Nativity one of the most important pilgrimage sites for the Christian faith now fully recovers its outstanding universal value. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. This is really a moment for celebration. Tunisia, you have the floor.

La Délégation de la Tunisie:

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Alors pour rester sur la lancée de notre discussion de tout à l'heure, voici encore un exemple où la convergence entre l'expertise technique, entre l'écoute des instances consultatives et l'État partie, avec le temps et le progrès, nous ramènent à des résultats satisfaisants. Nous devons nous en féliciter et donc, aboutissement logique, nous soutenons fortement cette décision.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your comments. The delegation of Norway has the floor. Thank you very much.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. World Heritage belongs to humanity and sometimes due to various circumstances the international communities are obliged to take shared responsibility and work together to safeguard the most vulnerable of all World Heritage sites, those that we find on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It is therefore a truly special day when a State Party with a property on the Danger List has met the requirements as specified in the Operational Guidelines paragraph 183 concerning the desired state of conservation for the removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route in Bethlehem has been on the Danger List since its inscription on the World Heritage List in 2012. On this day, to be able to see the results of systematic long term work in line with the agreed good practices principles with excellent provisions for and commitment to management and conservation leading to the removal of the List of World Heritage in Danger, is historic.

Norway wishes to commend and thank the State Party and all involved stakeholders and emphasize the significant contribution of financial and technical assistance, among others the extrabudgetary contributions made available by Italy and Sweden. In one sense international collaboration can be said to have been an underlying factor in the stewardship of this holy site for nearly 2000 years. This has become an exemplary case proving the value and potential of the Danger Listing mechanism, showcasing how close collaboration between the State Party,

the international community, UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies and most importantly the many stakeholders involved on the ground can lead to exceptional results.

The State Party has shown us all that patience, strategic long term efforts towards implementing the corrective measures, as well as international cooperation and continuous expert advice ultimately lead to results of the highest quality. We have full confidence that the commitment for protection, conservation and management of this outstanding property will continue in the future. Further, we trust fully that recommendations concerning the Historic Urban Landscape approach as well as those coming from the ICOMOS technical review will be duly observed and implemented.

Norway fully supports the draft decision. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I now pass the floor to the distinguished delegate of Kuwait. Please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Let me say first of all that Kuwait is extremely supportive of the draft decision on the screen and we are so delighted that there is a site being removed from the in Danger List and even more for a place needing positive information, a positive atmosphere, positive ambience for the place to be removed from the in Danger List. We would also like to thank all the stakeholders, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for all their work especially in a place where it's hard to produce a positive and hard to access. Finally, congratulations to everyone involved in this. This is great news for UNESCO. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the delegation of Spain. Please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Yes, I'll be very brief Madam Chairperson, just to echo what the previous speakers have said in congratulating everybody in taking a site off the in Danger List is obviously a very positive step and is a successful outcome. Given all the positive outcomes like this, I think it will stand as an encouragement to other States to make sure that if they have sites on the in Danger List that they are to continue their efforts. We also want to congratulate those for all of those who took part in the restoration particularly for the narthex and mosaics. I think it stands as an example of what can be achieved when we all work hand-in-hand and remembering that having something listed on the in Danger List is because it requires a joint effort. This is the world's heritage and that's why this stands as such a shining example of cooperation. I think it's hard sometimes to see how inscription on the in Danger List can be seen as a positive thing but I think this actually stands as an example of that so our congratulations to Palestine for all of its efforts and for the successful outcome. Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much to the distinguished delegate of Spain. I pass the floor to the delegation of Azerbaijan. Please, take the floor.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. My delegation also joins the previous speakers in congratulating the State Party for this huge success and it is indeed a great pleasure for my country, the host country to associate itself to this decision taken in Baku. We would like to commend the efforts of the State Party namely in complying with the recommendations of the

previous Committee decisions. We would like also to commend the State Party for the presentation of all the reconstructive work they have done so far and the conservation management plan which was submitted to the World Heritage Centre and I would say constructive cooperation and dialogue with the Advisory Bodies and the Centre. So in that regard, again, we would like to congratulate Palestine and express our full support to the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The delegation of Hungary has the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson for giving us the floor. We welcome this draft decision and we commend the State Party for the formidable work done. It's a very happy day when any site is removed from the in Danger List and the Church of Nativity is an iconic site for millions of Christians around the globe. Hungary was the first State to make a contribution to the reconstruction of the church and this is in line with Hungary's commitment to the cause of supporting Christian churches and communities in the Middle East as a priority and they can rely on our support in the future. We rejoice the city's very positive development for the preservation of one of Christianity's most important holy site and we would like to congratulate once again the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the distinguished delegate from St Kitts and Nevis.

The Delegation of St Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We would like to add our words of support for this decision to remove from the Danger List the Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem. We would also fully commend enthusiastically all the stakeholders who were involved in achieving this important milestone in the annals of the World Heritage Committee. An excellent example I have to say of constructive cooperation by all parties. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor to the delegation of Tanzania. Please, you have the floor.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Madam Chairperson, our delegation of the Republic of Tanzania wishes also to join other Committee Members to express our sincere congratulations to the State Party for the completion of very remarkable work to ensure the implementation of the desired state of conservation. We also congratulate the State Party for being able to establish new natural and cultural heritage legislation, which contribute to the protection of the property. Madam Chairperson, the Republic of Tanzania fully supports the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain has the floor now, thank you.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I'll be brief. We also would like to join our voice in fully supporting the draft decision and commend the State Party of Palestine for fulfilling its

commitment to the World Heritage Committee and to the Convention. We would also like to reiterate the importance of the Danger Listing mechanism as a positive means in achieving the desired state of conservation and we fully the same comments raised by previous speakers. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor to the distinguished delegate of China. Please, take the floor.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. China wishes to echo the sentiment of all the previous speakers. We want to congratulate the State Parties involved and we associate ourselves with the full support of the draft decision and we want to thank all the participants in the conservation of this great property. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. The delegation of Zimbabwe has the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. The delegation of Zimbabwe would like to note the commendable progress that the State Party of Palestine has achieved in the conservation and management of the birthplace of Jesus World Heritage property. We support the draft decision to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The delegation of Australia has the floor. Please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Short and sweet like the achievement we celebrate today we congratulate heartily the State Party of Palestine on this achievement.

Chairperson:

I think that after this overwhelming wave of support ... I'm sorry, the delegation of Cuba has the floor. Please, go ahead.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much Madam Chair. I'll be very succinct. We just wanted to share in the happiness of this Committee and with Palestine for the efforts carried out and the results, the fact that this site can be removed from the Danger List. I think that all of us have good reason to be very happy with this result. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Palestine:

Obrigado, Madam Chairperson. Well, actually after these interventions of the Committee Members it is really something special for us. It's a special day for me and my colleague from the Ministry, Dr Rjoob, our expert present here. Unfortunately, a part of what I wanted to say has been said by Committee Members. Nevertheless, let me Madam Chairperson thank first you and all the Members of the Committee but also for the valuable support of all States Parties, companies and individuals who financially, technically and morally supported the restoration of the Nativity Church in Bethlehem. Our thanks also for the Advisory Bodies and especially ICOMOS and ICCROM for their continuous support and, of course, the Secretariat.

We don't forget the Secretariat and their continued support also. And a special thanks to the Ramallah UNESCO Office who has been involved since the beginning of the process.

Madame la Présidente, les travaux de restauration de l'église de la Nativité, comme cela a été souligné par les membres du Comité, ont été réalisés selon les normes en vigueur pour les sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine avec un très haut niveau de professionnalisme.

Madame la Présidente, nous sommes vraiment fiers des travaux réalisés par nos experts, par le Comité présidentiel pour la restauration de la Nativité, le Ministère du tourisme et des antiquités et, bien sûr, les experts internationaux venus de l'Italie, que nous remercions chaleureusement à cette occasion. Il est nécessaire de souligner ce qui a été dit par beaucoup de monde, que la Palestine a respecté son engagement et a travaillé main dans la main avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organes consultatifs, notamment l'ICOMOS.

Pour finir, Madam Chairperson, allow me to address you and all participants to this important session a cordial invitation to the opening of the exhibition on the restoration of the Nativity Church that will be held on Friday the 5th at balcony EA1 to celebrate together the renaissance of the Nativity Church in Bethlehem which is situated in the State of Palestine but it belongs to all humanity. Thank you, Madam Chairperson. *[applause]*

Chairperson:

Thank you very much and congratulations once again. Thank you. At this point I would like to pass to the Director of the World Heritage Centre who has an announcement to make. Please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre :

I would just like to inform you that we have the list of sites, which are open for discussion in document INF.7.Rev.3 as we discussed this morning in the Bureau. We are receiving amendments for sites, which are not on this list. So in case any of the Committee Members who wish to open another site could you please formally inform us because otherwise no changes to the draft decisions can be made? My understanding is that there were two requests, one from Bahrain and one from China. Maybe you could just clarify now because that means we need to issue a new list so that everybody is fully informed about the situation. Thank you so much.

Chairperson:

Bahrain, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Yes, Madam Chairperson. We have just proposed the site in Tunisia, Carthage, which was just a simple paragraph of the technological efforts of the State Party, addressing some of the recommendations set forth by previous decisions. It's very minor. I don't think it will require a lot of discussion by Committee Members. It has been cosponsored by Kuwait as well. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We would now like to listen to the delegation of China. Thank you.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. This request of new addition concerns draft decision 43 COM 7B.56. It's only a very minor change. It doesn't change the content whatsoever. It is a request of the State Party concerned. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Both observations are noted. We will issue a new list. Thank you very much. We will now with your indulgence proceed to the discussion proposed by Tunisia on Item 33, Ancient City of Damascus, Syrian Arab Republic for the next property.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Sorry, we should open the discussion on another topic; I think you didn't see us. The idea was to open the discussion on topic 98, which is Valparaíso, the Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso. Sorry.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Has Norway requested the floor, too? No? Okay. Thank you so much. Sorry, Brazil for ignoring you. But now put your plate down because I thought it was remaining from your previous intervention. Thank you. Now we go back to our items and for the next properties to discuss I would like to give the floor to the delegation of Tunisia to present to the Committee the reason why you requested to open the state of conservation report on the Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic). Excellency, distinguished delegate of Tunisia, you have the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation de la Tunisie:

Merci beaucoup, Madame la Présidente. Alors sur la lancée de cet après-midi, Je crois que les arguments à avancer pour qu'une première étape soit franchie en direction de la sortie du site de Damas de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril deviennent plus aisés et plus évidents, et je m'en félicite. Damas est sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial depuis que cette liste existe, c'est l'un des premiers sites inscrits, donc c'est dire son éligibilité à en faire partie, et son éligibilité à représenter le patrimoine mondial dans sa diversité. Nous savons tous la situation qui sévit actuellement en Syrie et plus généralement dans toute la région. Cela rend l'idée même de regarder ces sites comme susceptibles de quitter cette liste probablement hasardeux aux yeux de certains. Ce que notre démarche veut souligner c'est que ce site est particulièrement en situation de moindre danger, même si nous n'excluons pas que des problèmes persistent, et nous soulignons, comme nous l'avons fait pour d'autres sites, une démarche positive graduée qui aurait pour aboutissement de faire sortir Damas de cette liste.

Donc nous voudrions à la fois souligner la particularité de ce site par rapport aux autres sites du même pays, qui sont tous sur la liste des sites en danger, mais également l'amélioration relative de la situation dans la région qui permet d'envisager cette sortie. Nous voudrions donc, comme nous l'avons fait pour un site précédent, sur lequel nous avons adopté une résolution déjà, que ce soit une démarche graduelle, pédagogique et aussi vertueuse, pour que la mise sur la liste ne soit pas considérée comme une situation définitive. À nous maintenant de nous adresser à l'État partie et de lui dire quels sont les pas qu'il doit franchir en vue d'atteindre cet objectif. Je crois que cela relève aussi de la responsabilité des États parties du Comité de procéder ainsi, de montrer la direction et de montrer parfois la voie de la sortie de la Liste en péril. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now like to ask Ms Shaer of the Arab States Unit of the World Heritage Centre and also ICOMOS to react to your proposal and to your comments. Thank you very much. So you have the floor Ms Shaer.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. In fact, the ancient city of Damascus was inscribed in 2013 on the List of World Heritage in Danger because the optimal conditions were not considered

to have been present to ensure the conservation and protection of the outstanding universal value of the property. The efforts of the State Party in recent months and years and the conservation management of the property are very much welcome and greatly encouraged. The invitation by the State Party to undertake a joint reactive monitoring mission with the Advisory Bodies as soon as the situation allows is very much appreciated. This would enable assessment of the protection and management measures that are in place. In the meantime, it is possible to initiate immediately the process for establishing the necessary corrective measures with the State Parties as well as with the Advisory Bodies. This would allow for eventually achieving the desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. I would like now to give the floor to ICOMOS for their further intervention. Thank you.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. ICOMOS and ICCROM have supported and will continue to support the State Party with its efforts to safeguard its cultural heritage. The improved security situation at this property offers an opportunity to resume work on the suspended management plan, which was requested by the Committee at its 34th session in 2010. Preliminary actions such as the database of documentation and archives are an important part of the recovery process as they can inform conservation decisions and foster coordination between stakeholders. The reasons behind fires previously reported within the property should still be analysed and risk prevention and mitigation measures outlined in the emergency response plan should be implemented as should the recommendations of the 2016 First Aid Support Meeting and the UNESCO Technical Assistance Workshop. ICOMOS and ICCROM agree it would be now opportune to pursue preparation of an agreed set of corrective measures and to identify the desired state of conservation for removal so that there is a roadmap to guide the State Party and all stakeholders towards removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now like to open the floor for comments by the Committee. I see Kuwait would like to express himself. Please, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. First of all let me take this opportunity to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the great work that has been done for the Ancient City of Damascus. Like my colleague said from Tunisia, I think it's always a starting point for removal of a site from the World Heritage in Danger List and this time to have the roadmap for the corrective measures and the corrective action plans for the State Party, stakeholders, Advisory Bodies and also World Heritage Centre for the removal of the site from the in Danger List. So Kuwait fully supports this draft decision. Thank you so much.

Chairperson:

Thank you, dear colleague. I would now pass the floor to the delegation of Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. This is another site, which has been on the World Heritage in Danger List for the last six years, and the corrective measures have not been identified and the desired state of conservation for removal has not been prepared. The delegation of Tanzania notes with appreciation the establishment of a centre for the production of building materials, the proposed development of a digital tour guide for the local communities and the project on raising awareness on the history of the property. Tanzania calls upon the Advisory Bodies in consultation with the State Party to try and see how they can assist in the work of the State Party to develop a desired state of conservation for removal as soon as possible or to go and

assess the conservation status of the site so to give an opinion on the actual situation at present. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The distinguished delegate of China has the floor now. Thank you.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. China wishes to support the motion by Tunisia and Kuwait and we also welcome the input by ICOMOS and ICCROM for their expert support and we welcome this move. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor to ICOMOS who would like to comment on the intervention of Tanzania. Thank you very much.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I welcome the contribution from the honorable delegate from Tanzania and want to make clear on behalf of ICOMOS and ICCROM. There was a meeting with the State Party as recently as yesterday and we strongly support and stand ready to work on the identification on the desired state of conservation and corrective measures and to follow up with a reactive monitoring mission to this property as soon as the security situation allows. We see this property as the appropriate forefront of a process, which may hopefully see all the Syrian properties progressively removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. If there are no more additional comments I would like to invite you to move now to the examination of the decision and in this regard I would like to ask our Rapporteur if she has received any amendments on the draft decision. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We received no amendments for this decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you. With the draft now being exhibited since there are no amendments I think we are very pleased to approve this decision right now. Thank you very much. Approved. [applause]

Dear colleagues, I would now invite Ms Shaer to read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Arab States region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Please, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The list of the cultural properties in the Arab region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion are Abu Mena in Egypt, Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) in Iraq, Hatra in Iraq, Samarra Archaeological City in Iraq. There's also a General Decision on the World Heritage properties of Iraq, the Archaeological Site of Cyrene in Libya, the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna in Libya, the Archaeological Site of Sabratha in Libya, Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus in Libya, Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines—Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir in Palestine, the Ancient City of Aleppo in the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ancient City of Bosra in the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ancient villages of Northern Syria in the Syrian Arab Republic, the Crac des chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din in the Syrian Arab Republic, the Site of Palmyra in the Syrian Arab Republic. There's also a

General Decision on the World Heritage properties of the Syrian Arab Republic, Historic Town of Zabid in Yemen, Old City of Sana'a in Yemen and the Old Walled City of Shibam in Yemen. These are all the properties proposed for adoption without discussion. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. If there are no objections from the Committee on the state of conservation reports, I declare the decisions read out adopted. No comments. I declare them adopted. Thank you very much. I would now like to ask whether any Observer delegation would like to make use of the floor about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decision without discussion. We cannot read from here but please identify yourself as you take the floor. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Turkey:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Since we take the floor for the first time we want to extend our heartfelt thanks for the great hospitality of Azerbaijan. Our statement will be regarding Item 34, particularly in response to the State Party's report. We want to underline three factors.

Firstly, no reactive monitoring mission has been undertaken to the site due to the security situation. Secondly, the SOC report clearly indicates the elements affecting the property such as use of ancient stones as building material, illegal construction, quarrying and use of the site by internally displaced persons and groups. Thirdly, the SOC report again states that access to the site is limited and the full extent of damage cannot be assessed. Under these conditions without undertaking a reactive mission in the site we have difficulty in understanding the consistent allegations of the State Party. There is no causal relation between our military operations in the neighbourhood and the damages in the site. We stated our position on this matter in reply to the previous allegations during the 205th Executive Board session as well.

Turkey is fully aware of its responsibilities, derived from 1972 and 1954 Conventions, as well as from the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2347. With this understanding we hope that the reactive monitoring mission will be carried out as soon as possible as the security situation allows, thus the state of conservation of the said site and the original cause of the damage can be assessed. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would appreciate very much if you could clarify which site you were referring to. It was not very clear to us. Thank you.

Turkey:

Absolutely, Madam Chairperson. It is number 34, which is the Ancient Villages of Northern Syria.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Any more comments? Please, the Syrian delegation, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Syria:

I would like to thank the organizers and UNESCO for organizing this session and their effort to support, protect and preserve the Syrian cultural heritage during the crisis, which is a part of human heritage. I appreciate you considering our request in removing Damascus Ancient City

from the Danger List and we look forward to the reactive monitoring mission to Syria and the state of conservation to the sites listed on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? Sorry, I can't see very well from here but I understand there are no more comments. I believe we can now proceed with our agenda without any further interventions. Thank you. I now invite Mr Jing, Chief of the Asia-Pacific Unit of the World Heritage Centre to read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Asia-Pacific region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor. Thank you, Mr Jing.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The following cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for which the draft decision will be adopted without discussion are Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley in Afghanistan, Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam in Afghanistan, Nan Madol: Ceremonial Centre of Eastern Micronesia in the Federal States of Micronesia and Historic Centre of Shakhristabz in Uzbekistan. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the decisions read out adopted. So the decision is adopted. Thank you very much. I would now like to ask whether any Observer delegation would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decision without discussion? Are there any comments? I see no comments so we can proceed, I understand. We now move to the discussion proposed by Hungary on the Medieval Monuments in Kosovo, Serbia. For cultural properties located in Europe and North America, I now give the floor to the Delegation of the Hungary to present to the Committee the reason it requested to open the state of conservation of the World Heritage Medieval Monuments in Kosovo. Excellency, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The World Heritage property Medieval Monuments in Kosovo in Serbia was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2006. The debate on this property was adjourned by the World Heritage Committee during its 42nd session in Manama and the Hungarian delegation wishes to open the discussion for this property because the present circumstances are still not met for the debate on it so we suggest to the Committee to adjourn the debate on this agenda item to the 44th session. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your comments. I would now pass the floor to the delegation of Azerbaijan. You have the floor, distinguished colleague. Thank you.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. My delegation would like to second the proposal of the distinguished colleague from Hungary and to request the postponement of this decision to the next session of the Committee. Thank you.

Chairperson:

I would now like to listen to the distinguished delegate from China. You have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Again, very briefly, we support the proposal by the distinguished colleague from Hungary and seconded by Azerbaijan. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I pass the floor to the distinguished colleague from Uganda. Please, take the floor.

Uganda:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The delegation of Uganda supports the proposal by Hungary, seconded by Azerbaijan and supported by China. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I'd like to pass the floor over to the distinguished delegate from Spain. You have the floor.

Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. Just to save time, we would also like to support Hungary's proposal. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I'd like to pass the floor to my distinguished colleague from Indonesia. You have the floor.

Indonesia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Indonesia also supports the proposal of Hungary, Azerbaijan, China and Uganda. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I believe that with so many expressions of support to the proposal of Hungary. I understand that we all agree that the debate is adjourned on this topic. So it is agreed. Thank you very much.

I now invite Ms Anatole Gabriel, Chief of the Europe and North America Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor, please.

Le Secrétariat:

Merci, Madame la Présidente. La liste des rapports proposés aux distingués membres du Comité pour adoption sans discussion sont le Centre historique de Vienne, Autriche, et Liverpool – Port marchand, Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord. Merci, Madame la Présidente.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the Decisions read out adopted. Nothing against it so it is adopted. Thank you very much. I would now like to ask whether any Observer delegation would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decision without discussion? I wish we had a telescope so we could see everything. We can't see very well but from what I can see there are no comments so we can proceed. Thank you very much.

We now move to the discussion on Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works in Chile, property proposed to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. I will now invite Mr Moreno-Triana, of the Latin America and the Caribbean Unit of the World Heritage Centre, and ICOMOS to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties located in this region and opened for discussion. You have the floor. Please, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I would like to introduce the report on Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works in Chile. The report can be found in document 43.COM 7A page 53 of the English version and page 55 of the French version. As the distinguished Members of the Committee may recall, this property was included on the World Heritage List in Danger in 2005 with the strong support of the State Party. At that time, this industrial complex had suffered significant deterioration of its material fabric due to the difficult climatic conditions and lack of regular maintenance. The corrective measures were updated in 2013 after which the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS reinforced their cooperation to support the achievement of the state of conservation. The national authorities, in particular, the National Monuments Council announced a new national service for cultural heritage has invested significant financial, technical and human resources needed to address the property's longstanding challenges and vulnerabilities.

The last ICOMOS advisory mission, that took place in November 2018, confirmed the extraordinary progress made by the State Party in the conservation and management of the property and concluded that essentially 100% of the corrective measures had been completed.

Since the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works has undergone a transformation not only in terms of its physical conservation but also in terms of the appropriation by the local communities of the *pampinos* history and culture in connection to this important site. In terms of addressing the extremely fragile state of conservation of many of the property's buildings the State Party has implemented the entire Priority Interventions Programme to stabilize and restore the most important structures. It has also formally established and regulated a buffer zone, improved the safety and security for its staff and visitors and has a fully operational and sustainable tourism strategy that includes the creation of a new visitor's centre in operation in 2018.

Finally, Madam Chairperson, it's important to highlight that today the property serves as a dynamic educational and cultural space for the local communities, in particular through their role played by the Saltpeter Museum Corporation. It is therefore the view of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS that this case is an exemplary process of using an inscription of the World Heritage List in Danger to generate streamlined and much needed attention and resources from the local communities all the way to the highest level of government. This process can be seen as a good practice for the Latin America and Caribbean region and the lessons learned over the past several years will surely benefit other properties with similar vulnerabilities and characteristics.

Having completed almost 100% of the very ambitious set of corrective measures, the removal of the Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works from the List of World Heritage in Danger is highly recommended. Madam Chairperson, ICOMOS would like to provide additional comments on this report. Thank you.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2005 with strong agreement of the State Party because of the perilous physical state arising from the fragile nature of its industrial

buildings, lack of maintenance, vandalism and natural forces. The State Party has progressively focused on addressing these threats over a sustained period, with support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The ICOMOS advisory mission in November 2018 reported on significant progress and achievements with conservation and management. The 2006 Priority and Implementation Programme directed at emergency structural stabilization is substantively complete. Security measures including fencing and patrols have been implemented.

The Saltpeter Museum Corporation, which owns and manages the property, is functioning effectively and there is now a stable work team of qualified staff. There is also an effective programme of liaison and interaction with other authorities. The local management agency must continue to receive support from government at all levels. The 2013-2018 Management Plan has been implemented effectively and an updated plan is being prepared providing for the protection and conservation of the property and joint decisions involving socio-political and administrative actors. The heritage interpretation strategic plan has also been implemented. Appropriate intervention guidelines and legislation are in place for the established buffer zone. In collaboration the Saltpeter Museum Corporation and the State Party have designed and implemented priority programmes and management arrangements focused on the conservation of the outstanding universal value of the property.

The 2018 mission provided further guidance on the integrated participatory management plan for the property and ongoing preventative conservation actions to address the property's inherent vulnerabilities. The updated corrective measures adopted by the Committee at its 37th session are now complete and the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger has been achieved. Significantly this property provides an exemplary benchmark of how the process of in Danger listing can be used to deliver essential support to the State Party in addressing significant threats to outstanding universal value. ICOMOS and ICCROM hope that the State Party might share this experience with other World Heritage properties including through the next World Heritage Site Managers Forum. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

My dear colleagues and friends, I would like to know whether there are any comments on the reports that have just been presented to us? I pass the floor now to the distinguished delegation of Australia. Please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Australia congratulates Chile on completing all the corrective measures to meet the desired state of conservation for the property, especially given the extremely nature of many of the structures. We have very few relatively large industrial properties on the World Heritage List and they do pose significant problems for conservation. It's particularly impressive in this case that along with the successful stabilization of these structures based on research to identify methods of conservation specific to the fabric and conditions of the property and the development of a comprehensive management plan, that there is also a sustainable funding mechanism to support ongoing conservation and management. The collective work of the State Party, the Saltpeter Museum Corporation and the local government agencies and of course the local community, provide an example for us of best practice and we fully support removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I'd like to give the floor to the distinguished delegate from Spain. You have the floor.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. Here again we see another example of how an in Danger List can actually bring forth new life and in some ways it comes out more reinvigorated than when it went on the List. With all the determined effort that has been taken by the State Party, we want to congratulate ICOMOS and UNESCO for all the work that they have done in cooperating with the State Party and our congratulations to Chile for all the work they've done since the in Danger Listing to try to put into practice the management plans. So here again just as with the case of Palestine, we wanted to congratulate the State Party and we fully support the motion for removal from the in Danger List. Congratulations to Chile to keep working in maintaining and protecting the world's heritage and to encourage them to work hand-in-hand with all those who are extending help the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I would like to give the floor to our distinguished colleague from Cuba.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Madam Chairperson. In 2005, the World Heritage Committee took up the challenge of including this site, to transfer it from one list to the other, the in Danger List and here what we are seeing, thanks to all the efforts made by the State Party but also the Advisory Bodies we're finding this outstanding outcome. Congratulations to Chile for having worked so hard to have this site removed from the in Danger List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the delegation of Brazil. Please, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Brazil:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works can stand out as an outstanding example of a phase in our heritage where hundreds of workers worked in difficult conditions creating solidarity among themselves and social structures that would later enrich the region. Since the earthquake in 2014 the listing on the in Danger List seemed to be something that would stand for a long time but now we are seeing a clear example of how the mechanism of in Danger listing can indeed facilitate the conditions in which the desired state of conservation can be achieved for a World Heritage property. Brazil would like to extend its congratulations to the State Party for all of the endeavours undertaken to reach this outcome and for having implemented all the recommendations and corrective measures. We think here again we are seeing a new line of decision-making, which is fully aligned with the goals of the World Heritage Convention and we think that the Ministry, Culture, Art and Heritage and other governmental levels has all borne fruit. We are delighted to see that this outcome has been achieved for the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Brazil. Je voudrais maintenant passer la parole au délégué de la Tunisie.

La Délégation de la Tunisie:

Merci, Madame la Présidente. La Tunisie voudrait se joindre à tous ceux qui avant nous ont pris la parole pour féliciter l'État partie d'un effort sans relâche, qui a duré plus de quatorze ans je crois, dans un contexte pas toujours facile, mais qui montre que la voie de la coopération, et notamment du travail main dans la main avec les instances consultatives, aboutit. Nous nous félicitons de ce résultat et, ce soir, ce site rejoint les cinq autres sites chiliens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. On doit féliciter cet État et nous en féliciter nous-mêmes. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

C'est vrai. Thank you very much. I would pass the floor now to the delegation of Norway. Please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. The Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works were inscribed on the in Danger List since 2005 and ever since then Chile has undertaken outstanding work in establishing a maintenance system and structures and major conservation efforts in a very arid work. Among all of the different measures that were taken to conserve and maintain this OUV of this site, the management and conservation plan stand out as most crucial. I think it is vital to have that cooperation at the local, regional and national levels and in this case the political decision-makers and local authorities have worked on the various systems and management mechanisms that made it possible to put the corrective measures into practice. Some of the management issues for the World Heritage site were rather serious though at the same time discussing them, sometimes when we focus on the negative aspects it blinds us to all of the positive results that can stem from it.

So I think we have a lot to learn from the example we have before us, firstly, that being on the in Danger List can, indeed, offer opportunities for improving quality management. Secondly, that there are no easy solutions. What it takes is a lot of hard work and a desire to keep moving forward step by step. Thirdly, that this way of working which does encompass all the different aspects of OUV is a prerequisite for creating sustainable management and conservation mechanisms and these are the lessons that we can take away and I think that in Norway we can learn from that and I think this has been a most inspiring example for us and I hope it will be for other countries too.

Finally, Norway would like to firmly endorse this proposed decision and we'd like to congratulate all Chileans. Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Well now I should like to congratulate you on your Spanish. We are so happy when a country is removed from the in Danger List that I think we all feel like speaking in the language of that country. Congratulations! I would now pass the floor to the delegation of Tanzania. Thank you.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Madam Chairperson. The delegation of the Republic of Tanzania commends the State Party of Chile for its commitment to conserve the Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works. We thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their support to the State Party to come up with these positive results. Indeed, Danger listing can be useful to a property where the listing has been understood properly by the State Party, and this is where effective dialogue is necessary.

Madam Chairperson, the delegation of Tanzania welcomes the effort of the State Party for successfully implementing conservation measures for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Madam Chairperson, the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania again congratulates the Republic of Chile and fully supports the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the delegation of Guatemala. You have the floor, Guatemala.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. We should like to congratulate our dear friends and brothers in Chile for all of the work they have undertaken over the last fourteen years to safeguard this site. We do think it's exemplary work and good practices and Guatemala would like to endorse the decision to withdraw this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you and congratulations

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the distinguished delegate of Azerbaijan. Please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. My delegation would also like to congratulate the State Party for this success and removal of the site from the in Danger List. It has been 14 years since it's been on the List and we commend the State Party for its efforts and activities aimed to conserving this site so my delegation fully supports the decision and reiterates its congratulations. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The distinguished delegate from Hungary has the floor now. Thank you.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The distance between Chile and Hungary is huge. But Hungary would like to join the other States Parties in congratulating Chile for this huge, big success. The consequent work to improve the state of conservation of the Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works proves again similarly and together with Palestine that there is a way out of in Danger status for World Heritage sites. It is a good example to all States Parties in the same position how to concentrate efforts to improve and find a way out of this position and to be proud again about their World Heritage sites. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor now to the delegation of China. Please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The China delegation would like to support the decision of removing the item off the Danger List and congratulates Chile. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The distinguished delegate from Bosnia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Pour être très bref, nous partageons cet enthousiasme et nous soutenons les efforts faits pour que cela soit fait de cette manière. Nous partageons l'enthousiasme du Comité et nous sommes contents d'avoir un exemple réussi de la sauvegarde du patrimoine. Merci.

Chairperson:

Thank you so much for your comments. I see no more Members of the Committee requesting the floor. I would then pass the floor to the distinguished delegate of Mexico.

The Observer Delegation of Mexico:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much. Since this is the first time that Mexico speaks here, we would like to thank the government of Azerbaijan for its generosity and hospitality in organizing this session of the World Heritage Committee. We of course would like to echo the recognition of the effort carried out by the government of Chile to guarantee the state of conservation of the Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works and we would like to extend that as well to the members of the Saltpeter Corporation. Since 2005, Mexico has been accompanying this particular inscription in the Council of Monuments and also the Secretary of Cultural Heritage of the Ministry of Culture, Art within the government of Chile. The primordial objective of the World Heritage Convention is long term conservation of those properties which are inscribed on both of the Lists and in this case the State Party has been faithfully fulfilling the requests and recommendations made by the Committee since 2006 aside from having received economic support from the World Heritage Fund.

Dear Members of the Committee, this decision that the government and Chilean society as well have taken in inscribing this property 14 years ago would not have been worth it without the commitment made by all of government and entire community to rescue and conserve the Saltpeter Works. The integrated project for the preservation that Chile came up with and that was validated and supported by Mexico as well as other countries has always been supported by the *raison d'être* of the Convention as well when the techniques created by one Member State are actually used by another and actually when the tools that are designed in one region for conservation are implemented in another.

We would like to congratulate Chile on this success, a country which very much is united with Mexico for many years indeed with roots of human solidarity as well as the fact that we share many aspects of our cultural heritage and we would also like to congratulate the Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your comments. I believe that after some many expressions of joy and support we can move to the adoption of decision 43 COM 7A.49 concerning this property. I understand from our Rapporteur that there are no amendments. Do you confirm this?

Rapporteur:

That's correct, no amendments to this one.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So I believe we can now approve this draft decision. No expressions in contrary so it is approved *[applause]*. With our whole-hearted congratulations to the State Party, our brother country of Chile, to know if Chile would like to take the floor? Yes, please, with our congratulations you have the floor. Thank you very much.

The Observer Delegation of Chile:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I would first of all like to greet the Assistant Director-General of Culture of UNESCO as well and thank you for the hospitality and organization of this event by the government of Azerbaijan.

Chile, on behalf of our President, would like to thank the Committee for recognizing the work we have made for the conservation of the Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works and the fact that this is no longer on the Danger List is a success that the work that has been made to recover a certain area that is one of the most arid regions of the world 15 years ago. It was going to be dismantled and that would have erased an important chapter of human history. These areas are actually proof of what the saltpetre business was like in Chile up until the 70s of this past century and we talk about the human capacity as well to transform a hostile area into a habitable area with immigrants that came from all over, that created that *pampinos* culture that was quite unique in nature. The workers who also fought for labor rights within the region.

In 1970, the first step was made for the protection of this when it was declared a historic monument under Chilean law and there was also a movement to rescue the work and in 2005 the World Heritage put it on the Danger List as a strategy as a way to try to deal with the vulnerable situation in which the property found itself and then the commitment that has been taken on by the State has continually worked towards the conservation of this site.

In 2013, in that meeting that was carried out by the World Heritage Committee in Cambodia, we came up with a five-year plan that was fulfilled successfully in each one of the stages focusing specifically on integrated management. We came up with a priority plan that was based on the technical aspects needed for conservation of the property that was turned into a place that would be able to bring visitors and researchers from all over the world and now has a management plan that has been updated and there are security measures, stabilization as well and we have increased the protection area with a buffer zone that allows us to conserve all of the cultural landscape associated with this property. We have also been able to recover original spaces in order to disseminate information but the process of working with saltpeter, and this is the first step in being able to work in the conservation, management and research of both this site as well as other saltpeter sites throughout the world that are included in this particular protection area and the rescue of the saltpeter works and keeping in account their outstanding universal value and able to take into account that particular way of living in that area that offers a certain dynamism to the area and also contributes to conservation of World Heritage which is invaluable for the *pampinos* and for the people of Chile as well as for the entire world.

This progress shows that the Danger List is actually an effective tool to be able to focus the efforts of Member States and local communities in order to come up with effective conservation of the sites that are actually listed and this is an important for Chile and we would like to mention once again our gratitude to the World Heritage Committee as well as to the Advisory Bodies and the regional government and the Saltpeter Works Corporation as well as to the *pampinos* themselves who are keeping the memory alive thanks to which the relevance of this chapter of our history is actually recessed today and can reach future generations as well. Thank you very much to you and everyone else *[applause]*.

H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan) resumes the Chair.

The Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would also like to join in congratulating the State Parties of Chile and Palestine for these great achievements and very good examples for all others to go forward in protecting the heritage as required of the international laws. Thank you very much for these

beautiful achievements. Now I would like to invite I now invite Mr Moreno to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The following four properties from the Latin American and Caribbean region and their relevant decisions are proposed for adoption without discussion: City of Potosi, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo in Panama, Chan Chan Archaeological Zone in Peru and Coro and its Port from the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. That's all for the Latin American and Caribbean region, Mr Chairperson. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any objections from Members of the Committee to this list? I don't see any so I declare decisions read out adopted. Thank you very much. I would now like to ask whether any Observer delegation would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decision without discussion? Are there any proposals? Wishes? I don't see any. Thank you. Now I invite Mr Stehl to read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Please, you are welcome.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. I will now read the list of the sites proposed for adoption without discussion: Old Towns of Djenné (Mali), Timbuktu (Mali), Tomb of the Askia (Mali) and Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda). Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Members of the Committee, I don't see any objections, any other opinion so I declare the decisions approved. Thank you. Any interventions from representatives of the countries? Thank you very much. So we consider this item fulfilled in whole today.

Chairperson:

Now I would like to return to the decision done yesterday on Item 5D where we had some matters to be discussed. Was there time to read the information submitted by Angola and the Republic of Tanzania on this matter? I think it was delivered and everyone had time to see it. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. En fait, comme il nous a été recommandé hier, nous avons partagé le document, donc tous les membres ont reçu le document. Il y a eu quelques consultations avec certains membres du Comité pour faciliter notre travail. Ce que nous voulons dire est que le document qui a été rendu disponible est un document approuvé par l'Union africaine. Ce document n'est pas objet d'examen, c'est-à-dire que c'est un document qui est officiel, donc il n'a pas été rendu disponible pour que ça soit discuté. Ce que nous demandons au Comité c'est de prendre note que ce document existe. C'est un document qui peut toujours être utilisé, parce qu'il est public, pour faire avancer nos discussions par rapport à cet important sujet sur la conservation du patrimoine et le développement durable. Donc cela est l'essentiel de la demande que l'Afrique est en train de faire par rapport à ce document. Au vu de cela, nous avons, comme je le disais, fait quelques consultations et nous avons envoyé, en fonction des résultats de ces consultations, les nouveaux amendements qui ont été faits sur le projet de décision, notamment sur le point 7, et il y a également un nouveau paragraphe qu'on a rajouté, qui est le point 15. Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Do we have some amendments and new version to this?

Rapporteur:

Mr Chairperson, we haven't received those additional amendments.

Chairperson:

In this case I would like to propose the following: as far as I am informed there are still some Items to be discussed between the delegations and I hope that you will come to an agreement to the final decision on this Item during this evening and tomorrow morning. Maybe we will return to this matter tomorrow before the end of the morning session to give an opportunity for that. Burkina Faso wanted...

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. C'est justement pour souligner les consultations constructives que le groupe a eues avec les autres membres du Comité et, comme l'a indiqué l'Angola, ces amendements ont été largement acceptés. C'est vrai, comme vous l'avez relevé, que ça n'a pas été communiqué pour l'instant, certainement par erreur, mais est-ce que ce ne serait pas mieux de projeter la décision et de les apporter, puisque ce sont juste des paragraphes qui sont biffés ; il n'y a pas d'ajout en dehors du paragraphe 15. Est-ce qu'il ne serait pas mieux de finir avec le point en apportant juste ces légers amendements, comme cela a été indiqué ? Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Actually we wanted to support your proposal in the sense that we understand now that there have been consultations going on. We have unfortunately not taken part in these consultations but we would like to, because we believe there is a slight contradiction with an already adopted paragraph and what was proposed so we would very much like to have the chance to also join these informal discussions to be sure that we have a text that everyone can agree on in the end. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie:

Monsieur le Président, la Tunisie s'en tient à votre proposition de report jusqu'à demain pour donner plus de chance au texte d'être abouti de la manière la plus consensuelle.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

I think that the support for this proposal is reasonable. We will give opportunity for everyone to discuss and look through the document once more and make necessary consultations so the proposal is the following. If you don't mind, we will approve that tomorrow before we will end our morning session somewhere at 12:30 p.m. we will pass to the discussion of this Item and accordingly paragraph 8 on the file on Turkana Lake proposed by China. So we will have two questions to be discussed before the end of the morning session tomorrow. We will start with

our agenda according to the proposed and approved timetable in the morning. So if we don't have any amendments and comments we agree on that. Now before finishing our session 10 minutes earlier than scheduled I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre :

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. There are some announcements to be made. These are also on the screens. There is first of all from 6-8 p.m. the introduction to UNESCO World Heritage Journeys, the Platform for Sustainable Tourism which is in Room B2. Then there is Conservation and Regeneration of World Heritage Cities which is the Aga Khan Trust in Room A6 and then from 6-8 Climate Vulnerability Index by ICOMOS in Room B3 in addition to the exhibitions. Il y a une réunion d'experts arabes de 18 heures à 19 heures dans la salle B7. And of course, the Chairperson cordially invites you to the Bureau meeting tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. On behalf of the host country I would like to propose to you to participate at the opening of the exhibition in our State Carpet Museum. There you will see some artefacts brought from the Louvre Museum connected with the history and craft in Azerbaijan. So you are most welcome at 7:30 at the State Carpet Museum, which is just at the seaside. Thank you very much and see you all tomorrow at 10 o'clock. We will start at 10 o'clock sharp. Bureau members please be in the room we usually have the meeting at 9:30. Thank you.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

THIRD DAY – Wednesday 3 July 2019

FIFTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, honorable Members of the Committee, States Parties, NGOs, representatives and everyone who is participating. We are starting the third day of our Committee's meeting and we will proceed according to the schedule and agenda, which we confirmed during the first session. I would like to remind you that we agreed to return to the two Items still open for discussion to be approved. This is scenario Item 5D, continuation. This one and the other one is scenario 7A 12 Lake Turkana, one paragraph to be discussed at the end of the morning session. We will start it at 12:30 p.m. Please take a seat. So, we return to our agenda.

Like for Item 7A, we will first discuss the reports concerning natural properties, followed by mixed and then cultural properties. The regions will be presented in the same regional order as for Item 7A. First, Arab States, second, Asia and the Pacific, third, Europe and North America, four, Latin American and the Caribbean, five, Africa and we will follow this guide. But before we start this discussion we had in the morning at the Bureau one proposal from Norway. I consider that we have to listen to it now to facilitate our working procedure during these next days. Please, Norway, the floor is yours.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson, for giving over the floor. The Norwegian delegation now has serious concerns with all the state of conservations that have been open and also the fact that we haven't seen the justifications or the amendments to the draft resolutions yet. This is not good practice and weakens the dialogue of the Committee Members and the States Parties concerned. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for this proposal. I think that our Rapporteur has something to say.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just a request to Committee Members, when they submit amendments if they could please mark all the changes to the draft decision in track changes or highlighted. That helps the Rapporteur but it's also good for transparency for other Committee Members and States Parties. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just to briefly we would align ourselves with the intervention by the delegation of Norway. We do agree that it is incredibly difficult for us as Committee Members to be able to effectively consider the state of conservation reports. Of course, having studied them previously but we always must be giving priority to those which are being opened for discussion and this trend of opening properties for discussion very late in the piece without having been given a very clear rationale as to why this is happening means that as Committee

Members we are not in the best position to be able to make considered comments on those dossiers and in particular where there are draft decisions being circulated very late in the piece or amendments to draft decision being circulated very late in the piece, it doesn't give us the opportunity for proper consideration of those proposals. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Ms Rössler, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. This was discussed as the Chairperson just noted in the Bureau and I would like to inform you that INF.7.Rev.4 was then distributed and we got for most sites the reasons why it should be opened except for one and if my information is correct it was the delegation of Brazil requesting the opening of Valparaíso. Maybe, Brazil can share with the Committee why they wish to open this Item. Thank you.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We have proposed to open the site because there has been a relevant evolution in this matter which we believe should be brought to the knowledge of this Committee and this evolution regards especially the plan of development for the area which is being conducted by the government of Chile as required by Chilean law. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we would like to take this proposal into consideration to facilitate our work in future and we would like to apply to the delegations for clarification. It's better to be submitted in written just for delegates to concern a sense of that. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson and good morning to all colleagues. We just wanted to add our voice on behalf of the head of my delegation to Norway and Australia in saying that we find that our work is really, really difficult when the state of conservation reports are being opened at the last minute without giving sufficient time for the experts to consider all the related documentation? Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

So I consider that there is certain understanding of delegations and they are applied to make it easier while opening the discussion to be prepared better. That is why I recommend and advise to all the Committee Members who consider it necessary to open discussion to provide us with a written explanation in advance. Thank you very much. Now we are going for the discussion of the Items and I would like to invite Mr Guy Debonnet, Chief of the Nature, Tourism and Outreach Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Arab States region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and good morning. We only have one property proposed for adoption without discussion for the Arab States natural property and that is Socotra Archipelago in Yemen. Thank you.

Chairperson:

If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report I declare that the decision read out, adopted. Thank you very much. I would now like to ask whether any

Observer delegation would like to express themselves? I don't see any. Thank you very much. I invite Mr Guy Debonnet and IUCN to present the reports on the state of conservation of the natural properties located in the Asia-Pacific Region and opened for discussion.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We start with the Sundarbans in Bangladesh. The report on this property can be found in document 7B.Add on page 8 in the English version and page 7 of the French version. The main concern for this property continues to be the possible impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value as a result of different industrial developments in its vicinity. The construction the Rampal coal-fired power plant is reported to be ongoing despite the request of the Committee to consider alternative solutions. As mentioned in previous reports, the power plant could result in significant downstream impacts on the property arising from air and water pollution, a substantial increase in shipping and dredging, and an additional removal of freshwater from an already increasingly saline environment.

In addition, numerous other industrial developments are being approved and are already underway in the vicinity of the property. It should be recalled that the Committee in decision 41 COM 7B.25 requested the State Party to ensure that no large-scale industrial and/or infrastructure developments are allowed to proceed before a strategic environmental assessment for the southwest region of Bangladesh including the World Heritage property has been completed. Unfortunately, two years later work on this assessment has not yet started. According to the information received from the State Party in June 2019, the consultant company to conduct the strategic environmental assessment is still under recruitment.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the continuation of the construction of the Rampal power plant as well as other industrial developments proceeding in the absence of the strategic environmental assessment, together with numerous other industrial projects represent both a potential and ascertained danger to the OUV of the property and to the ecological and hydrological dynamics which underpin the OUV and its integrity. It is therefore recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It is further recommended that the State Party is requested to invite a joint World Heritage Centre-IUCN reactive monitoring mission to assist the State Party in the preparation of a set of corrective measures and the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre secured in 2017 a small amount of funding from the UNESCO Netherlands Fund-in-Trust to ensure that the relevant processes under the 1972 Convention are taken into account in the preparation of the SEA. Unfortunately so far this project has not been implemented yet by the Bangladesh authorities.

Finally, yesterday here in the room the Director of the World Heritage Centre received a petition signed by 50,000 people calling on the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, and I quote, "to list the Sundarbans as a World Heritage site in Danger and send a message that people must come before coal." Mr Chairperson, I would like to give the floor IUCN to give some additional explanations.

Chairperson:

IUCN, please.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. IUCN wishes to emphasize the importance of a strategic environmental assessment as a tool to assist best practice decision-making, which allows the assessment of wider cumulative impacts of developments on the Outstanding Universal Value of the Sundarbans World Heritage property. As with an EIA and SEA should be undertaken

before decisions on projects and plans have been made. In this respect the ongoing construction of the Rampal coal-fired power plant and the continued absence of an SEA is of major concern.

IUCN has been pleased to engage in open dialogue with the State Party of Bangladesh in meetings just prior to the 43rd session of the Committee, which has provided additional information including on the SEA process. IUCN thanks the State Party of Bangladesh for discussing the proposed amendments to the draft decision text during this session.

However, IUCN strongly stands by the original text. IUCN is in agreement with the World Heritage Centre in considering that the Rampal power plant in the absence of an SEA, construction of two additional power plants on the Payra River and numerous other industrial projects represent both an ascertained and potential danger to the OUV of the property and recommend the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN stands willing and ready to assist the State Party with the preparation of a set of corrective measures on the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I would like to open the floor for the expression of the views. I see Norway. Please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Sundarbans mangrove forest is an extraordinary ecosystem providing habitats for endangered species as well as invaluable ecosystem services for the people of Bangladesh. Millions of people rely on the Sundarbans ecosystem for their livelihoods and for its protection from climate change induced threats. The IUCN analysis along with scientific evidence clearly demonstrates that severe and certain threats caused by the Rampal coal-fired power plant, a project that has continued without any assessment of its impact on the World Heritage property's values despite previous requests by the Committee. Over 150 industrial projects are also active upstream of the sites and their associated shipping and dredging activities further threaten its hydrological and ecological dynamics. It is our responsibility of Committee Members to voice our support to protect this precious World Heritage property and we find the decision to inscribe the Sundarbans on the World Heritage List in Danger both appropriate and necessary and we support the draft decision in its entire form. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like to make a few comments about our proposed amendments. The first is that we understand that the Government of Bangladesh is committed to all of the measures for protecting and conserving the integrity of this site. We can remember that at the meeting Krakow when various measures were taken, activities undertaken, promised for that and we think those actions that were undertaken at that point should be recognized. We also think that the power plant that we are talking about is actually outside of the buffer zone, which is actually quite far away from the site.

We've been talking since yesterday about finding a balance between development and conservation especially for emerging countries and along these lines to allow this State to be

able to fulfil its goals of sustainable development we have to make sure that these power plants, we have to take into account that 70,000 megawatts of electricity that they are producing will be of great benefit to some 50M people. It will also help the country to leave its state of poverty. All of this together with the commitment of the State Party for conservation and preservation of the site, taken that into account, we hope that the Committee will see favorably the amendments that we submit for your approval. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We understand that the State Party has taken several initiatives for the protection and conservation of the World Heritage property. These measures have had positive impact on the property as has been duly acknowledge. The draft amendment proposed by Cuba deserves a favorable consideration of the Committee and we would like to support this amendment proposal. One of the important decisions of the 41st session of this Committee was the conduct of a strategic environmental assessment by the State Party. We take note that Bangladesh has already initiated the process and we hope that it will be completed within a specific timeframe. In this context the State Party may consider taking technical support of the World Heritage Centre regarding the conduct of the strategic environmental assessment or the capacity building towards the preparation of the SEA. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Chairperson, the United Republic of Tanzania also appreciates the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body for the report on this state of conservation on this particular property. We commend the effort of the State Party for their compliance with decision 41 COM 7B.25 to a large extent. Tanzania also believes that the State cannot be denied its legitimate right to economic development, while paying due attention to the sustainability of the environment. More importantly, the State Party has demonstrated not only a strong commitment to the conservation of the heritage site, but has undertaken numerous effective measures for conservation of the property. In this particular respect the mitigation measures for any likely impact of coal-based power plant are based on the environmental impact assessment of the project and the systematic implementation of the respective environmental management plan that will duly address the issue of the potential air and water pollution.

In this particular regard, the draft amendment proposed by Cuba reflects a balanced approach to allow the State Party to undertake economic development activities that at the same time provide effective measures to address any potential adverse impacts of this activity on the property. The amendment clearly manifests a desire on the State Party to constructively engage with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN toward attaining their collective goal of conservation of the site. In this regard, therefore, we support the amendment to the draft decision as proposed by Cuba and supported by other delegations including China and other delegations that have spoken before us. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. Bangladesh is a developing country and has recorded impressive growth in recent years. Being a frontline country to combat climate change, Bangladesh deserves appreciation for its proactive merits, plans and strategies to address these challenges. We would like to join other Committee Members to commend that State Party of Bangladesh for having taken several initiatives and actions in line with the decision taken at the 41st session of the Committee for the protection and conservation of the heritage. These actions need to be recognized and duly reflected in the Committee decision.

Dear Committee Members, your Excellency dear Chairperson, I humbly ask you for your consideration for the following four reasons: first, the projects are being constructed in compliance with the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission of 2016 using the ultra-supercritical technology; these are being developed with the state-of-the-art technology adopting all mitigation matters and complying with emission guidelines prescribed by the World Bank, IFC, etc., for similar projects. Secondly, the power plants are located outside the buffer zone. These projects are implemented following all legal requirements and in full compliance with environmental related laws of the State Party of Bangladesh. Necessary mitigating matters have been put in place to guard against any potential adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Thirdly, the State Party has ensured environmental friendly transportation of coal to the plant sites.

Last but not least, as discussed many times during the Committee during the past two days, we need to strike a balance between economic growth and environmental sustainability. The State Party of Bangladesh has done a lot in recent years to initiate lots of progress with relation to strategic environmental assessment and expresses its commitment to implement the recommendations by the Advisory Bodies.

Therefore, it is China's position to recommend to the Committee to not rush to a decision to inscribe this very important property on the List of world Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Chairperson for your attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Voilà un autre exemple qui se présente devant nous pour faire évoluer nos réflexions par rapport à cet équilibre entre la conservation et le développement durable. Dans le cas du Bangladesh, c'est un autre exemple. Donc l'Angola aimerait qu'on accorde la parole à l'État partie pour apporter des précisions ou des informations additionnelles par rapport aux recommandations qui ont été faites par l'UICN, en fonction de l'évaluation qui a été faite sur le terrain. Et comme nous en discutons toutes ces dernières années, le point du dialogue ouvert entre les États parties et les organes consultatifs, ce sont des exemples qui nous interpellent, pour qu'il y ait sérieusement des échanges, qu'il y ait sérieusement du dialogue, pour éviter justement que le bien ne se retrouve sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en danger. Donc le but, la motivation de tous les États parties et évidemment du Comité du patrimoine mondial c'est de voir ce bien demeurer sur la Liste du patrimoine et avancer de plus en plus vers la conservation de leur valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Nous demandons donc à l'État partie d'apporter des éléments complémentaires qui nous permettront de pouvoir appuyer ou non leur position. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would like to thank the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the analysis and conclusion of the state of conservation report submitted by Bangladesh. We commend the State Party for the actions taken in compliance with the earlier decision of the Committee, particularly with regard to the protection and conservation of the heritage list.

Mr Chairperson, we would like to add our voice to support the amendment proposed by Cuba and supported by Bosnia and Herzegovina and China. The analysis provided in this document clearly shows the actions taken by the State Party towards the conservation of the site as well as taking necessary mitigating measures against possible impact of the construction of three power plants. The State Party has not only complied with the previous decision of the Committee and taken into account the recommendation of the reactive monitoring mission in 2016, but has also taken other measures that have positive impacts on Sundarbans.

Mr Chairperson, we would like to remind the Member States that we have the responsibility to ensure that in the name of the protection of the environment and the conservation of the heritage site we do not deny the State Party its legitimate right to economic development.

Mr Chairperson, in conclusion we would like to support the proposed amendment and adding this to the draft decision. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Mr Chairperson, I have taken the floor to support the amendment tabled by Cuba and supported by Bosnia and Herzegovina, China and other countries.

Chairperson, we have carefully studied the information provided in the document that lists several positive measures taken by the State Party in compliance with the decisions of the 41st session of the Committee as well as the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission in 2016. These measures have positively impacted on the World Heritage property. The concern regarding potential adverse impact on air and water quality due to the construction of power plants appears to us to be unrealistic and unreasonable. The State Party initiated the project after doing an environmental impact assessment and took protective measures identified in the impact assessment report. It is important Mr Chairperson, to note that these plants are located well outside the buffer zone and most importantly the power plants would generate some 7,000 megawatts of electricity, electricity that is needed for economic transformation, electricity that will benefit over 50M people, Bangladeshi citizens. We need to acknowledge the legitimate right of States Parties to undertake development work for the benefit of their citizens while taking into account—it's true—the principle of sustainability of universal value of the property. This can be achieved using appropriate technologies.

The amendment, in our view, is balanced. It allows the State Party to carry out its legitimate mandate of developing its country and it pays due regard to the environmental sustainability. I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Hungary really appreciates the efforts made by the State Party to protect this unique site with a lot of flagship species and habitats in Bangladesh. However, we

would like to first of all have a general observation stating that any kind of assessment especially strategic assessments which are submitted after infrastructure and development have been implemented this kind of assessment have a limited effectiveness, if any.

Secondly, although these major or minor developments really take place out of the property they are still in the water catchment area so we cannot forget about the downstream effects of these developments.

On behalf of Hungary I would like to apologize for the last minute submission of an amendment to this agenda item in which we would like to reach another balance in keeping all the elements of the draft decision, which we consider as crucial for the future of this property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Kuwait would like to convey its appreciation to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for its analysis and conclusion drawn on the state of conservation of the natural heritage property. We note that the Advisory Body welcomes the actions taken by the State Party such as the implementation of the freshwater flow management, the Tiger Action Plan and the Recovery Plan, assurance by the State Party to undertake the environmental impact assessment to the dredging of the Pashur River.

If I may, Mr Chairperson we are talking about an infrastructure project that would produce electricity of 7000 megawatts, one third of the country's production. The counter argument is to use better alternative energy resources. As my colleagues and Committee Members know the largest solar panel that exists in the world just opened a few weeks ago produced only one seventh of that, 1000 megawatts. That's the largest existing solar panel in the United Arab Emirates. It has over 3M solar panels just to produce 1000 megawatts. Also, if you look at the United Nation SDGs, the 17 SDGs, SDG 1 is no poverty. How can we implement SDG 1, no poverty without implementing or providing electricity? There is also SDG 9, industry innovation to create small and medium business. How can we do that if we don't lift people up out of poverty? This is not a luxury infrastructure. We are not building commercial space. This electricity is meeting basic human needs.

So the State of Kuwait would like to support the amendment proposed by Cuba because this is meeting the basic needs of the people of Bangladesh. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le cas que nous étudions nous remet devant une situation à laquelle ce Comité a été confronté à plusieurs reprises, celle de la nécessité de protéger les sites, de protéger le patrimoine, puisqu'inscrit sur la liste du patrimoine universel, mais également de regarder la situation objective des États face aux défis de développement. Je ne crois pas que dans la Charte et dans la Constitution de l'UNESCO, où on parle de construire la paix dans l'esprit des hommes et des femmes, nous pouvons la construire sans le bien-être, et c'est la responsabilité de ceux qui conduisent les affaires publiques dans ces pays-là. Donc nous regardons ce dossier avec beaucoup d'attention, et d'ailleurs on doit remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial, et l'UICN aussi, sur la qualité du rapport qui attire notre attention sur la réalité de ce dossier. Mais il y a dans la balance la question de la protection, les contraintes de la protection, et aussi les nécessités du développement économique et social. Il y a

beaucoup d'éléments factuels qui nous ont été avancés, notamment relatifs aux centrales électriques ; d'ailleurs, je crois qu'il serait utile pour ce Comité d'écouter l'État partie répondre sur notamment les deux nouvelles centrales électriques dont il a été question, et il nous apporterait peut-être un éclairage sur la vue prospective qui est la sienne quant à ménager à la fois la protection du site et veiller au développement économique et social de cette région.

Au nom de la Tunisie je m'interroge aussi, y a-t-il eu, depuis 2016, d'autres missions ou projets de mission ? En tout état de cause, notre position est de soutenir la proposition d'amendement introduite par Cuba. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Indonesia would like to thank the Advisory Body for its report on the state of conservation of the Sundarbans in Bangladesh. We would like to express appreciation to the State Party's commitment in addressing the issues affecting the property. The State Party has taken several issues in compliance with the recommendations of the 2016 reactive monitoring mission and the decision of the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee. Mr Chairperson, our commitment for the implementation of the Convention is indisputable. However, the implementation of the Convention should not disregard the need and right of the State Party to undertake development plans for the benefit of its people. In this regard, Indonesia seconds the previous statements by Committee Members that a balanced approach of sustainable development goals, consisting of economic, social and environmental pillars need to be taken into serious consideration. Indonesia supports the Sundarbans not to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Kyrgyzstan would like to thank the Advisory Bodies for the provided report and we would like to point out that the mere fact that development projects are located outside of the buffer zone doesn't necessarily mean that those projects would not have an adverse effect on the properties and that is why Kyrgyzstan would like to highlight the importance of strategic environmental assessment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We support the amendment of Cuba. Bosnia and Herzegovina understands the need for Bangladesh to achieve a balance between the development and preservation of valuable parts of nature including the World Heritage property. We appreciate the efforts of the State Party to govern this area in an integrated way including proactive actions and measures listed in document WHC/19/43.COM 7B.Add. The main fact that we understand from the document is that Bangladesh is in the process of preparing a strategic environmental assessment. We support the efforts of Bangladesh to complete this process in accordance with the national legislation and the requirements of this Convention. We would like to hear more clarification from the State Party about their plans and measures to mitigate the impact of that construction in case the SEA shows if it's possible regarding the vicinity of the World Heritage property. We also would strongly recommend firm monitoring of the species in the

Sundarbans mangrove forest to be done by the State Party as well as close involvement of IUCN as the Advisory Body of this Convention. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Zimbabwe would like to commend the State Party of Bangladesh for its efforts to comply with the decisions of the Committee. The decision by the Government of Bangladesh to more than double the area of three wildlife sanctuaries to cover the area beyond the property's boundaries is commendable. The socioeconomic challenges faced by Bangladesh are not different from the challenges faced by all developing countries in reconciling development and heritage management. Zimbabwe therefore supports the amendments to the draft decision proposed by Cuba, China and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia thanks IUCN for its comprehensive evaluation of the state of conservation of the property. Australia appreciates the actions taken by the State Party to conserve the OUV of the property. Australia acknowledges the need to balance between sustainable development and the conservation of OUV, but believes that development needs to be preceded by strategic environmental assessments of development of the OUV of the property. Australia notes the proposed amendment by Hungary and we note that there are some profound differences between that amendment and the amendment proposed by Cuba and others. We request therefore the consideration of amendments start with the draft decision developed by IUCN. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Notre délégation remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'IUCN pour le rapport portant sur le dossier concernant les Sundarbans de Bangladesh. Cependant, nous pensons que l'État partie du Bangladesh a pris plusieurs initiatives pour la préservation du bien au bénéfice des populations, suivant les recommandations de notre Comité. Ce faisant, Monsieur le Président, notre délégation souscrit à l'amendement proposé par Cuba et soutenu par plusieurs États parties. Aussi, Monsieur le Président, notre délégation souhaiterait que vous donniez la parole à l'État partie pour répondre aux questions posées par les différentes parties. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. It's clear that all of us believe that we have to strike a balance between safeguarding a World Heritage site and the right to development for people who want to go down that road. The IUCN report is very objective and very well prepared but we think that the State Party has undertaken efforts and that much is clear. But in striking that balance we want a real balance; we don't want to just force a decision

between one or the other. If we want a true balance, it has to actually address both issues. In other words, this SEA needs to be undertaken as is the case with all projects. We've already seen this in the African cases for example. And to strike a balance also between the various stakeholders involved and that is why we support the Cuban proposal but at the same time we think Hungary's proposal might actually acknowledge all of the efforts that need to be taken and therefore strike a real balance and therefore not just pay lip service to balance. Because on the one hand we are talking about people's right to development and on the other hand protecting a World Heritage site.

Obviously, these two need to be very careful to strike a meaningful balance because if we look at the text themselves we would see that what is required is a great deal of objectivity and it's very difficult to take a stance on this so meeting these objectives is a very difficult thing and the difficult task before us is how to really dovetail the two. But the texts are there in the Hungarian one and the Cuban one and so I think what we have to do is find the optimal arrangement between those and we want the Committee to be as objective as possible and we want to make sure that both parts are given due consideration. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Guatemala.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. We would like to acknowledge all the work and endeavors undertaken by the State Party of Bangladesh to adhere to the recommendations issued by IUCN. In this regard, we are aware that we cannot ask any country to hold its development ambitions. In any developing country we are very aware that plants that are going to produce one third of the country's electricity are projects of great scale and this has to be offset by the protection of the OUV of the property and that is why we like both Spain's suggestion and Australia's.

In other words, we want to look carefully at all the proposed amendments so that we can calibrate our position and the Guatemalan delegation would be able to support but we don't see them as being an either or situation. What we do see is that striking that balance between development and safeguarding of OUV needs to be found for this valuable property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So there is no request from the Committee Members? Everyone has expressed their opinion? I would like to give the floor to the State Party, Bangladesh to answer the questions just to inform.

The Observer Delegation of Bangladesh:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Let me first thank you and the country of Azerbaijan, such a beautiful place and such wonderful people. I listened to the deliberations, and Mr Chairperson, it would take a lifetime to answer all the questions. But then let me try to at least give you a feel to what we are up to. You see those white lines going down the green pages? You call them rivers, we call them mothers because Bangladesh is nourished by rivers and it is a very small and big country. You see that white patch of Sundarbans? You go 100km north you reach the capital city of Dhaka. You go 50km west and you meet the border to India. We are just about the size of Azerbaijan. The only difference is that you have 10M people and we have 160M people. So the challenge between development and environmental conservation is a huge challenge for us and we are up to that challenge. Distinguished delegates our Prime Minister has been acclaimed as the champion of the earth because of initiatives taken to conserve and at the same time develop the country. We have a growth rate of about 8% GDP.

Infant mortality has gone down, maternal mortality has gone down, and nutrition has improved. All the girls go to school; in secondary level the girls are ahead of the boys. This is some of the story and these projects you are talking about form a part of that story.

The projects that we are talking about, first, they are outside the buffer zone of Sundarbans. Secondly, when the reactive monitoring team came in 2016 they looked at all the scientific challenges and one of the crucial recommendations of that monitoring team was that we could overcome all these challenges if we had ultra-supercritical technology for producing electricity out of coal. We have done exactly that; it is state-of-the-art technology. It has cost us very dearly. The stack for example is 275m high. It has cost us extra money. We are using desulphurisation. That has cost us extra money. We are trying to lower emissions. That has cost us extra money. But we do that because we love Sundarbans; it is a part of life, it is a part of our heritage. It's not only a World Heritage site. It has been a part of our civilization. For example, with these power plants and development will take pleasure from Sundarbans. A lot of people have their livelihood with Sundarbans. So we kept that in view. We give fishermen allowances so that they don't fish during the breeding season. Sundarbans biomass has increased over time. The Tiger population has increased over time. So by answering in short phrases there we are trying to strike a balance like any other developing country. We do conservation of nature and development. And this is one good example where we all can focus and very humbly speaking learn from of it. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Minister for the explanation. Now, India. Two minutes, please.

The Observer Delegation of India:

Thank you, Chairperson for giving us the floor. India commends the activities of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for preservation and conservation of the OUV of the Sundarbans. We appreciate comments made as reflected in the state of conservation report by the concerned State Party Bangladesh. The State Party has just now eloquently portrayed the situation for us to understand. I feel that as a developing country, Bangladesh is dealing with climate change challenges effectively. As we know, there are proactive and effective measures taken by the State Party for protection and conservation of nature as a whole. In the past 10 years, the country has attained commendable economic development while respecting environmental sustainability. As regards Sundarbans, my country India and the State Party of Bangladesh are working closely to enhance the transboundary collaboration to conserve tigers in the Sundarbans. A joint working group has been formed with a view to assess the impact climate change on the ecosystem of the Sundarbans. I won't go into details because of time. Taking into account the strong commitment by and the effective measures taken by the State Party, we feel that the recommendation to inscribe the property on the in Danger List is not justified, because the emissions are well within the standards and the stoppage of work would cause grave economic damage to the Mongla and Khulna region and loss of livelihood for hundreds of employees and companies in the area. We should clearly underline that upgrading the level on the in Danger List would be problematic for ensuring the right balance to ensure affordable energy and environmental sustainability and to address the measures of SDG 7. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have the representative from the NGO Save the Sundarbans. Two minutes.

Observer NGO (Save the Sundarbans):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and also thank all of you for paying attention to this very important issue. My name is Sajed Kamal. I grew up in Bangladesh and I live in Boston and Bangladesh;

I make my home in both places and I've been teaching in sustainable and international development at Brandeis University for 20 years focusing on renewable energy. I very much feel that we are one with the State government in terms of the importance of development of the country as well as preserving Sundarbans. What we are really hoping is that the development should be in accordance with the United Nations Development Goals which is, economic and environmental development should go hand-in-hand which by definition warns us taking a non-renewable path because the world is moving away from it and our concern is that Bangladesh is becoming a dumping ground for rejected technologies that are no longer functional and inappropriate for anywhere in the world.

Secondly, Sundarbans is protected and we want to protect it, and I trust that the Bangladesh government also has the same sentiment and cares about it. The challenge is that it should be done the proper way any activities taking place. Our concern is that the recommendation of the last monitoring mission was that SEA should be taking place before any industrial activities take place but it has been taking place. There are over 175 industrial plants already constructed and the power plant is under construction. The monitoring mission recommendation was that until the SEA has been done no construction should be taking place. If it does it should be put on the in Danger List. But construction is going on and SEA has not taken place.

We have read the draft decision very closely. It is very different from the original draft decision originally written and recommended. We urge—please let us sit together and go over the draft to see that the draft hasn't been altered but rather amended. What it shows is that it has been altered to a point that it is a very different draft than what was originally submitted by IUCN.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Thank you very much. So we have the draft decision and we have two amendments accordingly from different countries: one from Cuba, Bosnia Herzegovina and China, the other one from Hungary. So I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur. Sorry, IUCN wants to say something.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. The Centre first will respond to some of the comments and then IUCN. I just want to note that several delegations mentioned that positive developments are taking place at the site and I think these were also acknowledged in the report and in the draft decision. However, the key concern remains that the industrial development is proceeding without the strategic environmental assessment, which has not even started, and that this Committee at its 41st session requested the State Party to ensure that no large-scale developments are allowed before the SEA was completed.

Finally, I want to respond to the comment of several delegations that the power plant is far away from the property and outside the buffer zone. This is of course true. At the same time, the hydrological system of the Sundarbans is such that the hydrological connection and also the coal for the power plant will probably be shipped in and has to go through the waterway with a lot of danger in terms of accidents and other problems.

The point of sustainable development is often raised by the Committee Members. I think we have to go back to the policy paper on World Heritage on Sustainable Development, which advocates for development projects to be promoted without affecting the Outstanding Universal Value. Thank you. And IUCN has some additional points.

Chairperson:

Please.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. IUCN didn't detect any specific questions back to us but just to reiterate we stand by our original draft decision and the recommendation while recognizing the very legitimate development aspirations of the State Party of Bangladesh. In this particular case, this is though we should remember a World Heritage site and the World Heritage Convention and we contend that the World Heritage in Danger List is in fact the very mechanism, which should be applied here in recognition of a place, which in fact is so special. As my colleague said, the large-scale nature of this system with its high levels of hydrological and ecological connectivity is an issue. We have a very high-pressured development context, which is pressing and threatening this site. Our position is also that the SEA needs to be the appropriate mechanisms to consider prior to decisions on large infrastructure and to understand the combined and cumulative impacts of these 150+ developments in the context of the property. We are concerned that we have not seen the SEA produced for the last two years, and while we understand that moves are now happening to engage consultants to prepare the SEA, we understand that will take another two years before that is finalized, so we there is a sense of urgency here and again we really pledge our support to work with the State Party through the mechanism of the Danger Listing provisions within the Operational Guidelines to work collaboratively and cooperatively on the ground with Bangladesh. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have two amendments and I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur to update us.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I think the Rapporteur has got here first real challenge with this one. We've got two significant amendments, one from Cuba, Bosnia and Herzegovina and China and others supporting that decision on the floor and another one proposed by Hungary.

What we will do is just go through the entire decision, not word for word but to give Committee Members a view of both of those amendments and then I would suggest that we might want to adopt those paragraph-by-paragraph.

The first three paragraphs are un-amended by either party. Paragraph 4, there is an addition suggested by Cuba and others and that is just at the end of the paragraph which would read, further requests the State Party to provide information on dredging activities. Then there is a new paragraph 5 proposed by Cuba, Bosnia and Herzegovina and China which Welcomes the State Party's actions, such as the implementation of the integrated freshwater inflow management plan, the implementation of Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART), the development of the Tiger Action Plan (2018-2027) and National Tiger Recovery Programme (NTRP), expansion of the wildlife sanctuaries and the adoption of Bangladesh Delta Plan 2100 to protect and expand the Sundarbans.

We then move on to the former paragraph 5, which both sets of amendments propose different versions on. Hungary's proposal is to remove the start of the paragraph and start with, Notes with great concern the likely environmental impacts of current and future large-scale industrial projects—removing the power plant—on the property's OUV, etc. The other alternative for former paragraph 5 is, Expresses concern about the likely environmental impacts of future large-scale industrial projects around the Sundarbans on the OUV and urges the State Party to continue to take all necessary mitigation measures as may be recommended by the SEA study to address the concerns previously expressed by the Committee in the 2016 Joint World Heritage Centre IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission.

The next proposal is for the former paragraph 6, which is proposed to be deleted by Cuba, Bosnia and Herzegovina and China so they propose to delete that. Hungary proposes to keep that but with some amendment at the end, which you can see—instead of strongly urges would be to reiterate its request, but that is proposed for deletion by the others.

Former paragraph 7 is proposed for deletion I believe by both amendments. And then we move on to a new proposed paragraph which you can see before you, Considering the importance of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in determining any ascertained and potential danger on hydrological and ecological dynamics which underpin the OUV of the property, appreciates the confirmation by the State Party of conducting an SEA for the southwest region of Bangladesh, and urges the State Party to ensure that future large scale industrial and/or infrastructural developments will not be allowed to proceed before the SEA has been completed in conformity with international standards and requests the State Party to submit a copy of the SEA to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it is available.

We are now on to former paragraph 8 which both parties suggested amendments to. Hungary instead of Requests the State Party invites a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to assess the state of conservation, in particular the level of threats to the hydrological and ecological dynamics, which underpin the OUV of the property, and recommends that this mission take place by the end of 2019. Cuba, Bosnia and Herzegovina and China and Hungary all suggest to delete the end of that paragraph.

Then the former paragraph 9, the next one, Hungary is proposing to keep the original paragraph that will be moved in the text if that is accepted. The other group of countries have amended that to read, Strongly urges the State Party to finalize the National Oil Spill and Chemical Contingency Plan and also reiterates its request that the State Party ensure adequate provision of funding and human resources for the implementation of the plan once its adopted.

And the final paragraph has been amended by both parties as well would read, Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020--and that's proposed for 2021 by China, Cuba and others--an updated report on the state of conservation of the property in the implementation of the above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020—and that's also suggested to be the 45th session in 2021 by Hungary, who also adds, with a view to considering, in case of the confirmation of potential or ascertained danger to its Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I hope I caught all of those ones but I suggest we move paragraph-by-paragraph.

Chairperson:

China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. In order to save the precious time of the Committee, China would like to propose that China and the distinguished delegate from Hungary and other interested Committee Members to form a drafting group and we work out a version for the Committee to consider as soon as possible.

Chairperson:

Thank you for this proposal. I just wanted to pose the same because I consider that we are going we can start if we will go to the discussion of the item-by-item. That's why if you don't mind we will have the delegates from China, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Cuba with Hungary to seek together and prepare the draft. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Chairperson, I just wanted to indicate Australia's desire to participate also in that group.

Chairperson:

I think it is correct, so you are also welcome. Norway, you want to take the floor?

The Delegation of Norway:

Norway would also like to participate. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just to say that we very much support this suggestion of the distinguished delegate of China but if you will allow us we also wanted to just make a few points right now. As we have expressed in our statement at the opening of item 7, socioeconomic development and World Heritage status do not exclude each other; they can and have been successfully reconciled by many States Parties. You have seen that our amendments were partly based on the amendments that were actually submitted by the group of countries and we want to say that we support the aim of the amendments, as you have seen, to not put this property on the in Danger List at this session but rather to come back next year, and we want to encourage Bangladesh to keep up its efforts of safeguarding this extraordinary property, and we really hope and trust that by next year we might have a more encouraging original draft decision and analysis than the one we have this year. You have heard the expert opinions expressed during the general debate so we are not going to repeat those but this is just to reiterate that we see our amendments as balanced and we look forward to arriving at an understanding in the working group and to come back with a text that is acceptable and can be adopted without much discussion. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. But still we will keep it in note and I propose that China, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Cuba along with Norway, Australia and Hungary will work out a consensus draft decision to be submitted to everyone. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We are quite concerned about this particular issue. The proposal made by Cuba and other Members States has been actually supported by 13 of the Members of the Committee, as we know from the Rules of Procedure. That is the proposal that is actually the furthest away from the original so that is where we should begin analysing and if we are doing that and at the same time there is going to be a working group going on, well if there is a minority in terms of a small delegation that could be working in parallel. We would actually prefer that there is analysis of what actually has been talked about here in the plenary session.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The matter is that we are not going to establish any working group. This is the group, which will be preparing the draft decision. As I understand it, the majority of Committee Members agree on the general version and the final proposal but we need correct wording which will clarify the attitude and evaluation and recommendations of the Committee. This is the matter. This is not a working group; this is a small drafting group to prepare the correct wording of the text to be accepted by everyone. I think that we better go this way until

the evening and then in the evening sometime before the end of today's session we will return only to the wording because it's clear we can analyze the decision recommendation not to list now—it is clearly supported by the Committee Members. So I don't think it is a difficult task. We only need to put the target, how to clarify the draft decision. If you don't mind we will proceed like that. Thank you very much for your understanding. Thank you. We will wait for the decision somewhere around 5:30 p.m. I would now like to invite Mr Guy Debonnet and IUCN to present the reports on the state of conservation of the natural properties located in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Secretariat:

Excuse me, Mr Chairperson, I think Phong Nha-Ke Bang in Viet Nam has been opened.

Chairperson:

So Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park in Viet Nam. For the next property to be discussed, I would like to give the floor to Indonesia, which requested the state of conservation report on Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park (Viet Nam) to be opened for discussion, to present to the Committee the reason why it made such request. You have the floor, Indonesia.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like to thank the Chairperson for giving us the opportunity to propose an amendment to draft decision 43 COM 7B.12 for the National Park Phong Nha-Ke Bang in Viet Nam for discussion. Initially, I would like to commend the Advisory Body on its report on the state of conservation on the Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park of Viet Nam. We acknowledge the State Party's strong commitment to addressing previous Committee decisions through actions such as the assessment of key species, the monitoring and control of invasive species and the engagement of local populations. Indonesia appreciates the State Party's commitment to protect and conserve the property including not to approve and implement any further other projects in the area without consultation with the Advisory Body, World Heritage Centre and without endorsement of the World Heritage Committee. It seems there are difference in the representation on the environment issues between the State Party and the Advisory Body. Therefore, I would like to request the distinguished Chairperson of the Committee to allow the State Party to provide their explanation on this matter. Mr Chairperson, I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I invite Mr Debonnet and IUCN to answer this matter?

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN had a meeting with the State Party prior to this session where we were informed that currently no cable car construction to the Son Doong Cave or to the Hang En Cave is being planned. At the same time, the State Party did not provide a clear statement that such projects would not be envisaged in the future. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that such construction would significantly increase visitation to the currently undisturbed or little disturbed caves in the property or alter the physical conditions of such caves and would therefore present a potential danger to the site. The development of mass tourism in the administrative zone within the property and the urbanization of the buffer zone are further cause for concern. The improvement of existing tourism offers and the reevaluation of the planned new products are recommended. In that respect we note that the amended draft decision in its new text acknowledges that the State Party would have revised the tourism development plan, which was requested by the reactive monitoring mission. However, we note that at this stage the World Heritage Centre has not received such a version. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. IUCN, please.

IUCN:

Thank you, Chairperson. IUCN also had an opportunity to have a meeting with the State Party together with the World Heritage Centre and we were pleased to hear the express commitment by the State Party not to proceed with plans for cable car construction in the Son Doong and Hang En caves located within the property and, in fact, any other similar infrastructure project which is of course welcome and it would be welcome if this is reflected in the draft decision. But as the Centre also expressed, it will be important to keep the wording that any similar projects in the future would have significant impacts on the OUV of the property, if they were to proceed so we would welcome that this is retained in the decision. We also did not have the opportunity to review the revised or proposed to be revised sustainable tourism management plan, which is mentioned in one of the amendments that we had a chance to see so we at this stage cannot provide any technical opinion on that. And just to highlight that perhaps some of the proposed language in some of the amendments might need some streamlining particularly in paragraph 4 and also to highlight that some of the proposed amendments might need to be reviewed to make sure that they are line with the standard language that we normally use in decisions and decisions previously taken by the Committee, particularly new paragraph 6 and we can provide further clarifications on that later in the discussion. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we should open this for discussion. Any comments or interventions? I don't see any so I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur because we have the amendment to the draft decision proposed by Indonesia. Please, Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As flagged we have received this amendment from Indonesia. As I understand IUCN is looking to provide some wording to assist that amendment. We will just wait for that to come up on the screen. It's decision 7B.12.

Chairperson:

Can you bring it on the screen, please?

Rapporteur:

So the first three paragraphs are unchanged. The fourth paragraph reads, Welcomes that the State Party has no intention to build a cable car to the Son Doong and Hang En caves or any other similar project within the property and requests the State Party to take the necessary measures to avoid a further increase in the number of visitors to caves located within the property; and not to approve and implement any future infrastructure project in or near the caves without consultation with IUCN, World Heritage Centre and without the endorsement of the World Heritage Committee. The next one is to propose changes to paragraph 5 and it would begin then, Considers that such projects significantly increase visitation to undisturbed or little disturbed caves in the property or alter their physical conditions and would represent a clear potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, in accordance with paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines. And as you can see the next paragraph is proposed to be deleted.

Minor amendments to former paragraph 7, reminds that the State Party is invited to submit to the World Heritage Centre, etc. Former paragraph 8, amended to say, Notes with concern the persisting poaching, etc. until, and also acknowledges efforts of the State Party made for the past two years in stepping up law enforcement efforts and continuing wildlife monitoring

activities and requests the State Party to make further efforts. The next paragraph, former paragraph 9, Also notes with concern the propagation of 14 invasive alien species, including the previously highlighted expansion of *Merremia boissiana* covering 1,000 ha in the property, welcomes the State Party's preventive and remedial measures and further requests the State Party to continue monitoring trends, strengthening measures for eradication and report on the monitoring results. Former paragraph 10, now paragraph 9, Acknowledges the revision of instead of reiterates, its previous request. Then as we move down I think there are not any more changes to that draft decision proposed. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The proposal is the following, to go paragraph-by-paragraph and see how the approval is going on. Paragraph 1, clear, paragraph 2, clear, paragraph 3, clear. Paragraph 4. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I just think it would be helpful for the Committee—we've heard that the State Party has had constructive and dialogue with both the Centre and IUCN. And we are being asked to consider amendments to this decision which are based on an understanding that Viet Nam has taken some very important decision around firstly abandoning construction of the cable car to the Son Doong but also that it has made a commitment to take the same attitude towards other infrastructure developments that might have an equivalent negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. So certainly from Australia's perspective we would very much like the opportunity to hear directly from the State Party of Viet Nam as to the actions it has taken so that the Committee can take reassurance directly from the State Party.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Do we have Viet Nam here? Please.

The Observer Delegation of Viet Nam:

Merci beaucoup, l'Indonésie ; merci, Monsieur le Président ; merci aussi, l'Australie, et merci à la République d'Azerbaïdjan pour l'accueil chaleureux et l'hospitalité. Je tiens aussi à remercier le Comité du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN pour l'accompagnement réservé au Viet Nam durant ces dernières années. En fait, le Viet Nam souhaite avoir ce débat parce que nous voulons proposer, comme vous le savez, des amendements au projet de décision relatif au Parc national de Phong Nha - Ke Bang du Viet Nam. Notre proposition d'amendements ne s'oppose pas à ce qui a été proposé, mais vise plutôt à avoir un langage qui reflète mieux la réalité et surtout à confirmer notre volonté ferme pour la conservation du patrimoine.

En effet, nos amendements concernent surtout les paragraphes 4, 5 et 6 relatifs à un grand souci du Comité du patrimoine mondial et de l'UICN concernant un projet potentiel de téléphérique dans la grotte de Son Doong et la grotte de Hang En au sein du bien. Je tiens à vous informer qu'aucun projet de téléphérique n'est actuellement en considération par la province de Quang Binh. Il y a quelques années, deux entreprises ont manifesté leur intérêt à un tel projet, mais nous avons abandonné l'idée depuis quatre ans et, dans une conférence de presse, le vice-président de Quang Binh a dit que Quang Binh n'accepte pas le projet de téléphérique. Maintenant, personne ne parle de projet de téléphérique à Phong Nha - Ke Bang. Le plus haut dirigeant de la province est à côté de moi, il me le confirme. Nos amendements vont dans ce sens, et nous proposons surtout un amendement au paragraphe 4 qui confirme notre engagement à ne pas approuver ni réaliser aucun projet d'infrastructures dans ou près d'autres grottes situées dans le bien sans consultation avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et avec l'UICN, et surtout sans l'approbation du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Il s'agit donc là d'un engagement très fort de la part du Viet Nam et de la province de Quang Binh.

Le reste des amendements visent à reprendre le langage de la décision de 2017 du Comité et du document « Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial ». Avant de proposer les amendements, nous avons eu l'opportunité de dialoguer avec les experts du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'UICN. Si le temps nous le permettait, je voudrais demander à Monsieur le Président de donner la parole à Mme Hayashi Nao du Centre du patrimoine mondial, qui a effectué la mission de suivi relative au Viet Nam. Elle peut certainement vous fournir plus d'informations à ce sujet et faciliter donc le travail du Comité. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we now come to paragraph 4. Can we accept it like that with the proposal of Indonesia? I don't see any opposite opinion. Thank you very much. Paragraph 5. I don't see any objections. Thank you very much. Please, Viet Nam, switch off your microphone, please. We agree that paragraph 6 is canceled. Thank you very much. Now new paragraph 6. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Yes, in paragraph 6 and in line with what we have just been talking about, when we are talking about reminding the State Party of its obligations to submit to the Centre any information and the EIAs, etc. I'm just wondering if maybe what we need to do is to invite them to submit rather than—maybe inviting isn't actually strong enough. It is an obligation to submit so therefore we should stick to that language. Thank you.

Chairperson:

St Kitts and Nevis.

The Delegation of St Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. My proposal would be to keep the wording invited, at least in English but perhaps to strengthen the overall paragraph by stipulating a timeframe when this review should take place. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you but I think it is done at the last paragraph. Until February so we have the time limit there. I think that invited is a correct recommendation. Thank you very much. Paragraph 7 please. No comments. Thank you. Approved. Paragraph 8. Thank you. Paragraph 9. Also no objections. Thank you very much. IUCN, please.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and apologies for taking the floor again. This is just to highlight that this is the document that we were just referring to in our intervention and this is something that we have not seen or have not received any information about and this is also confirmed by the Centre that no information has been received on the revision of the sustainable tourism development plan so at this stage we cannot really acknowledge it or provide any opinion so we would recommend that perhaps the original could be retained in this paragraph. Thank you.

Chairperson:

May I clarify from Indonesia—did you receive any documents concerned with that?

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson we have been requesting by the State Party but in terms of language it depends on the Committee to select it.

Chairperson:

So you did not received any documentation.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Not yet.

Chairperson:

Okay, so I consider that we have to follow the recommendation of IUCN because they can't acknowledge documents which they did not receive. So please let's return to the previous wording. So we return to the original version and we understand that it is correct. Thank you very much. Paragraph 10. No objections. Thank you very much. And finally the last one. No questions. Thank you very much. So we approve in whole. Thank you. Now we move to the other point. Again, I would like to invite Mr Debonnet to read the list of the natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage located in the Asia-Pacific States...I'm sorry but there was a request from Laos to say something concerning the previous approved decision. Are you insisting on that?

The Observer Delegation of Lao People's Democratic Republic:

Yes, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Please.

The Observer Delegation of Lao People's Democratic Republic:

Thank you very much. Mr Chairperson. The State Party the Lao People's Democratic Republic would like to congratulate the State Party of Viet Nam for its efforts and success to enhance the protection of the World Heritage property of Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park. Phong Nha-Ke Bang borders the Lao People's Democratic Republic, namely to Hin Nam No National Protected Area which is mentioned in paragraph 11.f) of the draft decision. The Lao People's Democratic Republic would like to express its readiness to continue and intensify cooperation and dialogue with the State Party Viet Nam. As we are preparing a nomination dossier for the Hin Nam No National Protected Area to become the transboundary extension to Phong Nha-Ke Bang we are eager to build on the constructive partnership between our two countries. We are confident that this will serve as a solid base to declare the first transboundary World Heritage property in the region of Southeast Asia and become a showcase for good practice in cross border natural conservation. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will note your intervention. Now again I would like to invite Mr Debonnet to read the list of the reports proposed for adoption without discussion, please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. So the site to be adopted without discussion are Greater Blue Mountains Area in Australia, the South China Karst Phase II in China, the Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area in China, Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area in China, Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in India, Great Himalayan National Park Conservation Area in India, Lorentz National Park in Indonesia, Shiretoko in Japan and Chitwan National Park in Nepal. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the decisions read out adopted. I know there are some Observers who would like to give some comments concerning that. So I invite the nongovernmental organization Blue Mountain from Australia to give their comments please. Microphone, please.

Observer NGO (Colong Foundation for Wilderness):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. My name is Bob Debus and I represent the Colong Foundation for Wilderness. In the year 2000 however, I was Minister for the Environment in the State of New South Wales with responsibility of national parks and I supported the Commonwealth of Australia in its successful nomination of the Blue Mountains for World Heritage. Consistent with World Heritage Committee principle, I passed legislation to forbid any further increase in the area then inundated by the Warragamba Dam. That was repealed last year.

The area now proposed for intermittent inundation is frequently understated. It includes up to 1000ha of World Heritage property and up to 3700ha of adjacent protected area critical to its integrity. Up to 65km of wilderness rivers will be inundated. The area proposed for inundation includes at least 300 known Gundangara aboriginal cultural sites, which would be damaged. Its cultural and conservation value is exceptional even within the Blue Mountains area. We wish to acknowledge the support that the Commonwealth of Australia has given to the motion moved today. On the other hand, there is as yet no convincing evidence that the State of New South Wales seriously embraces the solemn national undertaking to protect and conserve the Outstanding Universal Values of the Greater Blue Mountains for transmission to future generations. It is critically important that today's motion requires the rigorous assessment of the effects of new construction on property upstream and downstream of the dam in order to avoid impact on Outstanding Universal Value. The Government of New South Wales has in its own publications treated OUV as little more than an irritating afterthought.

Mr Chairperson, Australia has vigorously supported the World Heritage Convention since 1972. It is a rich country. Our failure to protect World Heritage values in the Blue Mountains would not be an isolated misfortune; it would amount to a fundamental attack on the Convention itself. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will note your intervention. Thank you. Now I now invite Mr Debonnet to read the list of the natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Europe and North America region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. So we have first Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe of the State Parties of Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, Italy, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Ukraine. Then we have the Białowieża Forest of the State Parties, Belarus and Poland. Then we have the Wood Buffalo National Park of Canada, the Golden Mountains of Altai of the Russian Federation, the Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve also of the Russian Federation, the Western Caucasus also of the Russian Federation, the Durmitor National Park in Montenegro and the Doñana National Park in Spain. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. There are two nongovernmental organizations that would like to make a comment. Doñana National Park from Spain, can you come to the microphone, please? And WWF International.

Observer NGO:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving me the floor. Doñana is one of the most important wetlands of Europe. Unfortunately, it's also a hotspot of accumulated threats. UNESCO has stressed that the greatest concerns for the preservation of the integrity of this property is the use of water. There is also considerable scientific and legal evidence that the aquifer and protected habitats are not being adequately cared for. Earlier this year, the European Commission took Spain to the European Court of Justice. Doñana cannot continue to be a showcase for legal land and water use linked to the agricultural sector. The State Party of Spain needs to be reminded by UNESCO that an ambitious water management plan needs to be implemented as a matter of urgency to ensure the recovery of the aquifer and to increase the resilience of Doñana to climate change. This includes closing all illegal wells more than 1000, and illegal fields, more than 3000ha in the surrounding area of the property and the stopping of opening new illegal ones, and also implementing alternatives to the transfer of water as transfer is not a viable solution. It would only contribute to increasing the irrigated area. Transfer would not be necessary if legislation is implemented and illegal wells and fields have closed. Moreover the new regional government is making promises in favor of intensive agricultural by offering to modify the planning tool that regulates the use of water that is called Plan de la Corona Norte de Doñana. WWF is very concerned and warns the Committee for the future and common threats to Doñana. This autumn, Doñana will celebrate its 50th anniversary and thus deserves far greater protection from the State Party of Spain pushing to promote a sustainable socioeconomic model for the territory and that UNESCO remains vigilante and gathers information from all stakeholders. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have Wood Buffalo.

Observer NGO (Mikisew Cree First Nation):

Good morning. My name is Melody Lepine and I'm part of the Mikisew Cree First Nation. We are the Mikisew Cree, an indigenous nation that depends on the health of the Wood Buffalo National Park for our existence. We are here because Canada has only acknowledge the deterioration of the property when we talk to you directly. The Mikisew will continue to push for the protection of our ancestral lands and protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of Wood Buffalo that the Convention requires.

For 30 years, Canada has told you that our Park was properly protected from threats but now you know that was inaccurate. Canada's own SEA confirms that the Park's OUV are seriously diminishing. The world's largest boreal delta is drying up and is increasingly polluted because of Canada's failure to take real action against threats to Wood Buffalo. Your decision today rightly confirms that the Park's OUV is deteriorating and that the situation is unacceptable under the Convention. We applaud your recognition that Canada must go further to halt the decline of this Park. Committee Members, Canada does not yet have the situation under control despite the Action Plan Canada is continuing to allow activities to further harm our Park and is weakening important protections. Canada has not yet made real changes to resolving the drying at the Peace-Athabasca Delta.

The most important issue, the return of water to the Park, remains unresolved. Necessary monitoring and partnerships with indigenous peoples are also still lacking. Many other indigenous groups from the Park have asked us to tell you that they share these concerns. Collectively, we ask why Canada hasn't yet taken bold actions to protect our freshwater resource, the Peace-Athabasca Delta? Committee Members we must all hold Canada accountable for finally taking action. In line with paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, we strongly believe the property meets the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger if Canada continues to fail to act to restore water and prevent pollution over

the next 18 months. This must be Canada's last chance. We thank the Committee, the Centre and IUCN for the continued support and the host country Azerbaijan for their warm hospitality.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Canada wants to make a comment.

La Délégation du Canada (Observateur):

Puisque c'est la première fois que le Canada prend la parole, permettez-moi de cordialement remercier la délégation de l'Azerbaïdjan pour leur généreuse hospitalité. Je tiens à souligner notre sincère reconnaissance envers les membres du Comité, le Secrétariat du Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organes consultatifs pour leurs efforts dans la préparation de cette session.

Canada welcomes the World Heritage Committee's draft decision on Wood Buffalo National Park and is strongly committed to implementing the Action Plan that has been developed with 11 indigenous communities, provincial and territorial governments and key stakeholders to protect this treasured place. The Governor of Canada has taken notes of the views just expressed by the Mikisew Cree First Nation and we can assure the Committee that we will continue working actively to improve relationships and engage collaboratively with all partners of Wood Buffalo National Park to advance more than 140 measures that were jointly identified in the Action Plan. Canada allocated \$27.5M (CAD) as an initial investment to develop the Action Plan and to support the early implementation of key actions with additional investments in the coming years.

I wish to conclude by once again thanking the Committee, World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the ongoing efforts to support Canada in conserving Wood Buffalo National Park Heritage site. Thank you, Canada.

Chairperson:

Now I see applies from the NGOs there. Sorry, may I clarify—your intervention is connected with the list that was just noted? Okay. Please introduce yourself.

Observer NGO (Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation):

It's connected with Wood Buffalo, yes. I'm speaking on behalf of Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation. The Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation or ACFN are Denesuline People. They have lived around Lake Athabasca since time immemorial. The lower Athabasca River system, which includes the Peace-Athabasca Delta, is critical for the ability of ACFN members to practice their hunting, fishing and trapping rights. The River itself is the main travel route into the heart of ACFN's territory. Without adequate water quantity in the river system, ACFN cannot access important cultural, spiritual and harvesting areas. ACFN also refer to themselves as K'ai Taile Dene which is translated as "people of the land of the willow." This land characterizes the Athabasca Peace Rivers, the Delta and the Muskeg areas found throughout ACFN territory. Indeed, the Delta is critical not only to ACFN's practice of rights but to Athabasca Chipewyan identity and culture. ACFN wants the Committee to understand that when you speak of the Wood Buffalo National Park this is what it means to ACFN.

Today, water levels in the river system and delta are already at a tipping point, heavily impacted by Bennett Dam, by extensive water withdrawals from industrial activity and by climate change. ACFN members frequently report of their inability to reach important harvesting areas and of the deterioration they see in the health and abundance of resources of which they have harvested and relied upon for centuries.

Despite this, the First Nation anticipates that in the face of continued unchecked threats water levels will only continue to decline and worsen. ACFN appreciates that the Committee is calling for measures to address water levels in the Delta. Without immediate action ACFN's ability to maintain their practice of rights and sustain their cultural identity is also under threat. ACFN supports Mikisew's efforts to push for the protection of this World Heritage site for all people of the Delta.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Sorry, are you representing the interest of the same site? The matter is...

Observer NGO:

Yes, sir.

Chairperson:

...but we recommended to the NGOs to make one common statement on behalf of all the NGOs because there may be numerous organizations that would like to express themselves. I'm giving the last floor but after that please, in future I apply to everyone to come with a joint intervention on behalf of the NGOs representing the same site's interest. Thank you.

Observer NGO:

Thank you, your Excellency. I wanted to speak on Wood Buffalo because it represents another striking example of the conflict between water infrastructure and management of a World Heritage site. And this conflict exists—basically it predates the date of inscription. The dam that had been built there decades ago was likely instrumental in economic development of the Canada but at the same time it changed the flow and ever since there is a lack of proper environmental flow into the Delta—it lasts for decades. Now we see that another dam, site C is being constructed without any obstruction lower and another dam is planned even lower despite that the key problem is not solved. I wanted to commend the State Party for implementing a very detailed and informative and technically high-quality strategic environmental assessment. But strategic environmental assessments are for taking action. They are not for just knowing how our sites will die. And I want to you to see the parallel between Lake Turkana and this case. They are almost identical. But in Lake Turkana is on the in Danger List and we understand why. Honestly speaking we do not quite understand why the same thing doesn't happen with Wood Buffalo, which has exactly the same situation and the same signs of insufficient action to support it. Thank you for your attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we will take your opinion...this is another site? Okay, please.

Observer NGO (WWF Caucasus Regional Office):

Your Excellency, Mr Chairperson, distinguished Committee Members. My name is Valerii Shmunk and I am the Director of WWF Caucasus Regional Office. On behalf of WWF, Green Peace Russia and a group of Russian NGOs, I would like to highlight several important issues related to the Western Caucasus Heritage site. We support the adopted decision on the property but we would like to call your attention to existing and upcoming threats to it. In our opinion, the State Party ignores the recommendations of the Committee. For example, Decision 32 COM 7B.25 requests the State Party to halt further construction of the road to Lunnaya Polyana, and ensure it is not enlarged, asphalted and used for recreational use, and the traffic is strictly regulated. However, last year the construction of this road was resumed to

be within the property. We are concerned that despite assurance from the Russian authorities, the road will soon be enlarged, covered in asphalt and used for recreation. The last Committee Decision clearly stated that infrastructure projects into implementation in proximity of a property would be considered as the basis for inscription on to the List of World Heritage in Danger. Despite this, the construction of a road near Krasnaya Polyana has significantly progressed last year and today it has reached the boundary of the property. If these activities continue and expand an important wildlife caribou in different parts of the site will be disrupted.

We call your attention to the ongoing large-scale infrastructure development within the property and near the Western Caucasus World Heritage site construction of roads, long-term lease of land from protected areas for ski resort development and lowering the legal protection of this protected area. We want to point out that the official report of the State Party contains out-of-date information of the site. Please, help us to save the Western Caucasus. Thank you for your attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So there are no other requests for interventions? Thank you very much. Committee Members, should we proceed to the approval of the list without discussion noting the interventions of the nongovernmental organizations? If you don't mind we adopt this draft decision. So, please, there is another site. We move to Latin American and the Caribbean region and there is a proposal to open discussion on one of the sites. Please, Mr Debonnet.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The sites are Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California in Mexico. The report on this site can be found document 7B.Add on page 25 of the English version and the same page in the French version. As the Committee will remember, the Outstanding Universal Value of this property is impacted by unsustainable illegal fishing practices. In particular, there continues to be widespread illegal use of gillnets to fish *totoabas*, an endemic fish species under the fully protected under the CITES Convention and which is targeted for its swim bladder. Since 2011, illegal fishing for *totoabas* raised significantly in response to a growing demand for market in Asia. The use of gillnets results in significant bycatch and has led to a dramatic decline in the population of *vaquita*, a small cetacean endemic to the Gulf of California and is now in imminent risk of extinction.

The Committee will also recall that a mission to the property in 2017 recommended inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger as a result of this imminent extinction. At its 41st session, the State of Mexico announced important new measures to halt the decline and as a result the Committee decided not to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger but to request a new mission to assess the effectiveness of these measures. This mission in 2018 concluded that the State Party was indeed undertaking significant efforts but also that it was too soon to determine how effective these measures were and recommended to defer a decision to the current session. Unfortunately, the latest data of the International Committee for the Recovery of the Vaquita called CIRVA show that the population decline continues. The Centre also received a letter from the International Whaling Commission, which reports that its scientific committee expressed its great concern that despite three decades of repeated warnings, the *vaquita*'s entirely preventable decline to extinction continues.

Given the critical status of the *vaquita* population, which can be considered at the brink of extinction and in conformity with paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore recommend that the Committee inscribe the property on List of World Heritage in Danger. They further note that corrective measures will need to address the issue of illegal fishing and to enable the necessary regulatory and operational reforms for legal fisheries to ensure that they are sustainable and do not cause bycatch of

marine mammals, sharks and turtles in order to guarantee the long-term protection of the OUV of the property.

Mr Chairperson, last week on 26 June the World Heritage Centre received a position paper from the State Party on the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In the paper the State Party announced that the new government launched on 31 March a new initiative for the sustainability of the northern Gulf of California with the participation of all government agencies and key stakeholders which aims to create an environmentally sustainable and resilient coastal communities and strengthen governance and rule of law. The State Party recognizes that the List of World Heritage in Danger is a mechanism to strengthen international cooperation for the conservation of the OUV of the property and expresses its full willingness to develop in cooperation with the Centre and IUCN the corrective measures which need to be taken along with a timeframe and desired state of conservation before the next session. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. IUCN, please.

IUCN:

Thank you, Chairperson. IUCN recalls at its 41st and 42nd sessions the Committee noted with utmost concern the ongoing decline of the critically endangered *vaquita* species. Recent scientific data released in February 2019 estimate that the population has further declined to possibly as few as 10 individuals. The two recent monitoring missions to the property in 2017 and 2018 both confirm that the bycatch of *vaquita* in the illegal gillnet fishing of *totoabas* has been and remains the main cause of this dramatic decline. The Committee has previously noted with appreciation the unprecedented level of financial and operational resources provided by the State Party to continue surveillance operations and other activities in preventing illegal fishing and subsequent illegal trafficking of *totoabas* products. However, despite these very significant efforts illegal fishing has regrettably continued and recently even escalated. It is considered that illegal fishing on such a scale, which poses a risk of immediate extinction to the endemic *vaquita* species, which is specifically recognized as a core part of the property's Outstanding Universal Value represents a clear ascertained danger to the property in line with paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines.

It is therefore recommended that the Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN would just like to highlight that urgent measures will be required both in the short-term to ensure that the area which is in fact a very small area, will remaining *vaquita* are likely to be concentrated remains completely gillnet free but also in the longterm including through development of solutions that provide sustainable livelihoods for local communities in the Gulf of California and these are the facts that corrective measures and the desired state of conservation report will need to focus on.

Finally, IUCN welcomes the constructive position of the State Party of Mexico, which recognizes the List of World Heritage in Danger as a positive mechanism, which can help strengthen cooperation for the conservation of the property stands ready to work with the State Party and the World Heritage Centre to develop corrective measures and the desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on this matter? Brazil wanted the floor. Please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I'll address the floor in Spanish.

[*Interpretation from Spanish*] Mr Chairperson, dear colleagues, given the urgent nature of protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of this property, Brazil supports its inscription on the Danger List and commends the State Party of Mexico for its commitment in developing a totality of corrective measures to deal with the issue of illegal fishing and thus allow for the regulatory reforms that are needed to create sustainable fishing. We are pleased that Mexico has brought no objections to the inscription on the Danger List which shows the appreciation that exists for the mechanisms for conservation that exist within the World Heritage Convention. The State Party of Mexico has also reported that the most recent recourse investment strategy carried out to maintain the populations of *vaquita* not only by preventing the fishing of *totoabas* but also other species brought unexpected results without actually having an effect on the increase in population of *vaquita* and the new strategy recognizes that fishing is important for the population of the Gulf of California. It's an activity that has to do with traditional lifestyles and knowledge of the community and is one that can contribute to maintaining a social framework and also taking into account biodiversity as axis of conservation thereof and we share the opinion of the State Party that the current area and its natural resources require actions that allow for a comprehensive development of the region in order to achieve social wellbeing and also satisfy the economic needs incorporate other subjective and cultural elements which would turn into opportunities for the local communities to be able to achieve social inclusion in their sustainable development processes. We are convinced, Mr Chairperson, that Mexico making a good use of the Danger List will very quickly implement a proper state of conservation desired for this property. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[*Interpretation from Spanish*] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We recognize the commitment undertaken by Mexico in the reinforcement of the surveillance in the area and in fostering international research about the area, as noted as well by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre's report. We support the decision especially about the need to reiterate the urging of Member States that the ones who engage in swim bladder transport require international cooperation and extend that to Member States of the Convention on international trade of flora and fauna in order to be able to fight against the censure of information about the situation. Synergy between conventions such as the World Heritage Convention and CITES can also mutually support the mechanisms by fighting against illegal fishing and they can be key in international cooperation on species and biodiversity protection especially in World Heritage sites. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[*Interpretation from Spanish*] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Spain supports the decision being taken to include this property on the Danger List. We think it is a very good report as well but we also think that it would be fair to recognize the act of maturity of Mexico when it recognizes that the Danger List is actually a mechanism within the Convention not to damage in any way the State but to work in favor of conservation of a property and to recognize its Outstanding Universal Value. We think it is also fair to recognize that the current government, President Obrador has taken on its responsibility to pay attention to what is going on with the *vaquita* and *totoabas*, the two species of the region in the protected islands off the

Gulf of California that are part of the Outstanding Universal Value thereof. It's also well known to us and we want to recognize the efforts being undertaken by Mexico to respect the recommendation made by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN that the State Party is trying to preserve this area and reduce interaction between human activities and the life cycle of this species.

As we know from the reports from 2017 and 2018, the property is maintaining in general its OUV and the Mexican government reiterates its political will to preserve the site. The increase of law enforcement as well as working in favor of sustainable development of the communities- this is a government that has just taken power and we think that aside from the supporting the resolution should also recognize the efforts that have been taken by them so thank Mexico, thank you the World Heritage Centre as well. We hope that the inclusion on the Danger List will strengthen this property that is right now in danger.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would also like to say we support the decision being taken by the State of Mexico and emphasize the comprehensive importance that this World Heritage site that it represents. The Outstanding Universal Value of the Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California doesn't have to do with the protection of only one particular species that might live there but rather to a totality of areas that are made up by 244 islands and by the coastal area in which a significant diversity of species live. We should recognize the efforts carried out by the initiative for sustainability by this State not only to save one of the most exemplary species of the area but also to come up with a natural laboratory to understand the processes of evolution of the ocean and coastal areas. We hope that by this decision the efforts being made by Mexico will lead to the recovering of this species native to this area and in danger, the *vaquita*. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway concurs with the previous speakers from Brazil, Cuba, Spain and Guatemala. We very much appreciate that the State Party of Mexico is positive towards inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger recognizing that this is central to implementing the necessary corrective measures to protect this property's Outstanding Universal Value. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Hungary also supports the decision and welcomes the efforts made by all the stakeholders to save this flagship species. On the other hand we have to express our hope that it is not too late and that the flagship species of this natural aquarium, the Gulf, will not go extinct in front of our eyes which would be really disappointing taking into account that the population of this species 12 years ago was almost 700 and now we are talking about 10 individuals which is obviously under the survival limit.

The Delegation of Hungary:

We still hope that the efforts of all the stakeholders will save this very valuable species in the Gulf. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So no further comments from the Committee Members--I have a request from WWF to make a comment. Please, you are welcome.

Observer NGO (WWF):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson, for giving me the floor. I am not only speaking on behalf of WWF but also using my voice as a Mexican who values and is proud of Mexico's natural and cultural treasures. The Gulf of California's high biodiversity and the number of species that are found only in the area together with a striking natural beauty of its rugged islands, high cliffs and sandy beaches make this place globally unique. Furthermore, if implemented sustainably this property has the potential to support the millions of people relying on this site for food, income and other important benefits offered by ecosystem services. WWF acknowledges the dire state of the *vaquita*, the panda of the sea in the Gulf of California. We also acknowledge that aside from the terrible situation that this endemic species the Outstanding Universal Value of the rest of the property is still in good condition. For this reason, WWF sees of utmost importance that the removal of illegal, discarded, lost or derelict gillnets together with a swift transition towards more selective fishing gear is paramount to ensuring long-term protection of the entire property. The future of sharks, whales, turtles and commercial species of fish is also at risk. WWF requests that State Party of Mexico to ensure that the necessary resources and institutional support be available to effectively attend to the problem of bycatch and drift gillnets in the entire property and we ask the Committee to provide expert support for these tasks. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Mexico, please.

The Observer Delegation of Mexico:

[*Interpretation from Spanish*] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Members of the Committee, the Government of Mexico reaffirms its commitment to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. During the current administration, which began 1 December 2018, headed by President Obrador, actions have been set with a new vision to protect and conserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California, which has been on the List since 2005 under the natural criteria 7, 9 and 10. As part of the new strategy to deal with the problem in the Gulf, on 21 March 2019 an initiative was presented concerning sustainability in the north of the Gulf of California in which all the different agencies involved with the protection and management of the areas as well as other stakeholders were involved. The objective of the initiative is to focus on the efforts that are needed to make sure that the coastal communities can live in a way that is sustainably developed and can work towards the recovery of the social network by reactivating the fishing activities that contribute to the benefit of the communities of the region.

The Government of Mexico recognizes that the Danger List is a mechanism of the Convention to strengthen those actions that are taken in terms of international cooperation towards conservation of a site and to maintain its attributes of Outstanding Universal Value. There are factors that effect the survival of the *vaquita* that go beyond borders and that is why we are looking for collaboration from other countries in fighting illegal fishing of *totoabas* so we are grateful for the efforts made in the Convention to fight against illegal fishing but we are receiving the high level of commitment from the government of Mexico as well to implement this. We can see that the communities of the coastal areas want to be able to conserve the habitat of the *vaquita*, which we cannot do if we do not join in the efforts to eliminate the illegal

fishing of *totoabas* products. On the other hand, it is also important to mention that the World Heritage site of the Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California not only houses the *vaquita* but also many other elements that contribute to its universal value that were seen in the missions of 2017 and 2018.

The Government of Mexico recognizes and is grateful for the valuable effort made by IUCN and the Centre in the evaluation process in the state of conservation as well as all the experts, civil society, researchers, academics, local communities and the fishing industries involved and concerned about the natural heritage of our country. We are also grateful the support and solidarity of the Members of the World Heritage Committee. We would also like to reiterate our commitment by the actions carried out by the current administration for the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of this extraordinary World Heritage site, the Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The last speaker on this Item is the representative of the Center for Biological Diversity. Please.

Observer NGO (Center for Biological Diversity, Animal Welfare Institute and Natural Resources Defense Council):

[*Interpretation from Spanish*] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Members of the Committee, States Parties, delegates, I am a very proud Mexican citizen speaking on behalf of my organization, the Center for Biological Diversity, Animal Welfare Institute and Natural Resources Defense Council. We are grateful to IUCN, the World Heritage Centre for continuing to focus attention on this particular site, the Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California, the only place in the world where the *vaquita* lives and that has led to the recommendation to inscribe this on the in Danger List. The *vaquita* is a small porpoise, which is in danger of extinction. Its Outstanding Universal Value is identified as part of the property however, its population is down to perhaps only 10 actual examples left and could be extinguished by 2021 perhaps even earlier unless we stop the illegal fishing of *totoabas* which is another fish that also contributes to the Outstanding Universal Value of the area. In 2017 when the site suggested to be put on the Danger List for the first time before this Committee there were 60 *vaquita* and yet the Committee on two different times pushed back that inscription on the Danger List in order to give the Mexican government more time to be able to implement some measures that would protect the species but unfortunately time is running out for the *vaquita*. We see the decrease in the population and failed efforts so we need immediate corrective measures before it's too late. The World Heritage Centre as well as the IUCN in their analysis saw that despite the continued efforts being made by Mexico to fight against illegal fishing not only has it continued but also in fact it has increased. Therefore, inscribing this on the in Danger List is absolutely essential and needs the support of the Committee. We urge Mexico not to see this as any sort of punishment but rather as an opportunity to get help from IUCN, UNESCO and the international community to save the *vaquita* and eventually remove the site from the in Danger List. This species can be saved, but only if Mexico together with other States and organizations and the fishing industry and this Committee all work together to take joint efforts so we would urge you to act now before the *vaquita* is gone for ever. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I don't see any comments and I know that there is no alternative draft submitted to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

Yes, that's correct, there are no amendments received. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Then we can proceed to the adoption of this document. So I adopt document 7B.26. So, I now invite Mr Debonnet, can you read the list of the natural properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion, please?

The Secretariat:

Yes, Mr Chairperson. The following sites are proposed for adoption without discussion are the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System in Belize, the Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks in Brazil, Los Katíos National Park in Colombia, Area de Conservación Guanacaste in Costa Rica, Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves/La Amistad National Park in Costa Rica and Panama, the Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve in Mexico, the Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection in Panama. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Can we accept this list for adoption? I don't see any objections. Thank you very much. Dear colleagues, Guatemala has some comments. Please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Distinguished Members of the Committee, members of the Secretariat of the Committee, Evaluation Bodies, it is my honor to address you concerning this draft decision on the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System, which you have just taken. The government of Guatemala believes that this is right time to reiterate the transcendence and the unique value of the OUV of the variety of ecosystems that make up the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System. Under Article 13 of the Convention on World Heritage be it natural or cultural, sets forth that the inscription of a property on the territory of a State on which there is a counter claim against the sovereignty of property shall in no way prejudice the rights of the States with a claim there too. The government of Guatemala would like to inform the distinguished Committee that on 7 July 2019 Belize and Guatemala agreed that the International Court of Justice would have jurisdiction to decide upon the island and maritime border of this area. In light of this, Guatemala would like to reaffirm that all efforts should be undertaken to preserve all the different forms of life that are held within the boundaries of this ecosystem and that this unique treasure for humanity needs to be preserved at all costs. Guatemala therefore believes that all of our attention needs to be continuously imported to the Barrier Reef Reserve System and to ensure that the conditions are met so as to continue to safeguard its preservation. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will note your intervention. So since we approved this Item I will attract your attention to the decision we made earlier to return to some questions we decided to postpone until the end of the morning session. As you know we have to resume our consideration of draft decision 43 COM 7A.12 concerning Lake Turkana National Park in Kenya. As you know we still have to examine paragraph 8 of this decision as we have already agreed on all other paragraphs. I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur to help us in summarizing the amendments. Please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have recently received from Norway, Australia, Bahrain, China and Hungary a new paragraph 8 which I will read, Recalling Decision 42 COM 7B.92 Paragraph 6, adopted at its 42nd session (Manama, 2018), welcomes the commitment of the State Party of Ethiopia to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), including a comprehensive assessment of potential downstream impacts on the OUV of the property, and requests the EIA to be submitted for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory

Bodies by 31 December 2019. And that would be the end of the paragraph. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as I understand there is a certain consensus between the parties involved in the discussion so I consider that there is no...Centre, you have something?

The Secretariat:

Perhaps just one clarification. The Committee will recall that this paragraph is related to the Kuraz Sugar Development Project so I think it would be good to state that it is to undertake an environmental impact assessment on the Kuraz Sugar Development Project so that it is clear what we are talking about. This is just a proposal.

Chairperson:

Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Yes, we are able to put that amendment in if the Committee is comfortable with that.

Chairperson:

Committee Members, any objections? So we can agree with this version. Thank you very much. So we consider paragraph 8 of document 7A.12 is approved.

Now we return to the other document, which we promised to resume today. This is Item 5D. Yesterday, I understood that some consultation was still going on. That's why we decided to move it to today. Angola, please.

Angola:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Comme vous nous l'avez recommandé hier, on a mené des consultations et nous avons trouvé des consensus. Je pense que le projet de décision qui vous est soumis devrait être approuvé sans beaucoup de discussions. Donc voilà le rapporteur peut donc nous le présenter. Merci.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We had received amendments yesterday. There have been no additional amendments received. If we just go through the screen and I'll just read the changed bits. So I understand there are no changes until paragraph 7 which would then read, Takes note of the Position Paper on World Heritage and Sustainable Development in Africa adopted in October 2018 by the African Union through resolution STC/YCS-3/ MIN/Report 67, as acknowledged in paragraph 20 d) of the Document WHC/19/43.COM/6. There's a proposal then that Hungary will move the paragraph un-amended from below so that's just a moved paragraph. And then if we go down, former paragraph 7 would now read, Reiterates the need to integrate the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of World Heritage properties with inclusive and sustainable development needs 5through the effective implementation of the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy (WH-SDP) aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The protection of the Outstanding Universal Value should be furthermore ensured by including environmental impact assessment, heritage impact assessment, and strategic environmental assessment in national and international development projects in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines. Then

that's just the movement of paragraph 8. And I think we have a very small addition to the final paragraph—oh sorry, 14 has a minor amendment there, Invites the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies, in collaboration with African States Parties, the African Heritage Fund and other stakeholders and then that would continue un-amended. And then there's a final additional paragraph, which is, Requests the World Heritage Centre to present, at its 44th session in 2020, a progress report on Priority Africa, Sustainable Development and World Heritage. That is all we've got. Thank you.

Chairperson:

So as far as I understand there is a certain consensus between the Members of the Committee. The draft was submitted unanimously by those involved Parties and their proposal is the following: not to open discussions anymore on this Item because everything is accepted. No comments? I don't see any. Thank you very much. Approved.

Chairperson:

We have time so I would like to make some shifts and propose to Mr Debonnet to read the list of the natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I just want to make one remark. On one of the sites that is proposed for adoption without discussion, the Comoé National Park, there was a slight error in the draft decision. In fact, in paragraph 8, the draft decision mentioned that the current surface of the Park is 1.5M hectares however, this is incorrect and it should be 1,150,000 ha so with the permission of the Committee we will make this slight correction to the draft decision and then we can adopt all the draft decisions without further discussion. If that is okay?

Chairperson:

Thank you, Rapporteur please can you make the amendment? Ok, we will take that into consideration and make this amendment and changes in the draft. So can we proceed with the approval of this decision. Can you read the names? You did not, yet.

The Secretariat:

Yes, so the names of the other sites are the Dja Faunal Reserve in Cameroon, the Sangha Trinational transboundary site between Cameroon, Central African Republic and Congo, the Taï National Park in Côte d'Ivoire, Comoé National Park which I already mentioned, also in Côte d'Ivoire and the Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls between Zambia and Zimbabwe. Thank you.

Chairperson:

So I would like to propose to approve this decision. Thank you very much. Any Observers, any comments? Thank you. So now we return to the questions, which requires some clarification. For the property to be discussed I would like to give the floor to the delegation of Burkina Faso which requested the state of conservation report on Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley in Kenya to be opened for discussion, to present to the Committee the reason why it made such request. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Je m'excuse pour une petite démarche, une sollicitation que je voudrais vous faire. J'aurais souhaité qu'on puisse, sur le point que nous

venons clore, donner la parole au Ministre du Cameroun pour une très brève déclaration, si le Comité en convient.

Chairperson:

Cameroon, please, are you here? Please, you are welcome, Minister.

La Délégation du Cameroun (Observateur):

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les membres du Comité, je voudrais tout d'abord adresser mes sincères remerciements au Comité du patrimoine mondial pour insigne honneur qu'il me fait de prendre la parole devant cette auguste assemblée. Par la même occasion, permettez-moi, au nom de l'État partie du Cameroun, d'exprimer notre gratitude aux hautes autorités de la République d'Azerbaïdjan et aux responsables du Comité d'organisation de cette 43^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial pour le succès de l'organisation avec panache de ce complexe événement, et puis pour l'accueil et les dispositions prises pour faciliter la participation de la délégation camerounaise aux travaux en cours dans cette somptueuse salle.

Mon propos est le témoignage de reconnaissance que l'État partie du Cameroun manifeste à l'égard des membres du Comité du Centre du patrimoine mondial et des organes consultatifs pour la confiance et l'accompagnement qu'ils accordent aux efforts déployés par notre pays en vue de préserver la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de la Réserve de faune du Dja et du segment Cameroun du Trinational de la Sangha, bien classés sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Ces deux biens, avec la haute impulsion du chef de l'État, Son Excellence Paul Biya, Président de la République, qui considère la culture comme étant le ciment de l'unité, le catalyseur de l'intégration nationale et du développement intégré endogène et global d'un pays qui compte plus de 236 groupes ethniques et 25 millions d'habitants, font l'objet d'une mobilisation des responsables du Ministère des arts et de la culture, des différentes administrations partenaires et des autres structures spécialisées concernées qui travaillent sans relâche dans le respect des recommandations de la mission conseil de l'UNESCO à préserver le prestigieux statut desdits biens. Comme vous le savez, ces deux biens constituent des exemples manifestes de la problématique à laquelle nos États font face, à savoir la conservation et le développement durable. Nous nous réjouissons d'une réflexion de fond à ce sujet menée dans le cadre de la priorité Afrique, développement durable et patrimoine mondial. Le Cameroun fera siennes toutes les idées constructives émanant de ces travaux.

Enfin, je voudrais réaffirmer l'engagement du Cameroun à faire tout ce qui est possible afin d'assurer le maintien de la réserve de faune du Dja et du Trinational de la Sangha sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial de l'humanité, et de proposer pour inscription, dans un proche avenir, d'autres biens. En outre, j'atteste de la disponibilité de mon pays à collaborer avec les partenaires de bonne volonté dans ce sens. Je vous remercie pour votre bien aimable attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Minister for your intervention. So we will note that and now I return to Burkina Faso.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso:

Merci, Monsieur le Président, pour votre sollicitude. Monsieur le Président, s'agissant du réseau des lacs du Kenya dans la vallée du Grand Rift, il s'agit d'une nomination en série et, tout en prenant note de l'appel que le rapport lance sur le renforcement de la protection dans la zone comprise entre les lacs Elementaita et Nakuru, nous notons cependant que l'État partie du Kenya s'est engagé à mener des actions de consolidation dans la zone. Cependant, nous pouvons relever également des contradictions dans le projet de décision qui appellent des

propositions d'amendement de la part de l'État partie. Monsieur le Président, telles sont les raisons qui ont motivé la demande d'ouverture du débat sur ce dossier. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Opinion of Centre and IUCN, please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. There were no particular questions asked of the Secretariat but in relation to the points in the draft decision where amendments are proposed I think that IUCN could clarify the question on the need to strengthen the protection between Lakes Nakuru and Elementaita which was an issue raised at the time of inscription and on the issue of removing existing illegal developments I want to recall to the Committee that in 2014 a report was presented on certain illegal developments on the shoreline of Lake Elementaita and the State Party took a commitment to address this issue and unfortunately, in the report submitted by the State Party no information was provided on this issue and therefore we suggest to the Committee to reiterate its requests that date back to 2015 and 2017 to ensure the removal of any existing illegal developments in this area and to ensure the ecological restoration of the affected areas. IUCN will give some clarification on the point on the corridor.

Chairperson:

Please. IUCN, please.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. IUCN would just like to note that during the IUCN evaluation process in 2011, we noted that in the absence of a formal buffer zone for two for the components parts it would be beneficial to extend the buffer zone for Lake Elementaita up to Lake Nakuru National Park. At the time IUCN was informed by the State Party of Kenya that there was an agreement in principle to open up a wildlife migratory corridor to connect Lake Nakuru National Park and Lake Elementaita. It is in this context that the Committee has previously requested the State Party to continue the protection of the areas between the two component parts of the property. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have one NGO representative who wanted to take the floor on this matter. Please.

Observer NGO (International Indigenous People's Forum on World Heritage):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I'm speaking on behalf of the International Indigenous People's Forum on World Heritage. Mr Chairperson, when Lake Bogoria was created in 1973 the Endorois people were evicted from their ancestral lands. This was done without consultation or adequate compensation given. The community went to court in Kenya and regionally and in 2009 the African Commission on Human and People's Rights gave a ruling in their favor. The ruling asked the Government of Kenya to restitute the land to the Endorois people recognize their rights of ownership and compensate them for all the loss suffered. In 2011, Lake Bogoria was inscribed as a World Heritage site in total disregard of the African Commission decision. The whole process ignored the community completely. There was no free, prior and informed consent. After the African Commission expressed deep concern about this, the World Heritage Committee strongly urged the Kenya to fully implement the African Commission's decision without delay.

Mr Chairperson, to this day the decision of the African Commission has not been implemented and no steps have been taken to recognize the ownership rights of the Endorois and restitute

the land to them. It is positive that the Kenyan government agencies are collaborating with the Endorians community to develop a joint integrated management plan for Lake Bogoria National Reserve. However, this process does not in any way imply the ruling of the African Commission is being implemented as draft decision 7B.33 suggests. We therefore consider that the Committee should again urge Kenya to fully implement the African Commission's Endorois ruling and recognize the ownership rights of the Endorois over their ancestral land in line with the obligations under international law, UNESCO policy on indigenous peoples and the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kenya, please.

The Observer Delegation of Kenya:

Thank you, Chairperson for giving us the opportunity to shed light on the conservation of the Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley. Kenya wishes to report that the issue of the property boundary re-survey of the Lake Elementaita to establish the new riparian area is underway. The need to conduct this re-surveying arose from changing lake levels in all the central lakes. This process of re-surveying is slow and involves many government agencies and the local communities who must amicably agree. Kenya is committed to expediting this activity in the most consultative manner. We also wish to clarify that there are no existing illegal developments in the areas between Lake Nakuru and Lake Elementaita. The distance between the closest boundaries of the two lakes is around 10km. This stretch is a settled area and has always been settled. There is therefore, no basis for any requirement for the removal of any structures. There is also no basis for the ecological restoration for the area in the sense of protected areas management.

Honorable Chairperson, I wish to inform the honorable Committee that there is no geothermal exploration within the property. On the issue of Endorois living around Lake Bogoria National Reserve, we have reported several leaders of the Endorois people having cooperated in the management of Lake Bogoria. As regards the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights the recommendation among others that Kenya should recognize the rights of ownership, I wish to inform the Committee that previous Management Plan and indeed the one being finalized take cognizance of this and map out cultural sites such as grazing areas, ritual sites and salt lake sites that the Endorois are allowed to use. The only thing that they are not allowed to do is to build settlements within the reserves. As for that restitution of the reserve back to the Endorois we find this as a direct contradiction of the strategic objectives of the World Heritage Convention. The Endorois community was compensated in a settlement programme in 1973. There were no issues during the settlement exercise. The restitution of the Lake Bogoria National Reserve land will first require Kenya to degazette the reserve and thereby remove any form of gazettelement, government protection and management support. This would lead to the site losing its integrity and inevitable un-listing from the World Heritage site. It's on this basis that we urge the Committee to reconsider its insistent call for the restitution. We have demonstrated the level of involvement of the community in conservation of the reserve and regret that seven years have carried on with a narrative of exclusion of the minority group, which we find as a gross misrepresentation of facts. Therefore, honorable Chairperson, I urge the Committee to look at the draft decision and to help Kenya to sustainably manage this important World Heritage property for future generations. Thank you, honorable Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We got the draft decision. I would like the Rapporteur to give out information.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We've had two sets of amendments to this decision from the delegations of Uganda and Burkina Faso and they'll be coming up on the screen now. There are no changes to the first two paragraphs. And then...

Chairperson:

Can you put it on the screen, please?

Rapporteur:

Paragraph 33, both delegations have proposed amendments. The first would be from Burkina Faso and that would read, Notes that the State Party provided updated information on the implementation of the Committee's past decisions. Point a) would be deleted by Uganda but kept by Burkina Faso. The second point, point b) the first part to ensure the removal of any illegal, would be deleted by both delegations. Paragraph 4 is not proposed for amendment. Paragraph 5, also amended by both delegations. Burkina Faso suggests, Welcomes the development of a joint integrated Management Plan for the Lake Bogoria National Reserve ecosystem by the Endorois Welfare Council and the Baringo County government, and then both delegations propose that deletion and it would finish, and urges the State Party to expedite the development of this overdue plan and to submit the final draft of the plan to the World Heritage Centre for review. Paragraph 6, a planned deletion by Burkina Faso. It would read, Also notes that no current plan exists for geothermal exploration in Lake Elementaita and Lake Bogoria components of the property, and also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre in due course of any other major developments in the property, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines. And I thank that will be it of proposed amendments. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So what is the opinion, should we proceed with the approval of the proposed draft? Okay, we'll start. Paragraph 1 is clear, paragraph 2 is clear. Paragraph 3, notes that the State Party provides updated information. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. Norway would like to keep paragraph 3 b) in its original form.

Chairperson:

Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia would like to see 3 b) as in the original and actually we would like to keep 3 a) in as well, please.

Chairperson:

Okay, it's clear now. Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Hungary supports both the proposals of Norway and Australia. I would like to highlight that there is a clear contradiction in information in what we received from the State Party and the Secretariat regarding the illegal construction and also about the geothermal exploitation so this I guess should be clarified.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you. Chairperson, after hearing the explanation from the State Party of Kenya we are in agreement that the amendments be kept as they are as proposed by Uganda and Burkina Faso. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Both proposals are a little bit contradictory to each other and I must inform you that we are now approaching the time to give our interpreters a break. So at 1 o'clock we have to finish. If you don't mind we will proceed with this immediately after lunch at 3 o'clock and I hope that during that time delegations will communicate with each other and come up with a decision to avoid long discussions on this matter. So now I'm giving the floor to Ms Rössler to make some announcements.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As you know you have the budget group from 2-3 p.m. in Room A7 and the Chairperson would like to see more countries coming. Then we have at 2 p.m. the third cycle of periodic reporting exercise for the African Region in Room B2. Then we have at 1 p.m. the Property of the Southern Iraq Marshes in Room B1 and at 1 p.m. Rethinking Impact Assessments: the case of Istanbul in Room A8 and from 1:10-2 p.m. World Heritage Sites Managers Forum: How it works and new ideas by ICCROM in Room B3 and at 2:10 p.m. a presentation of the Evaluation Process by ICOMOS in Room B3. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So see you at 3 o'clock. We will resume at 3 o'clock. Have a nice time.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.

THIRD DAY – Wednesday 3 July 2019

SIXTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 5.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev
later: H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil)
later: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Honorable Members of the Committee, ladies and gentlemen, we start our afternoon session. As far as you remember, we started the discussion of the draft agenda on the Item concerning Kenya Great Lake System in the Great Rift Valley. There is some a matter, which I would like to clarify that is why I will first give the floor to Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. je voulais juste signaler, par rapport à l'état du projet de décision au moment de la suspension, qu'il y a eu une confusion dans le document, ce qui a donné le résultat que nous avons vu, mais je pense que le Secrétariat a la bonne version de la décision, que nous pouvons examinée. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

The drafting group did work during the lunchtime however, there is some more work to do and we would like this matter to be adjourned until 5:30 along with the Sundarbans so that we are ready to table the consensus views of the drafting group, please.

Chairperson:

You mean on Item 33 on Kenya Great Lake System?

The Delegation of Australia:

Yes.

Chairperson:

Because we have the other group working on Sundarbans and you propose this Item to be schedules for 5:30 to discuss both matters then?

The Delegation of Australia:

Yes, please but if you don't think it would be possible to do both perhaps it could be made a little earlier.

Chairperson:

We'll see. We'll see how it is going.

Chairperson:

If the Committee Members don't mind such an arrangement we will leave this question also to be discussed sooner but at the end of the evening session. Thank you very much. So we move

to Item 35. May I invite Ms May Shaer, of the Arab States Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the mixed properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Arab States region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion? Please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The mixed property for which the report is proposed for adoption without discussion is the Ahwar of Southern Iraq: Refuge of Biodiversity and the Relict Landscape of the Mesopotamian Cities in Iraq. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Are there any comments?

Chairperson:

Other versions? We don't see any so I declare the decision read out adopted. Any Observers to make comments or whatever? Not particularly anyone so then—we don't see them apply. Maybe they are not in the room so is without question. Then we move to natural and cultural heritage in Europe. So I invite now Ms Isabelle Anatole Gabriel, Chief of the Europe and North America Unit of the World Heritage Centre, and the Advisory Bodies, to present the reports on the state of conservation of the mixed properties located in this region and opened for discussion. So you are welcome, please.

Le Secrétariat :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien Patrimoine naturel et culturel de la région d'Ohrid, Macédoine du Nord, se trouve dans le document 7B à la page 83 en anglais et à la page 85 en français. Le rapport rappelle, d'une part, que l'état de conservation global du bien est confronté à des menaces qui ont été évaluées par une mission conjointe de suivi réactif en 2017. Il rappelle, d'autre part, que les conclusions et recommandations de cette mission ont été endossées et pleinement soutenues par les décisions du Comité du patrimoine mondial prises lors de ses quarantième et quarante et unième sessions.

Parmi ses décisions, le Comité notait que, en l'absence de mesures suffisantes pour répondre aux recommandations prioritaires de la mission dans un délai de deux ans, le bien pourrait répondre aux critères d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en conformité avec les paragraphes 178, 179 et 180 des Orientations, cela étant un site mixte. Le dernier rapport soumis par l'État partie de Macédoine du Nord fait état d'un certain nombre de mesures prises. Toutefois, il signale également les retards accumulés dans la mise en œuvre des recommandations prioritaires. Ainsi, le bien reste affecté par un développement urbain incontrôlé à grande échelle et une exploitation inappropriée des zones côtières ; une pollution accrue, la fragmentation et la destruction de l'habitat et, enfin, par des pressions dues au tourisme. Ces menaces ont résulté pour le bien en une perte d'authenticité historique, une altération de l'espace urbain, rural et naturel ainsi qu'une altération de la beauté naturelle.

Pour ces raisons, Monsieur le Président, et en conformité avec les paragraphes 179 et 180 des Orientations ainsi qu'avec les décisions antérieures du Comité, les menaces sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien sont avérées. C'est donc sur cette base, Monsieur le Président, que le projet de décision soumis propose l'inscription du bien Patrimoine naturel et culturel de la région d'Ohrid sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril afin d'élaborer au plus vite un ensemble de mesures correctives ainsi qu'une proposition d'état de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Avec votre permission, Monsieur le Président, l'ICOMOS et l'UICN souhaitent présenter leurs analyses complémentaires.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you. The concerns expressed in the state of conservation report relate to concerns that have been reported to the Committee for just over 30 years and they arise from the cumulative erosion of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value and not just from impact of one or more major projects. At the time of inscription of this mixed property on the List in 1980 the world's preserved old towns of Ohrid and Struga were set in almost untouched natural landscape which was seen to be of exceptional beauty and an essential part of their setting.

By 1988, the first mission to the property noted the enormous increase in construction and settlement activity that had seriously altered the balance in the region with the town of Struga having grown to incorporate new communities. It also noted that economic and demographic developments posed threats to the values of the property and needed to be addressed through an integrated approach and protective measures that linked cultural and natural heritage preservation. The mission report called for a special legal framework for the World Heritage site, strengthening of management and the preparation of spatial plan. Nearly all these measures are still needed.

A further mission was invited in 2013 and found similar problems to the earlier one. The lack of an adequate legal framework, completely separate regimes and so on. It also found that on a symbolic hill overlooking Ohrid, a 9th-century monastic church had been reconstructed and development on large buildings for a new St Clement University. It found, too, uncontrolled development in some parts of the city and even more along the lakeshore and, as earlier, the coordination between culture and nature was still not in place nor adequate management and protection. That mission in 2013 concluded that all of this had eroded authenticity and integrity. It recommended that given the sensitivity of the built remains of the property and the need to maintain its important visual qualities management arrangements needed to become fully operational as soon as possible and conservation policies enforced to control Outstanding Universal Value.

The last mission to the property in 2017 found more major development and infrastructure projects being considered and urged the State Party to undertake a strategy impact assessment on the cumulative impacts of all these major projects on the properties OUV and overall the still found there was a lack of adequate management and protection arrangement with no management plan yet being in place. The Committee in considering this mission report concluded that the overall state of conservation of the property was increasingly vulnerable and if the priority recommendations suggested by the mission were not implemented within the two-year timeframe the property may face danger in line with the Operational Guidelines. The current state of conservation has addressed these priority recommendations and whether they have been undertaken and the conclusion is that the majority remain unfulfilled as to the majority of Committee requests.

The statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property highlights the concentration of archaeological remains and urban structure not just within the old centre of Ohrid but also along the coast of the lake as well as in the surrounding area, all of which together create an exceptionally harmonious ensemble and one that has coherence rising from this relationship between the buildings and the surrounding landscape. We still do not have in place the necessary underpinnings of a management system that could control the gradual erosion of these attributes and these threats have been facing the property and have been since its first mission 21 years ago and added to these threats are further adverse impacts of large-scale infrastructure and development.

ICOMOS considers that both individually and collectively this represents a potential danger to Outstanding Universal Value that urgent measures are needed to address these threats and that these measures need to be implemented in a shorter timescale as possible in order to stop the continuing erosion of attributes to Outstanding Universal Value. To this end we consider that the Danger Listing process should be used as a supportive tool. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. IUCN, please.

IUCN:

Thank you, Chairperson. IUCN recalls that the 2017 reactive monitoring mission to the property, which observed the presence of numerous threats to Lake Ohrid aquatic environment including uncontrolled discharge and pollution due to inadequate waste water treatment systems, heavy pressures from tourism, extensive uncontrolled urban development and inappropriate exploitation of the coastal zones. As already highlighted by ICOMOS following the conclusion of the mission that the overall state of conservation of the property was increasingly vulnerable, the Committee at its 41st session concluded that if the mission's priority recommendations were not implemented within the two-year framework the property may face potential danger. Some of the issues facing the property had already been noted with concern even at previous Committee decisions. At its 40th session the Committee further noted that the Railway corridor VIII and Highway A2 were likely to cause potentially significant negative impacts on the OUV of the property and considered these projects appeared to represent potential danger to the property's OUV. IUCN concurs with the view of ICOMOS that no significant progress has been achieved in addressing these threats and that the majority of Committee requests and mission recommendations remain unfulfilled.

In conclusion, IUCN considers that these numerous threats combined with the continued lack of key management systems and processes and planning documents combined also with large-scale infrastructure and development projects represent a clear case of potential danger to the property. It is considered that the property meets the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in line with paragraphs 178 and 180 of the Operational Guidelines and it is recommended that the Committee therefore inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I don't see any. Two Observers, please. You are welcome. Introduce yourself.

Observer NGO (Ohrid SOS):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I am giving this message on behalf of the Ohrid SOS NGO in Macedonia as a part of the World Heritage Watch network. The Ohrid region holds one of the most species-rich lakes on earth; perhaps the most florally diverse mountain in Europe and secrets of 6M years of human settlements on its shores, mixed the World Heritage of 40 years standing. Drop by drop it is being destroyed. Wetlands loss, eutrophication, overfishing, illegal construction, infrastructure by road, rail and ship, tourism expansion, hydropower, fires, habitat fragmentation and reckless waste disposal are all documented pressures contributing to its death. Lake Ohrid is even identified as the most climate vulnerable freshwater lake on the whole European continent.

The World Heritage Committee knows these threats. Endorsing 19 reactive monitoring missions, recommendations from 2017 it requested concrete remedial action including a moratorium on transformation, management of illegal construction, waste water revitalization,

railroad reconsideration and imposition of the rule of law. None is actualized and most of this is outstanding delayed by a State Party that deceives the World Heritage Convention with its technical mistruths. So entering the Ohrid region's 40th anniversary as a World Heritage site it is not just World Heritage in danger but World Heritage in multiple proliferating dangers. The World Heritage Committee must now take the firmest stand against this all. Urgent and determined action is required. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Hungary, briefly, is in favor of this site. It is one of the most important and relevant mixed sites in Europe. So it is very important to keep it in, of course, the best position. It can also be an international serial site. It is very important for it to have the same level of conservation both in natural as in cultural levels also in the future. Hungary supports this nomination and gives if it is noted any support to the State Party to help solve these very serious problems but on the other side we have to see also the problems as well. I would like to ask that the State Party be given the floor for a few minutes because it is possible that in the meantime there have been some interventions to make the site much better and safer. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Alors nous voudrions tout d'abord remercier toutes les instances consultatives pour le travail qui a été fait et les rapports éclairants qui nous été présentés, et, bien évidemment, les dangers et les menaces qui ont été soulignés sont absolument préoccupantes pour les membres du Comité. Mais il y a un certain nombre de points qui ont été soulevés, relatifs par exemple à l'absence d'un cadre juridique de protection. Nous avons cru comprendre et apprendre qu'il y avait des démarches positives prises déjà par l'État partie en ce sens ainsi que d'autres mesures. Donc la Tunisie souhaite que l'État partie s'exprime pour dire quelles sont les dispositions qui ont été prises et quelle est la lecture de l'avenir de ce site. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like first of all to thank the Advisory Bodies for their detailed report on their concerns about the state of conservation of this site, which is one of the most important mixed sites in Europe. I believe it should be highlighted that in the very short period of time of 20 months the State Party has completed a significant number of recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies such as the halting of the procedure for the modification of the management plan of Galichica National Park, the construction projects of the A3 road and the Galichica ski resort. The State Party has also shown a strong commitment to comply with the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies, which is evidenced by the very high-level delegation that came from Skopje especially to promote this site at this meeting of the World Heritage Committee. We are aware that the number of recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies is still pending but considering the progress that has already been accomplished we believe that the country will be more stimulated to implement the pending recommendations if it has one more year of time before the site is included on the List of World

Heritage in Danger. I would now ask you if there is any amendment proposed to the draft decision and after this I would like to take the floor again in support or about the text that would be proposed. I thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now the floor goes to Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

La Bosnie-Herzégovine est favorable à donner plus de temps à la Macédoine du Nord, comme proposé dans notre amendement concernant Ohrid, pour améliorer la situation sur le terrain. Les raisons sont les suivantes. Il s'agit d'un endroit exceptionnel, qui mérite toute notre attention. Depuis l'adoption de la décision 41 COM 7B.34, le Gouvernement du Macédoine du Nord a fait preuve d'une activité allant dans le sens d'améliorer la situation sur le terrain. Nous considérons qu'un an de plus va encourager davantage la Macédoine du Nord dans cet effort positif et n'engage que ce pays. L'objectif est de sauver un endroit exceptionnel, et nous proposons aussi qu'on donne la possibilité à la délégation de Macédoine du Nord de se prononcer sur ce sujet. Merci.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just very briefly--no amendments have been presented regarding the amount of time to be granted to the country so we would like to ask along with Hungary whether we couldn't hear from the State Party. We've heard from the NGO, we've heard the report from the Advisory Bodies. We wonder if it would be possible since Brazil says there was an important delegation from North Macedonia that was sent, that we could hear from them, to hear what their problems are and what progress has been made and what they intend to do in the future. We know about the programmes that have been carried out by the State so it would be very interesting if we could hear from them. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. China supports the view just expressed by Brazil, Bosnia and Herzegovina and other countries and we also welcome the opportunity given to Northern Macedonia delegation to express themselves. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, let me thank the Advisory Bodies for their reports and concerns regarding some positives and negatives and their concerns about the potential threat to OUV. But we also see there is some progress. It might be slow progress, not what we are looking for or what the Advisory Bodies are looking for but at least there is some progress and we think the State Party, might if given some more time for improvement of the situation and after that we can see if it should go on the in Danger List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. My delegation also joins the previous speakers and supports the statement made by Brazil that we need to first of all appreciate the efforts of the State Party and also given that these extreme measures are rather discouraging than encouraging States Parties we would appreciate if more time would be given to the State Party to mitigate the threats on the site so we support also the amendment to the draft decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia also notes the progress that has been made by the new government and supports the amendment to the draft decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Cuba also approves of the draft amendment but we would like to hear from the State Party in order to be absolutely sure of the need for more time.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I think that it's time to give the floor to the honorable delegation from North Macedonia who is with us today. You are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of North Macedonia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. And thank you to the Committee Members for giving us the opportunity to address the Committee. The Government of the Republic of North Macedonia remains fully committed to maintain the World Heritage status for the natural and cultural heritage in the Ohrid region maintaining the integrity and the authenticity of the of the natural and cultural heritage of the Ohrid region. The Republic of North Macedonia is particularly proud to have had the region on the UNESCO World Heritage List. This year we are celebrating 40 years since inscription.

In two years, since the reactive monitoring mission came to the region in April 2017, the new government elected in June 2017 made significant steps were undertaken to address the situation and establish parameters with a clear, longterm governing structure that would prevent abuses and repeated degradations. I will briefly mention just a few of them. In this period the State Party has abandoned completely the construction of A3 road subsection as per recommendation no. 4 and plans for a ski centre project in National Park Galichica. Lake water levels are properly monitored and maintained. Traffic in Ohrid city has been restricted and strict traffic regimes are being maintained. A strategic environmental assessment was conducted in January; a draft has been produced and is currently in the public consultation process. The findings of the assessment will be used to strengthen the draft management plan as per recommendations.

The management plan will be adopted no later than December as well as an assessment for possible solutions for buffer zones for properties with in put from the Centre and Advisory

Bodies. The relevant state institutions and municipalities have been tasked to compile an inventory of illegally built structures within the property by September. The State Party strongly believes that it is able to significantly improve that state of the natural and cultural heritage in the Ohrid region by continuing the work initiated in July 2017. Over the last two years the new government of North Macedonia has demonstrated to the world that it is able to deliver positive results and fully intends to deliver on the protection and conservation of the natural and cultural heritage of the Ohrid region as well. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, honorable Minister. Now as far as I see there is a wish to make some amendments from Albania. Welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Albania:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. As we are a neighboring country and we share Lake Ohrid let me just add a few words first to recognize the efforts of North Macedonia to preserve and protect the natural and cultural attributes of the Ohrid region. Albania and Macedonia share Lake Ohrid. This superb and extraordinary natural resource of particular importance for both our countries and as it was mentioned by many Members of the Committee, for the whole of Europe. We understand the resolve of the authorities of North Macedonia and trust their commitment to properly deal with the issues identified.

Our countries are bound by the Lake, which is only a part of an ever-stronger network of ties, at all levels. In 2005 our countries concluded an agreement creating a joint planning committee composed of representatives of local and central power to deal with issues related to the protection of Lake Ohrid including water quality and fishing. Since 2018 we organized a yearly government meeting—the whole government—where issues related to Ohrid are on top of the agenda. Of course, as it was identified, much more needs to be done. We are resolved to put in place specific effective integration and implementation of planning processes at various levels to deal with the vulnerabilities and threats, to develop a cross-sectoral cooperation, improve the community participation and transboundary conservation in order to achieve successful longterm management of Lake Ohrid because it will depend not only on one Party. To this end we will fully operationalize a joint coordinating body and joint management planning in order to make sure that both the natural and cultural values of the property are conserved in a fully integrated manner.

Let me repeat, Mr Chairperson, Ohrid is our shared treasure and we are determined to do what is necessary for it to remain a treasure. Therefore, in the view of the transformational changes in North Macedonia, we strongly encourage the Committee to provide more time to the State Party to properly deal with these issues. Thank you for the time that you provided.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have an NGO to give some comments on this matter. Please.

Observer NGO (Europa Nostra):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. On behalf of Europa Nostra, I wish to express the full support of our vast European movement of heritage NGOs for the proposed decision, which has been put forward to the World Heritage Committee. We wish to congratulate the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the very clear analysis and the very robust provisions of the proposed decisions which reflect the serious and continued threats which the natural and cultural heritage of the Ohrid region have been facing for so many years. We are of the opinion that the inscription of the natural and cultural heritage of the Ohrid region on the World Heritage List in Danger should be perceived also by the State Party as the willingness of the international community to ring the alarm bell and help raise the consciousness not only among

the political leaders and public authorities but also among the business community and citizens at large that the continuation of the current situation is contrary to the principles of sustainable development and to the responsibilities related to the World Heritage status of the natural and cultural heritage of the Ohrid region. We are convinced that by adopting the proposed decision the World Heritage Committee would live up to its very important responsibility of being the guardian both of the letter and the spirit of the World Heritage Convention and we very much hope that you will also demonstrate the same firm commitment when discussing other cases of endangered world Heritage sites such as Venice and its Lagoon. Thank you so much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I think that we have to finish with the interventions and move to the Rapporteur about the draft decision.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As flagged, we have received some amendments on this decision from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China and Hungary. The first three paragraphs as you can see are not amended or proposed for amendment, nor paragraph 4.

The first change is in paragraph 5 which would now read, Notes that partial progress has been made and then the paragraph continues as it was originally written. Paragraph 6 also changed to say, Notes that the State Party is not regularly informing the World Heritage Centre of projects and planning activities being developed within the boundaries of the property in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines. Paragraph 7 is also amended. Notes with concern that the State Party has not yet addressed the recommendations on the Railway corridor VIII despite the Committee's request to consider alternative routes outside the property and in fact the rest of that paragraph remains un-amended.

Then there is a new paragraph 8 proposed. Notes with satisfaction that the State Party's action on the longterm projects including the ways forward to management system and redirecting of the River Sateska and furthermore welcomes the government's adoption of law and management of the natural and cultural heritage in the Ohrid region as well as the government decision taken in June 2019 tasking all relevant domestic institutions to implement the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre. Former paragraph 8 is proposed for complete deletion and also former paragraph 9. Former paragraph 10 is unchanged other than changing the numbering and then former paragraph 11 is also proposed for deletion.

And then the last paragraph is also amended, Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2020 and updated report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020 with a view to considering in case of the confirmation of the potential or ascertained danger to its Outstanding Universal Value the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So it's clear for us that the discussion must go further but there is an opinion that due to the specific case for which there is an extension request to be examined under the agenda for Item 8B in the coming days so I would like to suggest that this Item be left opened until the time when we will have a decision on Item 8B and after that we will return to the approval of this document because it will be logically more clear and more legal, let's say. You don't mind? Thank you very much. So we leave this matter after the discussion of the nomination from Albania, immediately. Okay, thank you. I would now like to invite Mr Mauro Rosi, Chief of the Latin America and the Caribbean Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. The only mixed property of the Latin America and the Caribbean region for which the report is proposed for adoption without discussion is the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu in Peru. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

No other opinions? Thank you very much. So we declare the decision read out, adopted. Any Observers? Any comments? Thank you very much. Now we move to the other question, the discussion proposed by the United Republic of Tanzania, which is done by their delegation which requests the state of conservation report on Ngorongoro Conservation Area to be opened for discussion. I would like to ask Tanzania to give their reasons for that.

Chairperson:

Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. I'll be presenting the reasons for opening the decision for discussion as follows. We concur with the analysis made and the recommendations suggested by the Advisory Bodies on the state of conservation for the property, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. However, we have submitted evidence for gradual implementation of the Advisory Bodies recommendations, notably that all roads within the property are categorized as park roads and are now fully managed by the Ngorongoro Conservation Area who had as well submitted the feasibility studies for the Serengeti-Ngorongoro by-pass road as requested by the Committee in the previous decisions. These were the strongest and major recommendations for implementation by the State Party.

Looking at the current analysis we have observed a mismatch between the reported achievements, the ones I've just mentioned in the implementation of the recommendation and the analysis by the Advisory Bodies that requests the State Party, Tanzania, to halt the road-hardening project. We still consider the road-hardening project a priority for safeguarding Ngorongoro's Outstanding Universal Value. This will equally address the 2017 Advisory mission recommendation that the present situation of the road has significant impact to the property's OUV by a rapid growing number of tourist vehicles, increasing local resident use of the road as well as conservation operations in place. Then the road always requires considerable maintenance and this calls for constant destruction of the gravel with high financial cost and compromised visitors experience. We request the continuation of the road-hardening project while implementing the remaining recommendations from the Advisory Bodies. This will give us better possibilities to manage and regulate visitors experience, reduce road operations and this will as well reduce considerable environmental impacts affecting the property's OUV at the moment. We submit this request together with minor changes in the draft decision for the Committee's consideration. Thank you very much, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any comments from the Centre? Please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have had further consultation with the State Party and have further clarifications from their side. I just want to reiterate that the World Heritage Centre along with the Advisory Bodies did conduct 2019 reactive monitoring mission, which were really the first data that provided information that we have integrated so far and I would ask if with your permission, the Advisory Body ICOMOS to provide further explanation and clarification that we were able to up date so far. Thank you.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. Just to, if I may, clarify the issues over the surfacing of the road as set out in paragraph 6 of the draft decision, which the honorable delegate from the State Party has just mentioned. In relation to the road upgrade project the State Party was requested to undertake detailed surveys and studies of the landscape along the line of the proposed road particularly relating to archeological evidence before the road project was finalized. Although it was not anticipated that the road would impact on known archeological sites as the whole property acknowledges high archeological potential for further discoveries at the time it was inscribed for culture. These surveys were seen as being essential in relation to the potential for new archeological finds. Unfortunately, these surveys were not undertaken before the road upgrade project was finalized. These surveys have therefore now been included as part of the main contract and this is what the State Party has explained to us. The downside of this revised approach relates to the potential for delay in the project if archeological sites were identified and also the limited opportunities to alter the road route to avoid significant sites if they are found. We have discussed this matter with the State Party and they have agreed that the best way forward in the circumstances is if they forward the results on the survey to the Advisory Bodies for review as soon as they have been undertaken and to allow the necessary time for their review to be undertaken. This procedure has been agreed to by the State Party. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any other comments? Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président, pour la parole qui nous est donnée. En fait, nous avons lu attentivement le rapport qui a été proposé par les organes consultatifs et nous avons également approché l'État partie pour vérifier les détails sur la mise en œuvre des recommandations qui ont été faites en 2017, et nous nous sommes rendus compte finalement qu'il y a des efforts qui ont été déployés par l'État partie pour pouvoir mettre en œuvre ces recommandations, mais, toutefois, il y a d'autres recommandations, et d'ailleurs l'État partie l'a bien mentionné, qui vont continuer justement à prendre en compte ces observations des organes consultatifs, afin de pouvoir les mettre totalement en œuvre. Nous devons reconnaître une chose ici, c'est qu'il y a des coûts assez significatifs pour la mise en œuvre de toutes ces recommandations, notamment sur ce projet d'amélioration de l'accès au site, et nous sommes convaincus qu'avec cette amélioration d'accès sur le site, évidemment, il y aura un changement significatif sur les impacts que cela pourrait apporter sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Donc nous encourageons ici l'État partie à continuer à maintenir le dialogue et à coopérer avec les organes consultatifs et le Centre dans le sens de compléter et de mettre en œuvre le reste des recommandations qui ont été formulées. L'Angola, dans ce sens, a proposé certains amendements au projet de décision que nous soumettons à l'appréciation des membres du Comité. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le site Zone de conservation de Ngorongoro, bien mixte, a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 1979, suivi d'une extension en 2010, suivant les critères (iv), (vii), (viii) et (x). Si ces critères montrent la beauté et la richesse du site, ils

présentent également la complexité de gestion du site compte tenu de la présence de l'homme dont les besoins sont imprévisibles et croissants dans le cadre de l'utilisation des diverses ressources naturelles. C'est ainsi qu'au cours des premières missions effectuées il a été observé plusieurs facteurs pouvant affecter le bien. Il s'agit de l'accroissement de la population humaine, du braconnage, de la prolifération des espèces envahissantes, de la pression touristique, de la pression du pâturage, et autres.

Malgré ces difficultés réelles perceptibles, l'État partie de la République-Unie de Tanzanie a mis en place un système de surveillance qui permet de contrôler le braconnage, la gestion de la zone de conservation de Ngorongoro qui permet de maîtriser la circulation intense sur la route principale allant de la porte de Lodoare à Golini, et l'évaluation de l'impact environnemental et social de cette route qui a été entreprise et soumise au Centre du patrimoine mondial.

Monsieur le Président, toutes ces actions méritent des encouragements à l'État partie, la République-Unie de Tanzanie, et notre délégation souscrit à l'amendement apporté par l'Angola sur le projet de décision 43 COM 7B.39. Notre délégation voudrait également encourager le dialogue entre l'État partie, l'UICN et le Comité du patrimoine mondial pour la mise en œuvre de ces actions au bénéfice de la population. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I don't see any other interventions. I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur because we have another amendment to the draft decision.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As flagged, we have received amendments from Kuwait, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Uganda, Spain, Australia, Burkina Faso and Brazil. I'll just read those to you. The first two paragraphs remain the same. Sorry, I'm reading the wrong one. Thank you. The first five stay the same and I apologize, this is only from Angola. I'm ahead of myself. Apologies. That's very embarrassing. All right, paragraph 6 from Angola. Notes the reported continuing work on the surfacing of roads in the property while addressing the recommendations of the 2017 Advisory mission including the admission of the feasibility study for the southern by-pass road and also requests the State Party to urgently submit to the World Heritage—perhaps that is meant to be World Heritage Centre—for review by the Advisory Bodies, the details of the surveys and studies that were recommended by the 2017 mission before construction work commence.

Chairperson:

So there are no other changes on any other paragraphs with the draft decision--only with paragraph 6.

Rapporteur:

Sorry. May I just make a small remark on 6 just for the language in the English? Just to make clear here that we are noting, while the Committee is noting it's not the Committee who is addressing the recommendations so the Rapporteur just suggested that we would say in the English version, while the State Party is addressing the recommendations--to make it clear that it's not the Committee.

Chairperson:

Correct. This wording is correct. I think that we can approve the whole decision without discussing paragraph-by-paragraph. If you don't mind. I don't see any objections. Thank you very much. So we approve the version provided by Angola and with the amendments. Thank

you very much. We move to another matter. I would like to invite Mr Moukala, to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.

Mr Moukala:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The list is the Maloti-Drakensberg Park, Lesotho, South Africa. There is only one site. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any objections? So we can approve. I don't see any objections from Committee Members. Thank you. The decision is approved. Any comments from the Observers, organizations? I don't see any. Thank you very much. Now we move to Bahrain.

Chairperson:

Because they requested to discuss the matter over the conservation of the archeological site of Carthage in Tunisia to be discussed. So we need their reasons. Thank you very much.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have proposed opening this SOC report just to encourage the State Party on the work that has already been carried out. It has come to our attention that the State Party of Tunisia has already taken some positive actions in response to previous Committee decisions and we felt that it was a good gesture to actually commend their efforts within the draft decision and we have inserted just two paragraphs in that manner and we do hope for the support of the Committee in endorsing these amendments by consensus. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments from the Centre?

The Secretariat:

Thank you. In fact an Advisory mission took place in the archeological site of Carthage from 22-26 April 2019. It was mainly aimed at assessing the impact of recent and illegal construction works within the property. At the time of drafting the state of conservation report the mission's recommendations were not yet available. Nevertheless, we would like to point out that following the very close collaboration during the mission the State Party of Tunisia has already begun implementing the mission's recommendations, which is really much appreciated. I give the floor to ICOMOS if they have further comments.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

We have no comments at this stage. Thank you. Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait wanted to make a comment.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Also, the State Party of Kuwait submitted a draft amendment. We would like to thank the State Party of Tunisia and the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their positive collaboration getting the job during at an earlier time in a professional manner and we would also like to take this opportunity to thank the local government and the

national government in facilitating the field mission and we would like to see the changes in the amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like to highlight that this decision in our opinion offers us a good example of the very positive results of the dialogue between the State Party including at the central and municipal levels and the Advisory Bodies. It reflects very harmonious perceptions on both sides and the determination of the State Party to comply with the recommendations that were made. As we welcome and praise this continued dialogue we believe it is essential for strengthening the objectives of the 1972 Convention on World Heritage. We therefore, support the amendment presented. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now, Burkina Faso.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Au regard des efforts fournis par l'État partie de la Tunisie pour répondre aux sollicitations et exigences émises sur le site de Carthage, nous pensons que ces efforts méritent d'être soulignés et encouragés. De même, pour soutenir le dialogue entre l'État partie et l'organe consultatif qui a permis d'aboutir aux résultats que nous avons constatés, nous faisons nôtres les propositions d'amendements afin qu'elles soient mises en œuvre diligemment. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I wish to echo the previous speakers sentiments and we very much welcome the spirit of dialogue and we are also using this although not directly related to Tunisia case but the very good spirit of regional agreement through consensus is very much appreciated and I think this applies to the Tunisia case and we welcome the spirit and support the amendment. Thank you.

H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil) takes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to our colleague from Azerbaijan. Please, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Azerbaijan also congratulates the State Party and welcomes its efforts in conjunction with readiness to be engaged in constructive dialogue with the Advisory Bodies and to halt all those difficulties that the site was facing and we also welcome very much indeed the readiness of the State Party to host and welcome the Advisory mission of ICOMOS to the site and the mission which already took place and the work was highly facilitated by the Tunisian Government. So I think this kind of dialogue and communication between the State Party and the Advisory Bodies is setting a very good example for all of us, the way how State Parties should react on the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies but

using this opportunity I would like to ask you, Madam Chairperson to give the floor to the State Party so they can express their views with regard to the site. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you, dear colleague. Before listening to the delegation of Tunisia, now I would like to pass the floor to the distinguished delegate of Tanzania. You have the floor, please. Thank you.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. The delegation of Tanzania also commends the Advisory Bodies and the State Party for good work done particularly the employment of effective dialogue that was used to come to consensus. We do support the decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Je passe la parole maintenant à mon cher collègue le délégué de la Tunisie, s'il vous plaît.

La Délégalion de la Tunisie :

Merci beaucoup, Madame la Présidente. C'est en une autre qualité que je prends la parole devant cet honorable Comité pour parler d'un site que le Comité connaît très bien parce que ce fut l'un des premiers sites qui a été inscrit en 1979, et Carthage même était le lieu où ce Comité s'était réuni en 1991. Le cas de Carthage, et je souligne avec grande satisfaction l'intervention des différentes délégations, est un cas aujourd'hui, je voudrais dire, exemplaire de la coopération entre les différentes parties, à la fois le Centre, les organisations consultatives et l'État partie. Et d'ailleurs quand je dis l'État partie ici, c'est réducteur, parce qu'il y a les autorités nationales, les autorités régionales, et il y a bien entendu les autorités locales. Personne ne nie qu'il y a des problèmes, c'est un site de vie, c'est un site où il y a un développement économique et urbain important, et le maintien du respect du développement et également la protection du site posent un certain nombre de problèmes.

Ce dont je voudrais rassurer non seulement les membres du Comité mais l'ensemble de la communauté internationale, c'est que nous prenons nos responsabilités totalement à leur niveau, et que, deuxièmement, nous avons entrepris un certain nombre de mesures, notamment des mesures de démolition de beaucoup de constructions, au niveau du cirque de Carthage et au niveau également de l'École de police qui est située pas très loin des ports puniques, elle-même faisant partie, ou lui-même faisant partie des éléments inscrits dans le cadre de ce site. La dynamique est positive, la dynamique a commencé déjà à apporter ses résultats, et nous nous conformons, vous l'avez remarqué, à l'ensemble de ce qui le projet de résolution a proposé, et nous nous en tiendrons aux dates proposées pour vous faire rapport.

Je vous donne rendez-vous pour qu'au prochain rapport on puisse constater la totale conformité entre le site, ses partenaires, mais également l'ensemble des communautés qui y vivent, qu'elles soient locales, régionales ou nationales. Donc le message ici c'est que nous considérons les problèmes, nous ne le nions pas et nous voulons les traiter avec vous pour en venir à bout. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

With my congratulations I thank you very much and I believe that we could now move to the adoption of decision 43 COM 7B.55 and at this point I would pass the floor to our Rapporteur to inform us on the amendment. Thank you very much.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. And with a sense of déjà vu I will read the countries submitting this amendment. Kuwait, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Uganda, Spain, Australia, Burkina Faso and Brazil. The first two paragraphs remain the same. Then there is an addition of a third paragraph proposed, Welcomes the information provided by the State Party and commends it for the efforts made so far by national, regional and local authorities to address the difficulties and for better protection and enhancement of the property.

There is a new paragraph 4 also proposed: Underlines with satisfaction the prompt welcome and successful conduct of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Advisory mission organized at the request of the World Heritage Centre, which took place from 23 to 25 April 2019 and whose work was highly facilitated—I'm going to suggest the translation of highly is better as greatly facilitated there—greatly facilitated by all the Tunisian parties concerned.

An amendment to paragraph 5, sorry, former paragraph 3 which is to delete the start and instead say, Expresses its concern regarding the recent illegal construction work in and near the property. The next paragraph former 4 remains. New paragraph 6 un-amended. Same with the new paragraph 7, no amendments.

Paragraphs 8 and 9--in fact all the way I believe until the final paragraph which would now read, Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, as well as the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020. And I think that's all we have. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you so much. Are there any comments to the amendments proposed?

Chairperson:

As I see—Saint Kitts and Nevis. Saint Kitts and Nevis, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Just to simply lend our support to this particular amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I think that after so many expressions of support, no further comments we can declare the decision adopted. Thank you very much. I would like to invite Ms Shaer of the Arab States Unit of the World Heritage Centre, and ICOMOS to read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Arab States region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.

The Secretariat:

Thank you. The list of the cultural properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion are Kasbah of Algiers in Algeria, Tipasa in Algeria, Qal'at al-Bahrain, Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun in Bahrain, the Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis in Egypt, Historic Cairo in Egypt, Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur in Egypt, the Baptism Site "Bethany Beyond the Jordan" (Al-Maghtas) in Jordan, Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) in Jordan, Byblos in Lebanon, Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) in Lebanon, Tyre in Lebanon, Ksar of Ait-Ben-Haddou in Morocco, Rabat, Modern Capital and Historic City: a Shared Heritage in

Morocco, Rock Art in the Hail Region of Saudi Arabia in Saudi Arabia, Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region in Sudan. Thank you. This was the list.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor to the NGO that has requested to speak at this session. Is the NGO that requested the floor in the room? Okay, the NGO is not in the room so we will close the Item without reports. Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the decision read out, adopted. Thank you very much.

I would now like to ask whether any Observer delegation would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decision without discussion? Yes, the delegation of Morocco, you have the floor please.

The Observer Delegation of Morocco:

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Tout d'abord, permettez-moi au nom de mon pays de remercier vivement, puisque c'est la première fois que nous prenons la parole, le Gouvernement de l'Azerbaïdjan pour l'accueil chaleureux et l'organisation excellente de cette session du Comité, et aussi vous féliciter et féliciter le Président pour la conduite exemplaire de nos travaux. Madame la Présidente, après l'adoption de la décision concernant les deux sites marocains, j'aimerais au nom de mon pays remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives pour leur travail, leurs conseils et leurs recommandations, que le Maroc s'engage à faire de son mieux pour appliquer, en vue d'améliorer la conservation et la protection de nos sites et de notre patrimoine, ainsi que de leur valeur universelle exceptionnelle, tout en assurant son engagement envers le développement durable dans notre pays. J'aimerais aussi, si vous me le permettez, Madame la Présidente, remercier tous les fonctionnaires du Centre du patrimoine mondial et du Secteur culture pour leur travail et pour leur abnégation. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. It was very considerate to extend your congratulations and compliments to all the members of these important Advisory Bodies. With your permission now if there are no more comments I think we can move to Asia Pacific and discuss the Temple Zone of Sambor Prei Kuk, Archaeological Site of Ancient Ishanapura in Cambodia.

For the next property to be discussed, I would like to give the floor to the Delegation of China, which requested the state of conservation report on the Temple Zone of Sambor Prei Kuk, Archaeological Site of Ancient Ishanapura in Cambodia to be opened for discussion, to present to the Committee the reason why it made such request. You have the floor, please, your Excellency.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The reason that we are requesting the opening of this item for discussion is that we wish to, at the request of the State Party involved, make a minor amendment to the draft decision and that does not change the decision of the draft amendment at all. It only reflects a little appreciation to the State Party concerned and that is because it is reflected in the report itself and therefore we think it is fully justified to give them this incentive and appreciation. So it's in paragraph 3 at the beginning. I think the new amendment is circulated. It basically reads, at paragraph 3, Commends the State Party for the progress made in implementing the Committee's previous decision and the recommendations formulated at the time of inscription. This is inserted—that's the only change to the text. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, dear colleague.

I would pass the floor now to the delegation of Tunisia. Please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Juste pour appuyer ce qui vient d'être dit par l'honorable représentant de la Chine, que la Tunisie introduit et demande l'amendement en question, qui rentre dans la logique de ce que nous sommes en train de faire depuis hier, c'est-à-dire que quand il y a des aspects positifs, il faut les souligner, il faut encourager l'État pour aller plus loin et bénéficier de ce double accompagnement. Donc je voudrais à la fois appuyer cet amendement et souligner avec beaucoup de satisfaction l'attitude de l'État partie en question.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any more comments on this topic? Norway, please, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I just would like to say that Norway commends Cambodia for all the work they have done and the progress they have achieved with the Temple Zone Sambor Prei Kuk. We wish them luck with the continued work on the site that is in their care and in this regard I would like to emphasize the importance of the continued work on the risk and response management plan and the tourism management plan. I assume many visitors want to see this wonderful place. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Are there any more comments on the side of Committee Members? If not we before we proceed to the analysis of the draft decision I would ask ICOMOS if you have any comments to add. Thank you very much. You have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Bonjour tout le monde. Tout d'abord, comme l'a mentionné la délégation de la Chine, au début du document de travail on parle déjà des progrès qu'a faits l'État partie. Comme vous le savez, le bien était inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 2017. Le rapport de l'État partie sur la conservation démontre sa volonté ferme de répondre aux recommandations du Comité lors de son inscription. Je pense que, dans ce contexte, l'ICOMOS va faire des commentaires additionnels. Merci.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please, go ahead.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. ICOMOS and ICCROM acknowledge that the State Party has made considerable progress with the recommendations of the Committee since this property was inscribed on the World Heritage List at the 41st session and we agree with the representations made by the distinguished delegate from China and others that this achievement should be acknowledged emphasizing that this is a very fragile site and we must agree with the delegate from Norway that it is important that these works continue with further development of the conservation manual, with the preparation of a risk and response management plan and with further work on the tourism management plan. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now, with your permission dear colleagues, invite our Rapporteur to present the draft decision with the amendments so we can approve decision 43 COM 7B.56. Please, you have the floor.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. As flagged, we received one amendment from China and Tunisia and that's in paragraph 3, which would read, Commends the State Party for the progress made in implementing the Committee's previous decision and the recommendations formulated at the time of inscription and requests, etc. Madam Chairperson, that's all we have.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Are there any comments to the amendment proposed by the delegation of China? Since this is the only amendment to the text I think if you all agree we can consider the decision approved. Thank you very much. We now move to the Item related to the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi in Kazakhstan.

Chairperson:

For the next property to be discussed, I would like to give the floor to the Delegations of Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan, which both requested the state of conservation report on the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi in Kazakhstan to be opened for discussion, to present to the Committee the reason why they made such request. May I give the floor first to Kyrgyzstan? Thank you.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. By welcoming the report done by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, the Kyrgyz delegation wants to mention that the Kazakh State Party has responded to the concerns expressed by the Committee with the assessment of the development project regarding the OUV of the property. It should be considered that their heritage impact assessment report prepared by a multidisciplinary international expert team have concluded that the implementation of the project in the buffer zone as well as the wider setting will not have negative direct or indirect impact to the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi. It was acknowledged that the proposed development will have a positive impact on the residents of Yasi, Turkestan and its visitors.

Second, the consultation of the team of international experts. The content of the report submitted by the State Party is the result of extensive assessment, fieldwork, working sessions and discussions in Turkestan for two months in March and April 2019. The team consisted of 16 recognized international and national experts including ICOMOS experts whose evaluation must be taken into consideration. It also included close consultation with UNESCO as well as well as the local and national authorities of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Moreover, our experts point out the detailed information provided by Kazakhstan. Detailed information on the old development projects within the buffer zone and in the wider setting was provided by the State Party following the Operational Guidelines paragraph 172.

The state of conservation report and Heritage Impact Assessment report were sent by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre and these reports inform about the conservation activities of the historic structures within the buffer zone Eski Turkestan Archeological Park project within their buffer zone and the Spiritual and Cultural Centre project in the wider setting. Three concepts were proposed by the State Party should be acknowledged and welcomed. All necessary details related to establishing the Eski Turkestan Archeological Park within the buffer zone were provided by the State Party. The view access protection area is evidence-based and in line with Operational Guidelines. Moreover, the proposed view access protection

area presents an added layer of protection and efficient mitigation of negative impact on the visual integrity of the place in line with the national and local planning regulations.

In this regard, we would like to pose the following question to the delegation of Kazakhstan so they could put more essential points in the draft decision which they would add some more information. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Thank you very much. I would like to ask the delegation of Azerbaijan if there are any comments to be added to what has just been said? Thank you. You have the floor.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. Regarding the draft decision 43 COM 7B.67 on the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi World Heritage property, we welcome the substantive work which has been carried out by the State Party of Kazakhstan to improve the state of conservation of the property and appreciate the success achieved concerning the physical stability of the mausoleum structures. There is commitment from the Government to ensure the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by conducting necessary planning and the Heritage Impact Assessment. Our delegation would like to highlight the transparency of the reports delivered by the State Party. Draft decision 43 COM 7B.67, we believe was taken with little dialogue with the State Party and it focuses mainly on issues outside the buffer zone.

The continuous work of the State Party and the constant advice of an international team of experts with ICOMOS have all positive implications including active conservation measures on the Mausoleum itself, involvement of all relevant stakeholders, operation of a factory for the manufacture of custom-made traditional tiles, increased control of the level of visitors, ongoing maintenance and planned access for persons with disabilities. Referring to paragraph 6 of the draft decision, we should say that in the nomination dossier in 2003 there is no mention about height restrictions within the wider setting outside the buffer zone or that it would be controlled.

Having not been acquainted with the materials presented by ICOMOS and the State Party, we came to the following conclusion concerning the decision regarding the reactive monitoring mission. According to the Operational Guidelines in paragraph 169, reactive monitoring missions are sent to World Heritage properties that are under threat and when properties inscribed or to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Based on all the materials presented we do not see indications that the site is in danger. Thank you for your attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor to the distinguished colleague from Tunisia. Thank you.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier à la fois le Centre et les organisations consultatives quant au travail qui a été mené pour observer la situation de ce site. Il est vrai qu'il y a beaucoup d'éléments factuels qui suscitent notre intérêt, et par certains aspects même notre inquiétude, mais je crois que, dans l'esprit même de la Convention, l'existence de la catégorie Liste en péril joue aussi un rôle persuasif, et je crois que dans notre cas nous sommes dans cette situation. C'est-à-dire que la perspective d'arriver à ce soir et éventuellement de l'inscrire sur la liste a permis d'infléchir l'attitude de l'État partie. Il y a beaucoup d'évolutions qui sont à souligner et d'efforts louables à encourager. C'est pour ça qu'à la fois nous saluons cela et nous souhaitons écouter l'État partie nous dire quelle est son

évaluation actuelle de la situation, et quels sont les démarches qu'il entend entreprendre en vue de ramener ce site à la meilleure situation possible. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The distinguished colleague from Kuwait, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I would also like to welcome my talk with my colleagues from Tunisia and Azerbaijan regarding the Advisory Bodies' report. I would also like to thank the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their intensive involvement with the State Party regarding this site. There are a lot of subjective differences between the State Party and Advisory Bodies regarding for example the visual integrity still needs to be resolved. We think there is positive coordination and a lot of the items to be developed outside the buffer zone we think is still valid for the State Party and again we go back to the balance between development of the infrastructure for the visitors, for the people who live outside the buffer zone and for the keeping the integrity of the site and its culture. I would also like to hear from the State Party to show their point of view between the differences of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Distinguished colleague of China, please. You have the floor.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The city of Turkestan is an important site on the Silk Road and we pay close attention to the situation around the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi. Our delegation supports the proposed amendment to the draft decision for the following reasons: first, the property is in very good shape. Restoration work is under control; secondly, view access will be handled to protect the visual integrity of the Mausoleum in line with its OUV; thirdly, within the buffer zone and Archeological Park is proposed that is in line with the ICOMOS Salalah guidelines for the management of public archeological site guidelines; and fourthly, the Spiritual and Cultural Centre project proposed outside the buffer zone will add more intangible value to the tangible qualities of the OUV of the property. Visual integrity will be ensured by the visual access plan. The situation of the historical city of Turkestan should be evaluated through a scientific workshop as a whole, the recommendations of which will be integrated into the new Master Plan. The Operational Guidelines do not offer provision regarding the planning intervention into the dynamic of the development of the living city. There are plenty of examples worldwide where parts of living cities are even identical with the buffer zone, not talking about the living cities themselves outside the buffer zone. Further careful studies and resolutions in this regard are needed and have to be therefore presently not approved for Turkestan. The following amendments are necessary to the following dynamic development. Therefore the following amendments are necessary to allow dynamic development outside the buffer zone. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I pass the floor now to the delegation of Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. La délégation du Burkina Faso, après avoir écouté les interventions des honorables membres du Comité et étudié les documents présentés par l'ICOMOS et le Kazakhstan, prend note de l'élaboration détaillée du rapport sur l'état de conservation et des rapports sur l'impact des projets sur le site du patrimoine, ainsi que de

l'ouverture du pays, de la transparence et du haut niveau professionnel que l'État partie a manifesté dans la collecte et dans la préparation de ces documents. Nous avons aussi pris connaissance des rapports susmentionnés et considérons que le site du patrimoine mondial dénommé Mausolée de Khoja Ahmad Yasawi du Kazakhstan ne court pas un danger réel identifié ou potentiel.

Sur cette base, la délégation du Burkina Faso ne voit pas la nécessité d'envoyer une mission de suivi réactif. Par ailleurs, nous voudrions rappeler la création d'un centre culturel et spirituel situé en dehors de la zone tampon du mausolée, qui permet le développement des valeurs immatérielles associées au site du patrimoine mondial, toutes choses qui soutiennent la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien et ne l'exposent pas à une menace avérée ou potentielle. Je vous remercie pour votre aimable attention.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. I would like to pass the floor now to the delegation of Angola. You have the floor now, dear colleague.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. In our today global and integrated world, culture and education are becoming key drivers to achieving sustainable development goals. So the designation of the city of Turkestan is the administrative capital of the Turkestan Province. A number of development projects have been designed for the improvement of social welfare as well as cultural and administrative infrastructure of the city in line with the sustainable development goals. We have got some information and insights from the State Party that the development project located in the wider setting of the World Heritage property is not in the buffer zone and will improve the wellbeing of the residents of Turkestan city and its visitors in the following areas: culture, education, social, recreation and tourism. We think that this project is very important to nurture the sense of belonging, identity and strengthen community participation, promote appreciation and understanding of historic and cultural heritage.

We have to remind our colleagues here in the Committee that cultural heritage is not only to be considered in a traditional view but also in a modern perspective so that the local community can benefit especially young people. So in this regard we support the amendment made by some of the Committee Members and we recommend the State Party of Kazakhstan to continue collaborating with the Advisory Bodies and the Centre so that they can improve the state of conservation of this important property. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor now to the delegation of Hungary. Please, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. The Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi is really a very important place and very interesting for the respect and for the view that is seen as a very important and old World Heritage property and at the same time it is somehow in the centre of a new living village. The new and old structures have to be combined somehow and it is a very interesting task and we can see it in this case. Hungary greatly appreciates the well-based evaluation and proposal of ICOMOS. A very long numbering could be followed which are very important and due to be analyzed and followed by the State Party. However, Hungary agrees practically with all States Parties proposing amendments and also with Australia for paragraph 7, which is partly different from the other ones.

Let me mention one point, which could be seemingly very important for the evaluation. It is the height of the new structures. The average maximum height of the old structures is, as far as I know seven meters. And the new structures in the buffer zone should be much higher, up to 27 meters. In my opinion this is not agreeable and should be changed but maybe the State Party could give information about the mitigation of the heights of the new structures and so the case should be evaluated a bit differently. To prove and to show the sensible approach of the State Party towards the property let me mention one example. It is among others the fact that the traditional road system within the property will be fully preserved so it is for me a very important aspect. However, taking into account all the amendments and also the evaluation of ICOMOS permanent cooperation and connection between the State Party and ICOMOS will be of outstanding importance in the future. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I now pass the floor to the delegation of Indonesia. Please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

[Arabic spoken]

[English spoken] Indonesia would like to thank the Advisory Bodies on their report on the state of conservation of the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi of Kazakhstan. We acknowledge progress made by the State Party and express our appreciation for Kazakhstan's commitment to the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value. Indonesia understands that the State Party has conducted the very comprehensive study and this study has resulted in a clear map of protection zones and another result is a new Master Plan which has considered the protection of Outstanding Universal Value with a proper buffer zone and Special Visual Protection Zone outside the buffer zone within which no major development would take place. For this reason, Indonesia supports the proposed amendment by the delegation of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan and China. Thank you very much.

[Arabic spoken]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor now to Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. This is another important site, which is not only historic and symbolic, but also beautiful as it was inscribed based on criteria 1, 3 and 4. Criterion 1 is a masterpiece of human genius so the site is a very important site to all of us. Chairperson, thank you for allowing Tanzanians to intervene in this important site. We are part of the team that changed the draft decision. Chairperson, the United Republic of Tanzania delegation read the analysis of the Advisory Bodies with interest and attention. The delegation notes that the analysis and conclusion of the Advisory Bodies with appreciation and satisfaction. However, going into the analysis we see that the analysis is about two-pages long and the recommendations are about two-pages long. We felt that these recommendations were either too many or not brief enough to be able to be understood clearly. So we thought we should see how we could come up with changes into the paragraph to make the paragraphs clearer and consistent with the analysis and also to make sure that the paragraphs are brief.

In such a situation, Chairperson, we align ourselves with Tunisia, China, Kuwait, Burkina Faso and all other who spoke for the changing of the paragraphs in the draft decision. We are of the opinion that such decisions in the way they were written would be very difficult for the State Party to be able to understand the actual meaning and actuality of what is expected of them.

Chairperson, we are part and support the draft decision that has been composed. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I now pass the floor to the delegation of Cuba.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The delegation that spoke just before me clearly expressed the OUV of this site. I would like to say that we are speaking of a site with a high spiritual value and very small in terms of land area. We can see the limits to the buffer zone, however the State Party scrupulously following the procedure to guarantee the protection of OUV and protect the visual impact has elaborated a very serious report that has a second zone regarding visual impact and used international experts to do that. I think that that analysis really lends a lot of strength to the height regulations relating to the site so therefore I think that the amendment to the draft decision should express the concern of the Advisory Bodies and bring it into line with the work being carried out by the State Party concerned. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We would like to note the extensive work carried out by the State Party to provide the state of conservation report for this property by means of a multidisciplinary international team of 16 experts which highlighted the concept of the Archeological Park was operating in compliance with the ICOMOS 2017 Salalah guidelines for the management of public archeological sites. We believe that considering the valuable cultural layers of the old city of Turkestan, the Park may be an instrument to educate visitors on the cultural features of the archeological site and to enhance the tourism potential of the city and the region. We also reviewed that there must be balance between heritage conservation and urban development in order to ensure the conservation of the Mausoleum and sustainable development of the community in the wider setting of the World Heritage property. We expect this should be possible by means of effective action from the State Party to mitigate potential for negative visual impact of the Turkestan Spiritual and Cultural Centre project on the Mausoleum. In this sense we would like to request the delegation of Kazakhstan to provide clarifications to the Committee concerning the proposed Visual Axis Protection Zone. And we also welcome the amendment proposed. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I pass the floor now to the delegation of Zimbabwe. Please, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The delegation of Zimbabwe notes that this is yet another case in which the development needs of a State Party and the conservation requirements for World Heritage have to be harmonized to ensure sustainable development. The State Party of Kazakhstan has developed measures to ensure that the material wellbeing of its populous is catered for as well as ensuring adequate protection of the World Heritage property. This includes the expansion and development of the city of Turkestan. We also note, Madam Chairperson that in carrying out these development activities the State Party is cognizant of the need to safeguard this World Heritage property within the city of old Turkestan by implementing provisions provided for in the Operational Guidelines of the Convention. This

includes carrying out most of its development initiatives outside the buffer zone and subjecting all of its proposed developments to a Heritage Impact Assessment. In view of this, Zimbabwe supports the amendments to the draft decision proposed by Kyrgyzstan and China. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I ask my distinguished colleague of Bosnia and Herzegovina to take the floor.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Taking into consideration the great architectural and religious importance of this monument, one of the most important monuments in this part of the world, and the information received about the activities of the State Party, we join this amendment and additional amendment by Australia and join the previous speakers—it will be nice to listen to the State Party to give us additional information. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Dear colleagues of Australia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Australia also appreciate the work done by the Advisory Bodies and the report in relation to this property and also the respect for the property that is clearly demonstrated by the State Party and the conservation efforts for the Mausoleum and in the planning for the archeological park and the developments around the buffer zone. Australia supports the amendments our colleagues from Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan and others. We also submitted as our colleague from Hungary note, an amendment for paragraph 7 that is to clarify rather than to change the meaning of the paragraph although I believe the Rapporteur may want to make some drafting changes to it. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Guatemala, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. I don't want to take up much more time. I just briefly wanted to express our support to the proposed amendment. We believe that the State Party has demonstrated transparency and willingness to enter into a dialogue with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. We think that this is a living heritage site and we are pleased to note the connectedness between the culture, the spirituality and archeology of the site. We are of the belief that continuing a dialogue between all of the different instances is going to lead to balanced development of this World Heritage property. The physical boundaries of the site and buffer zones are clear and it has all of the components set in place for adequate monitoring for the future. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I pass the floor now to the delegation of Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Norway appreciates the wish of the State Party for development and especially in light of the new status of the city as capital of the Turkestan region and as a special economic zone. And at the same time, we commend Kazakhstan for keeping in mind the Mausoleum and the spirit of the site. We also commend Kazakhstan for their work on the Mausoleum itself. However, we would have liked to have seen that in the

plans and development projects did not come that far without sufficient dialogue between the State Party, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Norway encourages a good future dialogue between Kazakhstan, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, delegate of Norway. Since a few delegates asked to hear from the delegation of Kazakhstan, I would pass the floor to the distinguished representative of Kazakhstan.

The Observer Delegation of Kazakhstan:

[Russian spoken, translation read by the interpreter] Dear Chairperson, dear Committee Members, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak and to respond to your questions. Turkestan is one of the most ancient cities in Central Asia. It is one of the pearls of the Silk Road. Since the 14th century the Mausoleum rises majestically over tomb of the poet and preacher Khoja Ahmed Yasawi and has attracted many pilgrims from all over the Turkic world. Later the city became the political and spiritual centre of the Kazakh Khanate, the basis of our statehood. One year ago the President of Kazakhstan issued a decree bestowing on Turkestan that status of an administrative centre of the most populous region in our country. It is expected that within 10 years the population of the city will double. This significant factor determines the importance of creating new and safeguarding existing buildings designed to improve the sociocultural infrastructure, diversify tourism potential and ensure sustainable development of the local community. In the buffer zone we intend to create archeological park called, Ancient Turkestan. We thank ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for supporting this initiative. The projects of the spiritual and cultural centre located outside the buffer zone are designed in line with the requirements of the Convention and its Operational Guidelines. A Heritage Impact Assessment for these projects was prepared by a group of national and international experts with practical experience in ICOMOS missions. According to their conclusions, these projects do not have a negative visual impact on the World Heritage property. As Deputy Prime Minister I confirm that Kazakhstan and the implementation of all projects in the city of Turkestan will ensure the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Mausoleum. In conclusion I would like to thank Azerbaijan for their warm hospitality. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now like to invite Mr Feng Jing, Chief of the Asia-Pacific Unit of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to respond to those comments. Thank you very much.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. *Salaam alaikum*. It appears that this a really complex case, where discussion on the state of conservation of this property was not initially foreseen for the present Committee session, that development on the site and potential impact on the property and its buffer zone have promoted early review by the Committee. The Committee may recall that due to the construction of a new mosque a World Heritage—ICOMOS Advisory mission to the property was carried out in 2010. The mission recommendation was endorsed by the Committee with the reduction of the height of the mosque and its minaret. The Committee also requested the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with the revised map of the property and its buffer zone. That was Decision 38 COM 7B.16, but no submission has been received by the World Heritage Centre so far.

As indicated by the distinguished Deputy Prime Minister of Kazakhstan, the ICOMOS Advisory mission in May 2018 raised several issues concerning the development in the buffer zones and beyond. In November last year the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to

submit complete documentation on the projects and with possible Heritage Impact Assessments and a state of conservation for review by ICOMOS as there have been concerns that these planned projects may have potential impact on the OUV of the property and requested the State Party to provide detailed information and clarification, as several Committee Members indicated. Also, as the distinguished Deputy Prime Minister mentioned the background to this situation is that on 19 June 2018 the decree of the President of Kazakhstan about the renaming of the administrative and territory unit of southern Kazakhstan and then announced that Turkestan city where the property is located would be the regional capital of southern Kazakhstan.

As also the distinguished Committee Member of Kyrgyzstan indicated, the State Party organized an important technical mission composed of different international experts and also on the property together with the HIA, the draft HIA prepared, but this documentation depending a thorough review by ICOMOS and with the preliminary comments provided. There is however a strong concern expressed relating to the reduction of the area of height limitation for the property's setting as it alters the setting as defined at the time of inscription as already mentioned by many Committee Members as well as the 2018 ICOMOS Advisory mission with the conclusion that it would potential lead to negative impact on the OUV of the property.

The Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi is a unique and significant cultural heritage site in Kazakhstan. I think the site is also close and dear to the Kazakhs. In the context of the current situation the Committee may also wish to note that the World Heritage Centre through the Netherlands Funds-In-Trust, available at the Centre, provided support through subregional meetings to help raise awareness on the 2011 UNESCO recommendations on Historical Urban Landscapes which aims to address the situation at the site in an integrating manner.

The current complex situation leads to the Centre and also the Advisory Bodies to consider that in view of the potential negative impacts of the projects the Committee may wish to ask for a joint World Heritage Centre-Advisory Bodies reactive monitoring mission to the site to review through the reactive monitoring process as the distinguished Committee discussed yesterday. So in that context the draft decision, which was originally proposed in document 43 COM 7B, can be found on pages 18-20 in the English version and pages 17-19 in the French version. Madam Chairperson, with your permission ICOMOS will provide further comments on this property.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. First of all, for clarity could I say that ICOMOS was not formally involved in the panel of experts; this included ICOMOS individual members. ICOMOS fully understands the need to develop the town of Turkestan in light of its new status but considers that this must be done in a way that respects the Outstanding Universal Value of the property combining old and new in a harmonious and sustainable way. It is not only views of the Mausoleum that are important but also views from it and also its relationship with the town. At the time of inscription the Mausoleum was surrounded by a fairly low-rise town and the nomination dossier clearly states that protection objectives were to ensure the dominant position of the Mausoleum in the landscape.

The new development is in the wider setting beyond the buffer zone. But this area does need to be under effective management to support Outstanding Universal Value as is set out clearly in paragraph 112 of the Operational Guidelines. ICOMOS considers there is a need to reconsider aspects of the new urban plan in relation to the Mausoleum, the new development and the significantly reduced protection zone, which has already been mentioned. At the time of inscription the Mausoleum was surrounded by a large protection area, which has been reduced over the years. We note that this reassessment of the plan is in the revised draft decision. We do regret that it has not been possible so far to have effective collaboration on

this development. Unfortunately governance arrangements it seems have not allowed the timely submission of information on these major development initiatives.

A technical review of the early version of this major project in 2017 and the 2018 mission report both express concern that the potential impact of this development and suggested that reviews of the plans were needed before approvals could be given. But unfortunately so far we have had no further dialogue on this matter. ICOMOS would certainly like to find ways in the future to facilitate such effective collaboration to ensure that further development that is planned in the new Turkestan town does indeed respect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to a representative of l'Union internationale des architectes, qui a souhaité pouvoir se prononcer maintenant. S'il vous plaît, vous avez la parole. Merci beaucoup.

Observer NGO (International Union of Architects):

We are the international co-directors of UIA Work Programme for Heritage. On behalf the International Union of Architects let us convey this statement: Noting the state of conservation report we are witnessing a growing number of threats to urban heritage and heritage in an urban context which needs to be addressed in a multidisciplinary framework. Recognizing the complexities for the safeguarding urban heritage and the successful application of the approach 2011 Historic Urban Landscape recommendation. The International Union of Architects wanting to encourage creativity and innovation in our cities while protecting the OUV of World Heritage sites offers to develop in full cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies guidelines for architectural competitions in and around the World Heritage properties in urban areas that would protect their Outstanding Universal Value and contribute to Target 11.4 of the Sustainable Development Goals and the new urban agenda by giving heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of the heritage into a comprehensive planning programmes. Madam Chairperson, thank you very much for giving us a chance to speak on behalf of the International Union of Architects.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I now invite you to move to give appreciation to decision 43 COM 7B.67 concerning this property and I would like to ask the Rapporteur if she could project the amendments proposed. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. As outlined, we have two sets of amendments, one proposed by Kyrgyzstan, China, Tanzania, Kuwait, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Uganda and Burkina Faso. And another one proposed by Australia to amend one paragraph.

Rapporteur:

The first two paragraphs remain as they are. Paragraph 3 would read, Notes the detailed analysis and monitoring of the technical condition of the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi and the planned project for retiling the domes –and I'll suggest the removal of “the” there in the English version--and waterproofing the roofs, acknowledges the conservation work planned for historical structures in the buffer zone and the related Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), and requests that the State Party submits a final post-execution project report for these interventions the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Then there is a new proposed paragraph 4. Further acknowledges--sorry. Acknowledges the progress made by the State Party and encourages—I think the “to” doesn't need to be there--

encourages further work on improved management, capacity building, and stakeholder engagement.

Former paragraph 4 now paragraph 5 would read, Further acknowledges the proposal and associated HIA for the Eski Turkestan Archaeological Park, located in the buffer zone of the property and set to include walkways, presented excavations, visitor facilities and an open-air museum, following the ICOMOS 2017 Salalah Guidelines for the Management of Public Archaeological Sites, and also requests that details of further development of this project be submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies.

The next paragraph, former paragraph 5, Notes that, as a result of the declaration of Turkestan as capital of the Turkestan Oblast (province) and a Special Economic Zone, a new approved Master Plan for the city should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, which includes the Visual Access Protection Zone with evidence-based view axes—I understand that evidence-based view axes isn't a term and we would suggest, with view axes determined through analysis of evidence. So that's with view axes determined through analysis of evidence which I think will mean the same thing but be a little clearer in the English version.

Paragraph 7, new paragraph 7 would read, Also notes that the proposed Turkestan Spiritual and Cultural Centre project, located outside the buffer zone, which includes ten components, has been submitted to the World Heritage Centre with its corresponding HIAs. The next paragraph, former paragraph 7—Australia proposes a new paragraph but for the group of countries it would read, Further notes that governance arrangements for the property do not allow the timely submission of information for major developments in the wider setting, to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before decisions are taken that would be difficult to reverse and strongly encourages the State Party to arrange a capacity-building workshop in order to address this issue. The alternative proposed by Australia, Further notes that governance arrangements for the property must allow—and I think there needs to be a “for”—for the timely submission of information—I think we'll put a comma in there and might say, regarding all developments that may impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, and strongly encourages the State Party to arrange a capacity-building workshop in order to address this issue.

Then we move on to the former paragraph 8 which has been amended to say, Urges the State Party that an updated the Management Plan for the property needs to be developed and submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies. Former paragraph 9, new paragraph 10 would read, Requests that the State Party shall submit any further project related to the Turkestan Spiritual and Cultural Centre project to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies. Then it's proposed to delete former paragraph 10 and former paragraph 11.

And then the final paragraph would read, Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Since the presentation by our Rapporteur was so clear and so efficient, I ask you if you would like to go paragraph-by-paragraph or if you consider it clear and acceptable the way the text is presented to you. I see the delegation of Kyrgyzstan requesting the floor. Go ahead, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We would like just to say that we agree with the amendment of Australia. We can delete our original paragraph 7 and put Australia's amendment. And there is a slight change in paragraph 3. ICOMOS Advisory Mission Report 2018 instead of 2017. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So I believe that we could go paragraph-by-paragraph so that we can see more clearly the cohesion of the different proposals. Paragraph 1, there is no amendment so we can consider it approved if you agree. Approved. Paragraph 2, also with no amendments. I think we can consider it approved. Paragraph 3. Any comments on this paragraph? I see none so I believe we can consider it approved. Paragraph 4. Any comments? I see none so I believe it's approved.

Paragraph 5. Any comments on this paragraph? I see none so I we can consider it approved. Paragraph 6. Are there any comments on this text? I see none so I consider that we all agree on it so, approved. Paragraph 7. Are there any comments? I see no comments so I consider this paragraph approved. Thank you.

We now come to paragraph 8. We just heard from the delegation of Kyrgyzstan that they would accept the Australian proposal. Are there any voices against this or any additional comments? Does everybody agree with this proposal to change the paragraph originally proposed in the amendment originally proposed by Kyrgyzstan to be replaced by the amendment proposed by Australia? Are we all in agreement with this? No objections so I believe we can accept this paragraph. Consider it approved with the wording proposed by Australia. Thank you very much.

Next paragraph, 9. Any objections, any comments or any suggestions for this paragraph? Our Rapporteur will certainly improve our text. Thank you very much.

Rapporteur:

My apologies. For this one is just a minor thing. Rather than, Urging the State Party that an updated, it might read better if we urged the State Party to develop an updated Management Plan for the property and just delete the, needs to be developed there. So it would be, Urges the State Party to develop an updated Management Plan for the property and, etc.

Chairperson:

Shakespeare thanks you very much. Australia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Australia:

It's just a further change perhaps to the last line there, and submit it to the World Heritage Centre.

Chairperson:

Is everybody in agreement with this proposal? If there are no voices in contrary we can consider it approved. Thank you very much. Let's move on. Next paragraph, paragraph 10 now. Right? Are there any comments? Sorry, yes you have a comment. Thank you.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. As indicated in the background information, so far for this property there have been two ICOMOS Advisory missions but there have been no statutory reactive monitoring processes in place. So in that context we were thinking, in view of the

urgent situation and emerging conservation situation of the property a reactive monitoring mission—again as we discussed yesterday—could be an effective way to review the state of conservation of the property and/or make recommendations to the State Party as well as to the Committee on the way forward in view of the complex situation. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I pass the floor to Spain.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you. We asked for the floor before the representative of the Secretariat spoke because we didn't understand the reason why the mission wasn't mentioned. We think it's a good idea to raise the idea of a mission. We don't look askance at the reactive monitoring mission so we agree with the modification. We of course support it in order to facilitate the work of Kazakhstan. We don't see any reason not to maintain the reactive monitoring mission as the Secretariat just said, we think that it would be positive to reaffirm the changes. So with the support of Kazakhstan that understands the reason for the proposed modification that would not be superfluous so therefore we think that should be kept or at least we should be given reasons why there shouldn't be a mission.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you. Norway agrees with Spain and we would like to keep a paragraph on a mission and may I suggest that we could have the following paragraph: Also invites the State Party to invite a reactive monitoring mission to the property to discuss the Master Plan of the city of Turkestan in order to ensure the protection of the OUV.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The delegation of Kyrgyzstan has the floor.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. According to the Operational Guidelines, reactive monitoring missions are sent to the World Heritage properties that are under threat. However, as we know from the reports prepared by the State Party, there is no threat to the property at this time and there are no exceptional circumstances that have works undertaken which may have made an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. As we showed already in our previous speech the state of conservation report submitted by the State Party prepared by an international team and we also should not that there were already two or three missions in the last two years and we may have that mission but maybe we can also wait for the report which will be submitted before 1 February 2020 and then the next Committee meeting we may wish to consider sending the reactive monitoring mission. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I call upon Spain. You have the floor.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you. Just briefly to say that we think that Norway's former words are proper. We are not demanding anything urgent but I think that Norway's wording faithfully reflects our idea as well.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Are there any more comments? Norway, you have the floor. No more comments? Well the delegation of Kyrgyzstan presented I think a let's say legal framework for the missions. Maybe we should perhaps reconfirm it with UNESCO because I think it was a legal framework for the sending of a mission so this is perhaps a point among ourselves to clarify before insisting on the mission. I can see that the delegation of Norway has now changed its mind and will be giving us the pleasure of listening to them. Thank you.

The Delegation of Norway:

I'm sorry Madam Chairperson for the confusion. Norway wanted to suggest in the spirit of getting consensus that we have an Advisory mission. That is the suggestion.

Chairperson:

The delegation of Spain, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] We think that is fine. Just as we supported Norway before, that wording reflects the spirit of what we want and doesn't involve any sort of demand or threat.

Chairperson:

I would ask if there is agreement to this proposal especially to the delegation of Kyrgyzstan? Just before the delegation of Kyrgyzstan takes the floor I would pass the floor to Ms Rössler who would like to make on brief comment. Thank you very much.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. Just to clarify that the wording needs to be different. The Committee can request a reactive monitoring mission to be sent to a property. In the case of Advisory missions the Committee recommends that the State Party invites an Advisory mission so then the wording needs to be different but this is of course in the hands of the Committee. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Before passing the floor to other Committee Members, I would like to hear the distinguished colleague from UNESCO—you requested the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Very briefly, I think the distinguished Committee Member of Azerbaijan quoted the exact paragraph of the Operational Guidelines paragraph 169 where a request for a reactive monitoring mission could be asked by the Committee where the, I quote, reactive monitoring is the reporting by the Secretariat, other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to the Committee on the state of conservation of the property. So that is exactly the issue we are discussing here and that is the reason we examined yesterday the assessment on the reactive monitoring process. Thank you. ICOMOS can provide further comments on this. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor now to Cuba. Cuba, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The missions are exceptional in general and they are obviously useful. I think we have given the reason why a mission could

be called for but we've also said it's important to make rational use of our resources. The missions have to be clear and well defined. I have the impression from the information we've been given that there wasn't clarity when it comes to all the information that the State Party provided especially the work carried out by the State Party. When I heard from the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, I felt that there was a lack of clarity regarding that information. I think if we had some time for the monitoring would be the most rational approach. Then we could have all necessary information in order to determine what is to be done. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I give the floor to our dear colleague from Angola. Angola, you have the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Thank you, Madam Chair. Je pense que je vais abonder dans le même sens que Cuba. En fait, la proposition telle qu'elle est faite n'est pas très claire, peut-être que l'ICOMOS pourrait nous aider également. Je pense qu'il faut qu'on définisse clairement les objectifs de cette mission. Ça doit être clair. Bon, « une mission de conseil sur le bien », c'est trop sec. C'est pour faire quoi exactement ? On parle de projet de développement ; il y a beaucoup de choses derrière. Il faut qu'on le rende clair. C'est un conseil pour quoi ? Ça c'est la question. Peut-être que l'ICOMOS pourrait nous aider.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I pass the floor now to Hungary. Please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Now I don't know whether to mention anything but if so I take the floor to raise the question that there could be a simpler and clearer to invite an ICOMOS Advisory mission to the property in this paragraph.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Let's now listen to our colleagues from the delegation from Kyrgyzstan. You have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. In light of Kazakhstan showing its willing to cooperate with ICOMOS and other Advisory Bodies and seeing that a lot of work is being done and also taking into account that the previous mission was deployed in 2018 so a year ago, we just think that it would make more sense to consider sending an Advisory mission next year or at the next session because having these missions year after year may not be the best use of resources and time. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I just wanted to underline that my full proposal for the sentence is to invite an Advisory mission to the property to discuss the Master Plan of the city of Turkestan in order to ensure the protection of the OUV. And to add to that I think it's important that this mission doesn't too long to happen because projects are already on the ground. That's what the consensus suggestion from Norway was containing.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to our distinguished colleague of Tunisia, please. You have the floor.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je crois que sur ce paragraphe il y a des éléments qui sont déjà sur la table, admis par tout le monde, en tous les cas auxquels le plus grand nombre a acquiescé. D'abord, l'engagement de l'État et sa volonté, et nous avons écouté le représentant de l'État témoigner de cela. Il y a une échéance au début de 2020 pour la présentation d'un rapport. Il nous faut être cohérents. C'est-à-dire qu'on pourrait ici, en tant que Comité, inciter l'État partie à travailler de concert avec les organisations consultatives jusqu'à la production de ce rapport, et cela peut prendre la forme d'une visite, ça peut prendre la forme de l'invitation d'une mission sur le terrain. On fait confiance aux deux parties pour y arriver et on parlera en tant que Comité au vu de la teneur du rapport qui sera présenté. Ou alors, nous allons en direction d'une mission dans les plus brefs délais, ce qui n'est pas incohérent ; ce qui deviendrait incohérent dans ce cas c'est d'exiger de l'État partie un rapport aussi rapidement dans le temps. Je crois qu'il faut mettre de la clarté de point de vue-là et on pourrait tout simplement inciter l'État partie à travailler, d'ici son rapport, de concert avec les organisations consultatives et avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as I understand, your suggestion would then be to recommend that the State Party works in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS especially in designing the Master Plan for the city of Turkestan. Is this the idea?

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Oui, Madame la Présidente. Quelque chose qui se rapprocherait de cela. En tous les cas, on donne une orientation que, d'ici le rapport, il y ait un travail de rapprochement et un travail en commun entre le Centre, les instances consultatives et l'État partie.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. Are there any more comments? Azerbaijan, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Having listened to all the speakers, I think the intervention from the distinguished ambassador is reasonable. If the Advisory mission just took place recently and there is no advice that can be done to provide to the State Party maybe it would be reasonable to write, as you also mentioned, to work in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS with a view to discuss the Master Plan of the city and to ensure the protection of the OUV. It means that we will avoid, I mean if there is no need for the Advisory mission, but we request the State Party to engage in closer consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. Maybe this will be a solution to be adopted or accepted by all Parties. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So I believe that you are going in the same line that I was thinking that we should perhaps—but we need some wording so maybe I would propose, recommends that the State Party works in close cooperation and coordination with the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS in the elaboration of the Master Plan of the city and then we go on. Are there any comments on this wording? Do you think we could live with this paragraph until the next report? ICOMOS, you have the floor.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I think you have rightly elaborated where the issue we are discussing here is really all the development projects. So in that sense I think after the elaboration of the Master Plan we may add, assess all development projects and their impact on the OUV of the property. Thank you. Norway, you requested the floor. Are you going to help us to finish this paragraph?

The Delegation of Norway:

I hope so! Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I just wanted to ask ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre if they are willing to assist Kazakhstan in the way that we have described now in this paragraph?

The Secretariat:

Yes, that is exactly I think of course in this case the ongoing dialogue since February led to the current situation. That is, in our best judgment, the reactive monitoring mission as a matter of urgency could help the State Party in assessing the overall situation and also assessing those projects and their impact on the OUV. Thank you. ICOMOS.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. As indicated earlier we would certainly welcome the opportunity for collaboration with the State Party over the development of the Master Plan and other work in the city. We would, however, appreciate a little bit more information about how that sort of facilitation might take place.

Chairperson:

Any further comments? Kyrgyzstan, please, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The State Party will organize a workshop in 2019 and maybe that will be a platform to discuss closely with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre all the issues.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Madame la Présidente, je voudrais saluer ce qui vient d'être proposé par le représentant du Centre du patrimoine mondial, mais je n'ai pas vu sa proposition de rajout à ce qu'on a écrit transcrite sur le projet, parce que si cela est ajouté, je crois que nous arrivons à un point d'équilibre entre les différentes positions et pourrions ainsi adopter le point 10.

Chairperson:

Thank you. The delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, please you have the floor.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Yes, I would just like to give one comment. The last set of discussion is going in the direction that they don't trust the State Party to organize their job and engage experts to realize this Master Plan. This is my impression.

Chairperson:

Any more comments? I would pass the floor now to our Rapporteur to enlighten us. One moment please, before this we would like to listen to the delegation of Angola. You have the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je pense qu'on a du mal à être vu de ce côté, donc il faudrait que de temps en temps vous puissiez tourner votre regard, nous sommes vraiment à l'extrémité de la salle. J'aimerais essayer d'aider pour qu'on avance sur ce paragraphe. Donc je propose la formulation suivante : « Recommande que l'État partie continue de travailler... ». C'est-à-dire qu'il y a déjà une démarche qui est là, donc c'est une continuation du dialogue. « Recommande que l'État partie continue de travailler en étroite collaboration avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial... » – on peut enlever « coordination » – « ...et l'ICOMOS afin de discuter... » – je crois que l'anglais utilise « discuss », mais peut-être que « d'analyser » serait beaucoup plus pratique – « ...les projets d'aménagement... », car si j'ai bien compris l'ICOMOS veut prendre en fait l'ensemble des projets qui sont en cours. Donc « ...afin d'analyser les projets d'aménagement devant garantir la protection de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien ». Merci.

Chairperson:

Any more comments? Kyrgyzstan. Yes, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

We support this amendment. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Can we consider the amendment proposed by Angola with which Kyrgyzstan agrees, can we consider that we have a consensus on the adoption—we have Tanzania? Please, you have the floor.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Tanzania goes with Angola.

Chairperson:

Can we consider this position a consensus? Do we agree that we have a consensus on this text? Yes, okay. So approved. But before approving I would just like to ask the Rapporteur if she has any refinement to the text to suggest? Thank you very much.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The only thing I'm not sure is reflected, and I'm not sure if it was deliberate, to exclude it is in relation to specifying development projects, which could be then, works in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in order to discuss the Master Plan of the city of Turkestan including to assess all development projects. That's only really if—there was only one thing listed in that decision that was discussed.

Chairperson:

Any comments on this? Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. This is becoming a little bit tortured in terms of its English and I don't understand why there's two references to discussing the Master Plan and it would

be better if it read, cooperation with the World Heritage Centre to assess all development projects to ensure the protection of the OUV of the property in the elaboration of the Master Plan. Sorry, it's easier just to delete. With the World Heritage Centre. I would suggest those words there and delete ICOMOS.

Chairperson:

Any comments on this? Can we accept this wording? Australia wants to comment again? Thank you.

The Delegation of Australia:

Sorry. It may be the typist catching up but certainly I don't want ICOMOS deleted. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any more comments? If there are no more comments, and I see none, we can consider this paragraph adopted. Thank you very much for your cooperation. Thank you. Paragraph 11. Let's go on. Are we in agreement with paragraph 11 as it is shown? No comments on this. So we can consider it adopted. Thank you very much. So the decision is adopted and I am very grateful for your cooperation. I would now like to pass the floor to Ms Rössler who has some information for us. Thank you very much.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. For the decisions from the drafting groups on the Sundarbans and the Kenya Lake System we will have to come back tomorrow. This is my understanding. Then there are a number of announcements to make. We have side events this evening. At 18h10 the World Heritage Convention: an international tool for protection of the natural heritage of the Congo Basin. At 18h30 Planning the Reconstruction and Recovery of World Heritage: the ancient city of Aleppo. At 18h00 Mobilizing Cultural Heritage for Climate Change Auction: the role of World Heritage by ICOMOS in Room B3. And you have it on the screens.

H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan) resumes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we are agreed that we are returning to these two Items for tomorrow and there is the meeting of the group of Arab countries in Hall B7 at 2 o'clock tomorrow. The other announcement on behalf of the host country is that we have at 7 p.m. the fair for handicrafts and you can be taken there by the buses in front. This will be on Theatre Square between our two theatres; a special exhibition and fair of the handicrafts of Azerbaijan at 7 p.m. See you tomorrow. Have a nice evening. Thank you very much.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

FOURTH DAY – Thursday 4 July 2019

SEVENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Ladies and gentlemen, honorable delegates, honorable Members of the Committee, we start our fourth working day of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee and I would like to inform you that in the morning we had a meeting of the Bureau. During this meeting we agreed that two Items that remain opened from yesterday, Item 7B.3 for the Sundarbans as well as the Kenya Lake System 7B.33 will be discussed at 12:30 at the end of the morning session. So please note this and we will proceed accordingly to the next discussion concerning the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal. I now invite Mr Feng Jing and ICOMOS to present the report on the state of conservation of this property.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Distinguished Committee Members, ladies and gentlemen a very good morning to you all. Details of the conservation issues identified for the World Heritage property Kathmandu Valley are summarized in working document 43 COM 7B on pages 148-151 in the English version and pages 152-156 in the French version. The Committee may recall that in July 2003 due to uncontrolled urban development, which continued to decrease the urban landscape and the architectural fabric of the property, and lack of a management mechanism for the property, the site was put on the List of World Heritage in Danger. With significant mitigation measures taken by the State Party to address these issues, particularly the establishment of integrated management framework and also the redefinition of the property boundaries and buffer zones, the site was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in July 2007 in Christchurch, New Zealand.

Most recently, the property was threatened by the impact of the severe earthquakes of April and May 2015 and by uncontrolled urban development resulting in the loss of traditional urban fabric, in particular, privately owned houses. Further important threats include the lack of a coordinated management mechanism and new development projects carried out as part of the post-earthquake recovery rehabilitation and reconstruction processes. In view of the extensive damage caused to all seven-monument zones by the 2015 earthquakes there is ascertained and potential danger to the property as defined in paragraphs 177 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines. This was confirmed by both the October 2015 and March 2017 reactive monitoring missions.

Therefore, since the 39th session of the Committee the discussion to put the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger was ongoing. A report on the current state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party on 1 February 2019. However, after careful review, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies considered that despite the positive measures adopted by the State Party the recovery process is not currently at adequate skill to deal with the major challenges that have arisen following the earthquakes. Although some recommendations of the 2015 and 2017 reactive monitoring missions have been addressed they have not yet been systematically implemented and the architecture and town planning coherence of the property continue to deteriorate. This is the consequence of not only the earthquakes but of the unforeseen enormity of the resulting repair and conservation

challenges. Conservation efforts have not covered the full extent of the property and four years after the earthquakes nearly half of the reported damage is yet to be repaired.

Despite some welcome success stories, not all the work undertaken respect the distinctive traditional structures, materials and local practices and some are therefore inconsistent with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The extent of the unrepaired damage and inappropriate work impact adversely on the property's authenticity and integrity and, therefore, on the OUV. And there is high potential for even greater damage in the future. This clearly reinforces that the property's OUV faces both actual and potential threats in accordance with paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines.

Regarding a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Advisory mission requested by the Committee in Decision 41 COM 7B.95 as per request of the representative of Nepal during the 2017 Krakow meeting, and reiterated in Decision 42 COM 7B.12 the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies defined the terms of reference for this Advisory mission but the Advisory mission was postponed several times before being cancelled. It is therefore considered that a reactive monitoring mission to the property is now warranted. To achieve the considerable amount of work still required to ensure recovery the property needs even stronger mechanisms to coordinate and control projects undertaken by national and international agencies, along with overarching guidance and clear justifications for intervention based on the evidence and documentation.

It is recommended that the Committee encourage again the State Party to initiate with technical support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, international scientific steering coordination mechanisms tasked with assisting in the development structures and resources to guide the recovery of the property and its OUV while balancing social and economic community needs. As a consequence the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This will help ensure that measures are taken to focus recovery on projects that sustain the attributes of the OUV and will avoid reconstruction and construction activities that have potential to damage the authenticity of the property.

It is also recommended that the international community continue supporting local communities and their housing and social needs as well as ongoing conservation and reconstruction efforts. Let me point out that in the March 2107 discussed in detail with the State Party the technical planning and legal and management measures necessary to recover the attributes of the OUV. These could be considered as a contribution towards a desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger which the State Party would need to further develop and propose following the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

On 21 June 2019, the Director of the World Heritage Centre met with the Ambassador of Nepal to UNESCO and briefed him of the process of the preparation of the working documents and for the Committee and the proposal of Danger listing for Kathmandu Valley. During the meeting, ongoing dialogue held with the State Party on the possible organization of a reactive monitoring mission to the property. Mr Chairperson, dear Committee Members draft decision 43 COM 7B.70 can be found in working document on page 150 in the English version and 155 in the French version. Mr Chairperson, with your permission ICOMOS will now provide comments on this property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for the report. ICOMOS, the floor is yours.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The State Party, its Department of Archaeology, ICOMOS and ICCROM and the UNESCO Office in Kathmandu and many other national and international organizations have worked with local agencies and the community to repair the property and support affected communities in very challenging circumstances following the 2015 earthquakes. These efforts are acknowledged.

However, the report of the 2017 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission outlined the scale and scope of damage across all seven-monument zones as well as degraded housing and commercial properties and the report highlighted the need to support and protect many damaged areas. Although much has been achieved especially within the Durbar Square Monument Zones as shown on the screen four years on from the 2015 earthquakes a large proportion of the reported damage has yet to be repaired and this has profound impact for the property and for the community. Although some of the recommendations of the 2015 and 2017 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring missions have been addressed they have not been fully implemented and the attributes which contribute to the OUV of the property, especially its distinctive architecture and cohesive town planning, remain in a degraded state. This has risen not only from the earthquake impact itself but also particularly because of the scale and resource requirements for repair and conservation which are well beyond normal capacity of the agencies involved despite the resources which have been deployed. Additional support and resources are needed.

Despite some welcome success stories, not all of the works undertaken respected the distinctive traditional structures, materials and local practices and some are therefore inconsistent with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, particularly affecting its integrity and authenticity. The property requires even stronger mechanisms to coordinate and control projects undertaken by international and national agencies as well as overarching guidance. An international scientific steering coordination mechanism established with technical support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies could guide the recovery of the property while at the same time addressing community needs.

It is disappointing that the proposed Advisory mission that the Committee strongly encouraged at its 42nd session in 2018 has not occurred. A reactive monitoring mission is now proposed. Despite the considerable efforts of the State Party and other organizations the Kathmandu recovery process has not dealt with all the major challenges that have arisen following the earthquake. The extent of unrepaired damage and inappropriate works impacts adversely on the property's authenticity and integrity and therefore on its Outstanding Universal Value. The property continues to be subject to both actual and potential threats to its Outstanding Universal Value in accordance with paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines.

ICOMOS and ICCROM consider that the circumstances of this property mean that in Danger listing would offer a much needed opportunity to deploy essential technical planning, legal and management measures within a structured framework of agreed corrective measures and thereby to support the State Party in addressing significant ongoing threats to the property's Outstanding Universal Value. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to have some comments from Committee Members. China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. We listened to the World Heritage representative and ICOMOS representative's comments very carefully. I think we all know that the case concerning

Kathmandu is the result of devastating earthquake, an 8.1 magnitude earthquake that caused massive loss of life and property including those listed as World Heritage.

Nepal is a small developing nation with very limited resources. The restoration of such large-scale recovery work takes time. China together with a number of other countries have been actively involved in helping the restoration of those sites. On example in which China is currently engaged since 2017, is the nine-storey temple, which requires 58 months, which is almost five years. It is ongoing. Because of its World Heritage architecture ancient building we cannot apply modern technology to do it. Everything has to be done in accordance with requirements made by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. Therefore, the miracle of sort of “China speed” cannot apply in such circumstances. So the process will be painstaking and take time. But we together with the international community will continue to assist the country in the process.

I wish also to stress that the Asian culture actually is slightly different than many other cultures and Asia may not really be helpful if a property is listed in Danger, this very label may not really help them and may not be perceived as a “helping hand” and that is important. I think the State Party involved deserves to be heard and I would like to ask the Chairperson to give the State Party the floor to explain themselves and the level of work they have already done, the commitments they have been making and also most importantly the mobilization they have been in engaging in and they have invited Advisory missions twice which did not occur.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Thank you. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Indonesia would like to thank the Advisory Bodies on its reports on the state of conservation of Kathmandu Valley in Nepal. Indonesia would also like to commend the government of Nepal on its continued collaborative efforts with national and international organizations as well as other related stakeholders to repair and recover the Kathmandu Valley in very challenging circumstances. We take note of the improvements so far and acknowledge the strong commitment of the government of Nepal to implement the decisions of the Committee. Taking into account the good intentions of the State Party to protect and conserve this property, Indonesia is of the view that it is appropriate to allow the State Party to continue its efforts for another year before being considered for the List of World Heritage in Danger. I thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your proposal. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. In accordance with paragraph 183 of the Operational Guidelines, this Committee, to be able to make a decision when putting a site on the Danger List, has to do some homework. One of the important requirements of this paragraph of the Operational Guidelines is the consultation with the State Party. Tanzania therefore would want to hear from the State Party on their involvement in these activities which is leading now to put this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger so Tanzania would want to hear from the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Good morning. Australia also recognizes and greatly appreciates the immense scale of the works facing the State Party following the 2015 earthquakes. We also note that many of the recommendations in the 2018 decision are included in the current draft decision and that it has not been possible to have a full report on the progress of the implementation of these recommendations because the Advisory mission recommended in 2018 has not been able to go ahead. In the spirit of positive dialogue we urge the State Party to work with the Advisory Bodies to enable a reactive monitoring mission to take place as soon as possible. However, given the apparent slow progress in the implementation of the recommendations from 2018 and the scale of the work required to sustain the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property we consider that the decision to include Kathmandu on the List of World Heritage in Danger is appropriate and in line with the aims of the in Danger listing and may assist the Party in speeding the recovery efforts. We also consider that the text of several of the recommendations in the draft decision concerning the recovery process and how best to approach the implementation of that process could be clarified and along with our colleagues from Norway and Hungary, we have submitted amendments to the draft decision to this effect. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The delegation of Zimbabwe notes the progress that has been made on the reconstruction and rehabilitation since the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee. This includes the rehabilitation works of 40 monuments that have been completed. More importantly, the State Party continues with these rehabilitation works, which employ traditional practices. The State Party has also shown its commitment to reinstate all the cultural properties of Kathmandu Valley by undertaking the necessary measures for ensuring quality work that is based on the traditional construction practices associated with the property. As such the progress made so far should be considered satisfactory in view of the damage caused by a natural disaster and not due to human interest. It is also important, Mr Chairperson, that the Committee takes note that the State Party has reestablished local level government after a long gap along with the central government, conditions which are going to spur further rehabilitation of the property. In view of the above, together with China, Zimbabwe has proposed some amendments on the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like first of all to thank ICOMOS for its report. In line with the statement made by China I would like to reinforce that the 2015 earthquake produced tragic consequences affecting the Nepalese people and causing severe damage to a very important World Heritage site. Despite its limitation concerning not only financial means but also specialized human resources added to other significant challenges the State Party has kept a strong commitment towards recovering the property having already addressed more than 50% of the damaged monuments with the support of UNESCO Kathmandu Office as acknowledged in the ICOMOS report.

We understand that the State Party needs additional capacity building and financial resources to be able to fully comply with the recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies. In this sense we do believe that it is doubtful that inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage

in Danger will assure the financial means and technical cooperation that the country needs so much.

On the other hand, inscription on the List may send a negative message to tourists, one of the country's most important source of revenue therefore hindering the country's potential to attract more financial means. We understand that the country should be allowed more time to carry on the rehabilitation process and that the progress of the ongoing works should be evaluated a joint World Heritage/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. Norway notes with great satisfaction of the committed efforts of the State Party in recovering and improving the general state of conservation of this very significant property. We further note the contributions of national and international organizations towards the recovery of the property through the implementation of the recovery Master Plan as well as through repair and conservation works already undertaken.

Four years after this tragic earthquake, we commend the State Party for having addressed already half of the reported damage while registering that certain challenges are outlined concerning the work undertaken. We truly commend the State Party's continuous and substantial effort but we also have in front of us a draft decision, which for the fourth time suggests including this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger to secure added resources and assistance. There is a significant amount remaining to ensure recovery and safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value.

On this background, Norway supports the position of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS as well believe Danger listing as a tool indeed has positive effects. We were humbled witnesses to two World Heritage properties being removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger two days ago and we saw demonstrated how the targeted advice, deep consultations and increased resources led to the establishment of a shared understanding of desired and prioritized corrective actions, actions which later allowed the Committee to remove the properties from the Danger List. Norway believes this may also be of great benefit for the State Party of Nepal and its continued high-quality efforts in this outstanding World Heritage site. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier l'ICOMOS du rapport édifiant qui nous a été présenté, qui nous éclaire sur la situation très grave qu'a subi le site, notamment après le tremblement de terre de 2015, mais également, et comme le reconnaît le rapport lui-même, les efforts consentis par l'État partie et le progrès qui a été réalisé malgré toutes les difficultés jusque-là dans la restauration. La question qui se pose pour nous aujourd'hui, au moment de la discussion de ce projet de décision, c'est de savoir si l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril permet d'avancer par rapport à l'objectif que nous partageons tous, c'est-à-dire revenir autant que possible au statu quo ante, ou alors, la non-inscription pourrait être un signal positif. Je crois que les deux idées se valent. Mais, en tout état de cause, nous avons aujourd'hui les autorités du Népal qui disent leur engagement et qui souhaitent travailler de concert avec le Centre, avec l'ICOMOS, et nous considérons que l'inscrire sur la Liste pourrait être un signal de fléchissement de cet engagement national.

Alors je crois qu'on pourrait, en toute responsabilité, donner davantage de temps à l'État partie et lui demander de revenir l'année prochaine devant le Comité pour voir si cet espace supplémentaire aura servi à progresser et, auquel cas, si la réponse est négative, le Comité pourra dans ce cas l'inscrire sur la Liste. C'est pour cela que la Tunisie soutient l'idée de donner davantage de temps à l'État partie pour lui permettre d'avancer et de bénéficier de cet élan de solidarité internationale. Aujourd'hui, ce site a plus besoin d'un élan de solidarité que d'une mise à l'index à ce stade.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson and I wish a good morning to all colleagues. We have listened to the interventions very carefully this morning and we also acknowledge the enormity of the task the State Party faces following the devastating earthquake of 2015 that claimed many lives. This Committee has been debating Kathmandu for many years now and last year my delegation supported the postponement of the decision to inscribed Kathmandu on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to give the State Party more time and mostly to invite a reactive monitoring mission before 2019.

However, seeing that despite the request last year little progress has been made. We believe that the time has come now that in accordance with paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines we inscribe Kathmandu on the List of World Heritage in Danger. We believe there is a very dangerous narrative surrounding the List of World Heritage in Danger as some kind of blacklist of World Heritage properties and we want stress that this is not the case. It's a mechanism foreseen by the Convention first of all to help and assist conservation. The State Party's engagement of the safeguarding of the site is not being called into question. We also would like to urge the State Party to again invite the reactive monitoring mission to take place as soon as possible and as it has already been acknowledged during the debate we have also submitted amendments to this draft decision. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, let me show my great thanks to ICOMOS for the report submitted and the World Heritage Centre and also I would like to thank the State Party for the progress made since the last meeting in Manama. But I think what we are missing here is the reactive monitoring mission. That is really important to have the whole picture. So Kuwait urges the State Party to facilitate and--hopefully since last year the obstacles have been removed—to host a reactive mission to have a better, clearer picture of the situation there. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I would like to give the floor to the State Party, please to answer the questions that were posed.

The Observer Delegation of Nepal:

Excellency Chairperson, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the Government of Azerbaijan for the organization of the 43rd meeting of the World Heritage Committee, and our wishes of success to this meeting. The Government of Nepal is constantly working for the conservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation of our damaged cultural heritage following the devastating earthquake of 2015. We have circulated an aide-memoire to all Members of the

World Heritage Committee outlining the conservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation works that are already completed, including ongoing projects in line with Outstanding Universal Value by using traditional materials and craftsmanship. The World Heritage property in Kathmandu Valley was damaged by a devastating earthquake in 2015 with 8000+ human casualties and hundreds of thousands of private houses also demolished. At that time, there was political instability and transition of decades-long internal conflict.

Despite such a situation, 250 heritage monuments are rehabilitated all over the country. In Kathmandu Valley, out of 140 monuments, 96 have been rehabilitated and 40 more will be completed by December 2019. Next year in 2020, all the monuments will be rehabilitated. The Government of Nepal has amended the Procurement Act and Regulation for Rehabilitation; the procurement period had been shortened from 30 days to 15 days; the ceiling for community-based rehabilitation programme was extended from one 1 crore to 10 crore Nepali rupees. The Department of Archeology is fully equipped with 100 engineers, architects and other support staff for contribution to rehabilitation. The Department of Archeology conducted and is still running technical training, especially focusing on youth, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, ICCROM and the UNESCO Office in Kathmandu and local government and also with NGOs and IGOs. The Department of Archeology is running a series of skill training for artisans, masons, carpenters and woodcarvers. Now we have enough manpower. We have established a cultural management system to provide information for the rehabilitation activities. and facilitate the stakeholders of illegally closed roads in Pashupatinath monuments already closed in June 2019 and vehicle movements has completely stopped. Trees have been planted.

We always welcome the visit of joint reactive and advisory missions, which will have our full support. Such a mission will enable us to have first-hand information regarding the progress, as well as to start our future course. Meanwhile, federal, provincial and local level governments are implementing rehabilitation and reconstruction work and extended code of conduct for new construction is limited in urban areas especially focusing in the heritage site. In view of our efforts and commitments to the good cause, the Government of Nepal humbly requests the esteemed World Heritage Committee to allow the State Party of Nepal to move forward with conservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation activities with the support of UNESCO and other development partners without placing Kathmandu Valley World Heritage property on the Danger List. Once again, Excellency Chairperson, I would like to assure...

Chairperson:

Sorry, how much longer do you need? You are out of time. Half a minute.

The Observer Delegation of Nepal:

Just one minute. Excellency Chairperson, once again I would like to assure the World Heritage Committee with our full commitment of completing all remaining conservation and rehabilitation work within the specified time period. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

So if there are no other comments from the Committee Members and we listened to the State Party, I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur because we have two amendments on the table. Oh, okay, please. ICOMOS, you have some comments.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. If I may take a few moments to respond and clarify in relation to the Committee Member interventions. Particularly, I'd first like to clarify in relation to the contribution from the distinguished delegate from China that the Advisory mission was requested by the

Committee and it was in fact not possible to hold the Advisory mission because the necessary arrangements were not made for that.

In relation to the progress—the progress that has been made is acknowledged but it is important that Committee Members understand that the progress has particularly been in the prominent Durbar components of the property as shown on the screen. This property has seven components and as the distinguished delegate from Nepal has pointed out there were thousands of buildings that have been damaged and much of the damage that has not been repaired is not in the prominent tourist components; it's in the components that affect the daily lives of the Kathmandu community and it is these that need additional resources and additional support.

I note with respect to timing and having particular reference to the intervention from the honorable delegate from Tunisia, that exactly the same request has been made year on year. In 2015, when the earthquakes occurred the State Party urged one more year to get its restoration and reconstruction activities in order. In 2016, when in Danger listing was recommended, another year was requested. Another year was requested in 2017 and again in 2018; it is now 2019 and ICOMOS and ICCROM do not feel it would be appropriate to be back here in 2027 again requesting one more year.

This is not a reflection of the efforts or commitment of the State Party; it is a reflection of the size and challenge of the task at hand and I could remind the Committee of the outstanding success stories that were discussed in this very chamber two days ago with respect to the Church of the Nativity and the Saltpeter Works in Humberstone and Santa Laura which show how with commitment from the Advisory Bodies, the Centre and States Party, the international community can rally through the framework of in Danger listing. In Danger listing is not a finger-pointing exercise and ICOMOS and ICCROM would finally highlight that the time has come and there is not a choice between more time and in Danger listing. More time and in Danger listing can coexist. The difference is that in Danger listing provides a framework of support and a roadmap for corrective measures that can address the integrity, authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value of this extraordinarily important but very challenged World Heritage property. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for these clarifications. Rapporteur, the floor is yours.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have two sets of amendments, one from China and Zimbabwe and one from Hungary, Norway and Australia. China and Zimbabwe's amendments are to the last five paragraphs of the draft decision only. I'll flag the earlier ones now. The first paragraph remains unchanged.

The second paragraph Australia, Norway and Hungary recommend recalling more previous Decisions of the Committee so it would now read, Recalling Decisions 40 COM 7B.41, 41 COM 7B.95 and 42 COM 7B.12, adopted at its 40th (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016), 41st (Krakow, 2017) and 42nd (Manama, 2018) sessions respectively.

Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 are not proposed for amendment. Australia, Norway and Hungary proposed deletion of paragraph 6 in its entirety. And then they propose amendments to former paragraph 7 and also former paragraph 8 which they are combining.

So I'll just read from the top of former paragraph 7 which would become 6. Considers that the recovery process needs to be further improved and hastened, and requests the State Party to:
a) Initiate with technical support from, and in ongoing dialogue with, the World Heritage Centre

and the Advisory Bodies, an International Scientific Steering Coordination Mechanism tasked with assisting with the development of structures and resources to guide the recovery of the property and its OUV—it would then be 7 b) or former paragraph 7 b) now 6 and this was modifying former paragraph 8. It would read, Invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, to review progress with the implementation of the recommendations of the October 2015 and March 2017 missions, to assist with the development of a strategy for the implementation of the six-year RMP, and to provide guidance on its review. Then there's a new part c) proposed, Seek further technical support from the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies in order to coordinate and guide the recovery of the property, based on documentation, research, analysis and use of appropriate traditional methods and materials, and new part d) which would read, Ensure all recommendations and outcomes of the above are fully integrated within the six year RMP.

There are no proposed amendments to former paragraph 9. Former paragraphs 10 and 11. The China and Zimbabwe amendment proposes to modify former paragraph 10 and this would read, Also requests the state party to implement fully its already declared six year plan and complete all rehabilitation works within 2021 and report to the World Heritage Committee. The Australian, Norway and Hungary proposed amendments combine former paragraphs 10 and 11 and that would read, Also considers that the potential and ascertained threats of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, notably the threats to authenticity through inappropriate reconstruction and conservation methods are so considerable and decides therefore, in conformity with paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines to inscribed Kathmandu Valley on the List of World Heritage in Danger. That combines two paragraphs. The China and Zimbabwe amendment however proposes to delete former paragraph 11 which you can see down at the bottom there.

And if we just move along, former paragraphs 12 and 11 which are labelled here due to the vagaries of track changes—that's former 11 and 12, they are both proposed for complete deletion by the China and Zimbabwe amendments. And the final paragraph remains unchanged. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So what is the proposal? Should we start discussing the item? We have to look through it so let's start. Paragraph 1, clear. Paragraph 2, can we adopt this proposal by Australia, Norway and Hungary? I see no objections here. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Mr Chairperson, just reflecting on the ICOMOS intervention in terms of the listing of decisions which should be recalled, the first one made by the Committee was 39 COM 7B.69 so we suggest that should be included for reasons of completeness.

Chairperson:

No objections? I don't see any. Approved. Paragraph 3, paragraph 4. It's clear? No changes. Paragraph 6. Should we remove it or what is the opinion of the honorable Members of the Committee? I don't see any objections for removal of this item from the text. Thank you. Paragraph 7, now new 6. The version given by Australia, Norway and Hungary. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Dear Chairperson, we believe that this paragraph is much more complete than the previous one and guarantees exactly what this delegation said last year. Along those lines we would like the previous paragraph to be changed for this one, which we

believe, to be much more complete and is very much in keeping with another intervention that we will be making in a moment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

So Spain supports this version. Any other observations from anyone? I don't see any so okay, we can accept it on both paragraphs a) and b), yes? Okay. Thank you. Next, c) and d). Thank you. Paragraph 7 there are no changes, proposal of China and Zimbabwe. I cannot see any objections. So there are some contradictions between the text proposed by China and Zimbabwe and the remain part...Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Could we just please have some clarification on the meaning of the China-Zimbabwe amendment within 2021? Is that by 2021? China, can you give clarification for 2021? This is the time period you proposed.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. Like I said earlier in my comment the restoration, rehabilitation, everything takes time. It's not something that you can really just hasten so we suggested that 2021 might be more realistic timeframe. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Please, Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. In which case perhaps we could replace within by the end of 2021? If that is the meaning.

Chairperson:

China, is that acceptable?

The Delegation of China:

We have no problem with that.

Chairperson:

Thank you.

Chairperson:

So now we have to clarify so we leave the version of China and Zimbabwe with the proposal and delete the text that is noted by the black letters. So we remain only the blue version. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just to support the amendment proposed by China and Zimbabwe. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So Rapporteur, give us the last version of this text.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As I understand, the China, Zimbabwe and now supported by Brazil new paragraph 8 would read, Also requests the State Party implement fully its already declared six year plan and complete all rehabilitation works by the end of 2021 and report to the World Heritage Committee. I just might not that we are considering two paragraphs in one a little bit here because Australia, Norway and Hungary have proposed to combine two paragraphs. The very bottom of this paragraph is proposed by Norway, Hungary and Australia is actually former paragraph 11, which is proposed for deletion by the other amendment.

Chairperson:

Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Actually the Rapporteur has said much of what I wanted to say. But I was about to suggest is that perhaps we could divide this into two paragraphs so that we could have the China, Zimbabwe, Brazil proposal and then where we see the yellow and the two slashes that could become another paragraph so that we can move on to debate later on, on that one because that is the heart of the matter here, if we are going to inscribe this on the Danger List or not and in my view the suggestion made by China, Zimbabwe and Brazil, I don't see it as a contradiction with our amendment to indeed inscribe this property on the List. So this is my proposal to divide this into two paragraphs. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. We are just wondering with paragraph 8, we have no objections to it necessarily but we think it is a very tight timeframe for the State Party to be able to complete all rehabilitation works. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So what is the decision? We approve the version proposed by China, Zimbabwe and Brazil? Or can we leave it if Australia and Hungary don't see any contradictions? Okay, thank you very much. Next, please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. So the next paragraph in question would read, Also considers the potential and the ascertain threats of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, notably the threats to authenticity through inappropriate construction and conservation methods are so considerable and decides therefore, in conformity with paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines to inscribe Kathmandu Valley, Nepal on the List of World Heritage in Danger. So we have two alternatives here: one is to keep that paragraph as amended or to be deleted is also proposed by China and others amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Please, you are welcome to make comments. As far as I see we have a certain split of proposals. Until now the delegations, which have spoken, the majority of them supported the idea of inscription and fewer for non-inscription. May I have the opinion of others who did not give any response to that to find some consensus? Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Just to be clear, our position is to inscribe it on the Danger List. Just to clarify, after what we heard from the Advisory Body for the second time, that is our position. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Some other opinions? Bahrain.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We also support the amendment proposed by Australia. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We have here before us a very complicated and difficult issue if we take into account the circumstances. We've seen the detailed report, we've heard from the State Party, we've heard various opinions. Last year Guatemala supported giving the State Party more time to continue the implementation of the recommendations towards the reconstruction and recovery of the site. And here we would like to keep the same opinion, giving them more time and pushing the decision back to be discussed in the next Committee meeting. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. We have already discussed this several times here in the Committee and from a technical perspective, obviously it's a site that is facing great peril and it really is a huge task for the State Party. Despite all of their efforts, commitment and the progress made they need more time and that is why we would actually be in favour of China's proposal. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we have to make a decision. I don't see the reason for voting here. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. When Tanzania first intervened we had wanted to reaffirm the State Party and to hear from them what they are thinking. We have heard from the State Party that they are committed to doing work. Tanzania would want to suggest, let's give them more time. Let the reactive monitoring mission be invited so that from the report of the reactive monitoring mission the Committee could then assess and see how the situation is so the Tanzania delegation goes with those who want to not put the site on the Danger List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Kyrgyzstan.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Chairperson. Kyrgyzstan understands both positions and recognizes that the Danger List should be a tool for safeguarding the property but at the same we take into account the intervention by China saying that the perception of Danger listing may have actually adverse effects than positive effects. Taking all these things into consideration we think that putting this property on the Danger List now at this moment when the rehabilitation process is underway may give a wrong signal to the local communities given the perceptions and that is why we would encourage for non-inscription. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So as far as I can see, there is no consensus on this matter. I think that either we propose to postpone the decision on this matter. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Of course, my delegation's opinion has been very clear from the screen but what we wanted to point out is actually the Operational Guidelines paragraph 23 says that our decisions have to be made on scientific and objective considerations and I just want to say to all the Committee that after having heard the explanation given by the Advisory Bodies and after having heard all –and we have been hearing this year after year after year after year and as it was acknowledged if it is postponed one more year we are going to be back to square one next year and it's going to become a standing item on the agenda. So this is why we stand by on the amendment that we have co-sponsored with others to inscribe this property here at this session. We understand the perception surrounding the Danger listing, but as we have explained we see it more as a tool of the Convention and we really think that we have to give a lot of consideration to what was said by the State Party but also what has been said by ICOMOS, ICCROM and the Centre. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Indonesia.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Considering the explanation of the State Party of Nepal, Indonesia would like to propose to give more time to Nepal and therefore we agree with the proposal of China, Zimbabwe, etc.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I have a suggestion for my dear colleagues. How about we meet in the middle and say it will not be listed in the draft decision this year but if the State Party has not met and not received the mission it will be listed next year.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. Norway wishes to concur with what was expressed by the distinguished colleague from Hungary. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I understand from the words of the Hungarian delegation that if they will give some time we will also return to the matter again once more and once more to discuss this matter. As far as I understand the Chinese delegation and Zimbabwe clearly underlined in their proposal that the limit of time is 2021. So I consider that if we are giving some time to them we have to return to this matter in 2021 if it is possible or next year like the last period of time so without postponing it giving a chance to postpone in the future.

I think that this kind of consensus will ease the situation and all of us will be clearly understanding and including the State Party that they have only one year to do. The resolution must reflect that the Bureau members are voting for the postponing only for the last year and urge the State Party to take the necessary measures. In this case it will be much easier for us to deal. We have to support States Parties at the same time but of course we have to take into account the opinion of ICOMOS and so on.

So let us resolutely put it in the decision that this must be done for the last year and this is the last chance. If you accept such a version I would like some working group to clarify the wording and we will return to this matter. But we will clearly note that the decision is postponed to next year. If it is possible, if it is acceptable by the honorable delegates. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je suis tout à fait avec vous, donc on leur donne une chance finale.

Chairperson:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

We support your proposal to give the last year and to draft a new decision based on this.

Chairperson:

Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Mr Chairperson, Azerbaijan also supports this proposal, which can be a kind of compromise, and maybe we will find a consensus in the Committee. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I think that this is a good compromise but I do think we have to be very clear with the wording, last chance. In the past we have had actually said that a Danger listing is actually a positive thing in order to facilitate changing so I think in the future we are going to have to give more thought to what in Danger listing means. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania supports the Chair's position.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Monsieur le Président, la Tunisie soutient votre proposition.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. We hear your proposal to try and find a constructive pathway through this but I think the challenge that we would face in going down that path which we are open to exploring is that next year the composition of this Committee will be entirely different and I don't see how it's possible for us to make a decision here that is binding on the Committee next year so I think we need to approach this with a great sense of caution and I do need to say that we do still hold the view that the way this is constructed is the most appropriate path for this Committee to take in the dire circumstances facing the Kathmandu Valley.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Kyrgyzstan, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We support your proposal. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Well, of course we are not willing to go against what the majority in the room wants but concurring with much of what was said by my colleague from Australia, we also believe that since the composition of the Committee is going to be different we have to be very cautious. We also wanted to point out that the previous decisions, which were actually always putting this item back on the agenda for the subsequent year, they were always implied as that's the last year so we are basically doing the same thing again. We are just adding one more year and we say this is the final year. But then we will probably add another year. But of course we are very open to approaching this in a constructive way, to find a solution that is ultimately good for the site that has conservation of the World Heritage site because this is why we are all here—which will also enable the Committee to take a responsible decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I do understand the rationale of what was said by the delegation of Australia but I think we need to remind ourselves and actually we are stepping into very important issue of consistency of decisions taken by the Committee so we need to realize and

understand that the previous decisions of the Committee should be respected by the subsequent Committee Members regardless to the change in the composition of the Committee. But the very serious which I think should be applicable to many cases here is the consistency of the decisions of the Committee. I thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Yes, thank you, Chairperson. We have been listening very carefully to this discussion and we are very, very attentive to this. We all know what is going on. We are very aware of all the efforts of the State Party is doing in this process of repair and recovery but we also are aware that the List of World Heritage in Danger is being perceived here on this Committee as something negative as if it's a kind of finger pointing against the State Party but it's the opposite in fact. It's the best tool for assisting a State Party for exactly when there is this kind of natural disaster that occurs, to help them. So that is why any State Party, if they have properties that are affected by conflict or natural disasters, this is the appropriate mechanism. That is why we would like it if the State Party could also see it this way and we think that in our own countries we really have got to do more to communicate that the Danger List really is a way of setting forth a roadmap to recovery and it can be done hand-in-hand with the State Party to try to find the best way forward for the State Party, to restore the properties attributes to the state that it was in at the time of inscription. So we understand the debate but we really do think that the best way forward is to follow Hungary's suggestion. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. First of all, we support your suggestion. Secondly, I think we also wish to echo what Azerbaijan just mentioned. I think consistency is important. Thirdly, it is the desire of the State Party concerned that they do not wish to have their property inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. I mentioned in my earlier remarks that the cultural difference is an issue. Danger listing is not really perceived in many countries as a helping hand. Therefore I think we should try to reach a balance; a compromise might be the best solution. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would also like to support your suggestion and I would like to pose a question to maybe the Advisory Bodies about the resources: what are the resources, financial resources and capacity-building resources that ICOMOS or maybe even this Committee could help the country with if the site is on the Danger List. ICOMOS and IUCN have not provided this so far. So what is the added value in terms of assistance by the Advisory Bodies to the country if the site is inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger? And why if there are resources and possibilities of helping the country with capacity building, why can we do that only if the site is on the Danger List? Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you for this question. I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler for clarification.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much. Dear Committee Members, this Committee has already taken a Decision at 40 COM 7 which takes note of its discussion under agenda item 7A and B and requests the Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and States Parties to promote a better understanding of the implications and benefits of properties being inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to develop appropriate information material in this regard with a view to overcome the negative perceptions of the List of World Heritage in Danger. And this information material should highlight the importance of the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value. And I think you had at this Committee already debates for the removal of two sites from the Danger List which benefitted from Danger listing and in many cases sites on the Danger list get considerably more support also from other international organizations and from funding agencies.

You see in the case of Nepal in your document on page 148 in the English version what funding flows in. but Danger listing also is a means to get more funding from other agencies and donors. So this is what I would like to add and I think following what the delegate of Brazil and many others, China, has said on the perception of the Danger List, we need to work very closely together to overcome this perception because that was not the intention of the founding fathers and mothers of the Convention. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I thank the honourable delegate from Brazil for her question and the Director of the World Heritage Centre for her advice. In addition, the way in which paragraph 183 and 184 of the Operational Guidelines work is that in Danger listing sets up a structured framework and a roadmap through two devices. One is a statement which is brought back to the Committee about the desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the Danger Listing so it is very clear in terms of the difficulties now about is it adequate or not. It's very clear what adequate would mean. In addition to that, the second tool is the corrective measures, in other words the programme through which the State Party would proceed in order to achieve that desired state. At a practical level, the in Danger listing also affords the property priority, priority in terms of capacity building of the like that is done by organizations like ICCROM and ICOMOS and as the Director has highlighted, priority within the minds of the international community, particularly the benefactor agencies because this becomes a more important property and project to fund. As we have seen during this Committee session that can have great success for even very challenging properties such as the Saltpeter Mines in Humberstone and Saint Laura in Chile.

Finally, I would say that given the four-year history of this property with the Committee there is actually right now a huge opportunity to change the trajectory and perception of in Danger listing using this property. And if the message that is sent by the State Party back to the people of Nepal is that in Danger listing has been undertaken as an expression of support that could be part of the very process that the Director has outlined with regard to the Decision of this Committee at its 40th session. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as we come to some understanding of the situation, I would like to note that I support the idea, which was expressed concerning the thoughts of the Australian delegation of the implementation of the Decision taken by the previous Committee. First of all we have the same World Heritage Centre, the have international organizations ICOMOS,

ICCROM, IUCN who are responsible for the implementation and providing fulfillment of the matters agreed by the Committee.

Secondly, the previous Decisions of the Committee are not less important for the implementation that those which will be taken by the next team so I consider that if we will agree that we are giving the last year as proposed by most of the delegations and next year if the necessary documentation and proofs will not be provided then this matter will not only discussed, it must be inscribed on the in Danger List. I think that this solution will permit the State Party to understand what is the challenge they face and at the same time to put the Committee in a strong position that they urge the implementations of the past Decisions and urge the State Party to take necessary measures. This is my proposal for that.

I would like to propose that we have some working group to work out the drafting and wording which will ensure the ideas which you expressed here during the discussion on the List and after that we will return to this matter at the end of the day today. The content of the group I propose would be China, Australia, Hungary, Norway and Kuwait. Okay, five members. Thank you very much. Norway, you want the floor?

The Delegation of Norway:

Sorry for taking the floor, Chairperson. Just very quickly the mandates of the working group should be clarified so that we are sure we are not preempting any of the outcomes we need to be able to continue to discuss in the working group also. Thank you.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. As you have already adopted the first paragraph, so the mandate would be for the group to look at the last paragraphs and to come up with a wording which reflects the spirit of the discussions and Mr Chairperson, I think that Zimbabwe also wishes to be part of the group. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Zimbabwe, do you want the floor? Please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. We are requesting to be in the group.

Chairperson:

Okay, thank you. We enlist you in the group. Thank you very much for understanding and for such approach but dear friends we have spent one and a half hours discussing this matter and next we have another eight items to be discussed. So please let's move a bit quicker. Thank you very much. So the working group will provide at the end of the working day today at 5 o'clock the last. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Now we proceed to the next item. For the next property to be discussed, I would like to give the floor to the Delegation of Azerbaijan, which requested the state of conservation report on Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) to be opened for discussion, to present to the Committee the reason why it made such request. Thank you.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, my delegation would like to thank ICOMOS for their report, the work done and the communication with the State Party. I think the Committee knows this case—we have discussed this issue for many years and I believe this is another bright

example of how the Committee, and we need to find a compromise between sustainable development, the social, environmental elements and preservation of the site. But before embarking on this exercise about finding this balance, I would like to give you background about the city.

Lahore has a population of 12M. This is one of the largest cities. The Orange Line Metro (OLM) was conceived in 2005 but the execution started in 2015 due to the cautious approach of the government to avoid any negative impacts on the heritage of the historic city of Lahore. The Orange Metro Line is estimated to carry daily 3M passengers in the first year of operation and it is expected to increase. It navigates and traverses through the poorest localities. Its pro-poor orientation coupled with the correlation between subsidized urban transport and poverty reduction makes this project a necessity. So I would like to repeat that this is not for pleasure; it's a necessity. It is also important to highlight the eco-friendly nature of this project, as it will decrease carbon emissions by decreasing congestion on the road in the vicinity of the park. The energy efficient nature of this project will contribute to an actual decrease in pollution.

The State Party did its best to protect the property and its integrity and a special curve has been given to the train track by creating a maximum possible distance 141m from the main entrance of the Shalamar Gardens. For that, the Government acquired the property and there was some dislocation of a large number of people. Moreover, the State Party undertook nine assessment studies. According to Visual Impact Assessment conducted by the internationally renowned company the authenticity and visual integrity and Outstanding Universal Value of the property are not significantly impacted by the construction.

In 2018, a reactive monitoring mission took place in April. During six days the reactive monitoring mission has given a number of recommendations some of which have already been implemented by the State Party. The others are underlined and reflected in the draft decision including realigning existing roads, redirecting traffic, construction of glass curtains to mitigate the visual impact, creation of pedestrian area around the site and many others. These steps involve acquisition of land and houses to create open space around the property building new and additional motorways as well as pedestrian roads. These proposed measures involve the displacement of a large number of people residing in the neighborhood surrounding the property, which entails a significant social and financial cost for the State Party.

All these actions require detailed technical studies, hiring of consultants and adequate social measures for which appropriate time and financial resources are essential. In that sense we believe that the Committee should take due account of efforts of the State Party in ensuring the compliance with the World Heritage Convention Guidelines and therefore seek to play a constructive and facilitating role in this regard. Reference to the possible inscription of this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the 44th session of this Committee in our view is presumptuous and implies failure on the part of the State Party in implementing the mission's recommendations.

With this in mind, the delegation of Azerbaijan tabled amendments to the draft decision and we had consultation with Committee Members, namely with the delegation of Australia to find consensus on this matter. I thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to invite Mr Feng Jing, please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As the distinguished delegate of Azerbaijan has mentioned, the main issue facing us relating to the conservation of the property is the construction of the Metro Line project. It is understandable that the Orange Line Metro was motivated for the need for

improved public infrastructure and reduced environmental impact of vehicular traffic but as shown in previous analyses and conclusions by the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM there has been a lack in complying with the required procedure and especially considering all impacts on the property. The State Party did not give due consideration to alternative options before decisions were taken despite the provisions of paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

Yes, as the Ambassador mentioned, the April 2018 joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission has confirmed also the negative impacts of the project on attributes related to artistic, aesthetic accomplishments of the 16th and 17th centuries of the property but so far the efforts made by the State Party have not been confirmed at the time of preparation of the working document.

On 27 May 2019, the State Party provided additional information, which is being reviewed by ICOMOS. The efforts made by the State Party to address some of the Committee's requirements with regard to the conservation of the property and the directions provided by the Supreme Court of Pakistan are appreciated. These are demonstrated by the creation of the special committee of experts, which oversees the Orange Line Metro project and undertook the planting of trees that may screen the view of the project from the property and the test operations to evaluate vibration levels.

However, most importantly the Committee may wish to request the State Party before implementation of the recommendations of the 2018 mission to mitigate to the maximum extent the adverse effects of the project on the OUV of the property. It should also be recalled that the State Party has been requested for years to consider boundary revision and the creation of buffer zones for the Shalamar Gardens component of the site and in particular the actions to create open space around the property that involves the displacement of people residing in the neighboring area of the property as a result of the position of land and houses, but I think we need further information.

On a positive note, it is acknowledged that the State Party conducted a number of conservation measures within the property. It is requested to report on the effectiveness of the roof waterproofing systems and also new and old drainage systems of runoff water in the open courtyard and also in the historical buildings of the Lahore Fort and particularly those corresponding to the pictorial wall sections—I think some of you may see that in the side event of the Aga Khan Trust for Culture.

The Committee in this context may wish to reiterate requests that the State Party submit detailed information on the elements mentioned notably for the proposing of mitigation measures to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies in the absence of significant progress in the implementation of the measures recommended by the mission and previous sessions of the Committee. For that reason we propose the potential danger listing with a view of the absence of substantial progress. As mentioned earlier, after the drafting of the working document the State Party provided additional information on 27 May and the information is being reviewed by ICOMOS.

The draft decision appears on document 43 COM 7B.72 on page 157 in the English version and page 162 in the French version. So, Mr Chairperson, with your permission ICOMOS will provide further comments on this property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Please. Thank you and note the time limit, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. As already mentioned the 2018 Reactive Monitoring mission made a series of recommendations to mitigate the impact of the elevated Orange Metro Line on the property. There were 31 recommendations in all of which six are reflected in the draft decision in front of you. These involve directing traffic away from the Shalamar Gardens on the side of Grand Trunk Road creating a noise-sensitive zone around other sides of the Gardens, developing a soundproof tube between two stations on the new Metro Line where it overlooks the Gardens and revising the buffer zone to include the original line of the Grand Trunk Road.

As you have also heard, after the state of conservation report was issued we received a response from the State Party to these recommendations. In this response the State Party gave its commitment to implement the remaining recommendations and we welcome that commitment. Nevertheless, some of the recommendations require substantial work particularly in relation to the amendments to the Trunk Road and the Metro Line. The State Party has already considered hiring a consultant to undertake a comprehensive survey and study of the road possibilities under the Metro project.

From discussions with the State Party during this Committee meeting, we are pleased to say that they have agreed to invite an Advisory mission to offer specialized advice on the approach to these projects, and particularly to explore the implications and options for consideration. The proposed road project would impact on developed land and it is clearly of the utmost importance that the options considered clearly take into consideration the impact both positive and negative on local communities.

With regard to the buffer zone, I am pleased to say that this matter has been clarified with the State Party so that it is now clear that an amendment to the buffer zone does not necessitate the purchase of land or the clearing of houses and other buildings but rather the development of appropriate protection and management measures. We welcome the opportunity for further dialogue with the State Party in progressing the implementation of the Committee Decisions, but would like to request clarification from the State Party on the proposed Advisory missions. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and also the State Party for the continuous collaboration. This is the same topic we discussed last year. I don't want to repeat myself regarding the importance of public transportation since this is a national need. The problem with the Shalamar Gardens is unfortunately it is in Lahore a place with 12M people. That is a fact. This site is a very congested place. Public transportation is a must and I should remind my colleagues that the placement of the Metro was not done just like that; it's based on traffic studies. For transportation there has always been traffic studies before construction of any project to also take into account the place, safety and optimization of the people. As we see from the photos, it is a very congested place. We see progress from the State Party so we think again we support what was said in the draft amendment submitted by Azerbaijan.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. In order not to take a lot of time I would like just to say that we support the amendment by Azerbaijan because we agree that all the details in the draft decision are still in the report of the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre and we think they will be taken into account. Concerning the last paragraph, I think we agreed in the meetings before that we do not threaten with the possibility of in Danger listing and therefore I think we should be consistent with our previous Decisions. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. We view the protection of World Heritage is the joint responsibility of the World Heritage Centre and Member States. At the same time, however, the World Heritage Centre should not be oblivious to the requirements of States Parties to undertake projects aimed at uplifting the quality of life of its people. The Orange Line Metro project, which was envisaged to meet the transportation requirements of Lahore city, is one such project. Pakistan has conducted numerous assessment studies prior to the execution of the project, which indicated no significant or immitigable impacts on the OUV of the property. We have been informed that the State Party is committed to implementing all practical recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission and is actively engaged with the World Heritage Centre and that has also been acknowledged by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. In our view, we should not burden the State Party to implement in a hurry some of the reactive monitoring mission recommendations, which have significant social and thus technical implications such as shifting the 250-years-old road, and constructing a new motorway in the area, which is thickly inhabited by people since ages.

I think it is important to give the State Party of Pakistan the opportunity to explain its position and to respond to questions raised in the debate. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like first of all to associate myself to the statement made by the distinguished delegate of Azerbaijan, especially when he made reference to the challenge posed to many countries in addressing sustainable development and preservation of World Heritage sites. This is a specific case where we are discussing one of the areas of the world with very high population density, which has very significant challenges to overcome. We are very grateful to the Advisory Bodies for their reports and I believe that the report we are analyzing now is the one released on June 2018 which highlights a number of recommendations some of which involve the acquisition of land and houses to create open space around the property, building new and additional motorways and a pedestrian road along all sides of the property. We understand that the State Party is on the other hand fully committed to ensuring compliance with the recommendations by the monitoring mission. But perhaps they will need more time to accomplish the complex tasks that are demanded which involved the displacement of a large number of people with significant administrative, social and financial costs to the State Party.

We therefore believe that some more time should be given to the country, so that the authorities have the opportunity to fully comply with the significant demands posed to the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and our gracious host. Mr Chairperson, if you go through the state of conservation for the Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore, you will find that the property faces many conservation challenges. These include development pressure, particularly infrastructure development such as the railway line near the property, among others. However, not enough studies have been done to inform impact of the proposed project despite several requests that have been made.

Mr Chairperson, the proposal by the State Party to suggest some changes supported by Azerbaijan, particularly in the last paragraph is backed by the—for the Committee intends to put this property on the Danger List in the next session. Mr Chairperson, therefore this delegation supports the amendment made and is convinced the State Party will implement the recommendations made by the reactive monitoring mission in 2018. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. je voudrais tout d'abord remercier le Centre du patrimoine et l'ICOMOS pour leur rapport, qui nous permet d'avancer dans la connaissance et dans le traitement de ce dossier que ce Comité connaît assez bien, et qui condense des points qui ont été hier largement discutés sur la difficile quadrature du cercle entre la question du développement durable, la question de la protection des sites classés et aussi la question de la gestion au jour le jour de la question démographique et du développement économique de nos villes. Ce rapport reconnaît lui-même les progrès qui ont été faits de la part de l'État partie, les différentes structures nationales ou locales. Nous soulignons avec satisfaction la décision prise par la Cour suprême dans cette direction, et je crois que, dans l'ensemble, il y a une reconnaissance d'une direction positive qui a été jusque-là suivie. C'est pour cela que la Tunisie soutient le projet d'amendement, qui permet d'avancer dans cette direction et de laisser au Comité qui vient le soin de décider au vu de l'évolution sur le terrain.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

[Arabic spoken]

[English spoken] Mr Chairperson, Indonesia would like to commend and praise the Advisory Bodies on their comprehensive report on the state of conservation on the Fort and Shalamar Gardens. We take note and acknowledge efforts taken by the State Party to address the Committee's recommendation on preserving the conservation of the Gardens. We understand there are necessary steps. Hence, we trust that it would be in line with the efforts of preserving the property to be in its required state of conservation. Despite all efforts made by the State Party the 2018 report of the reactive monitoring mission urges the State Party to implement many recommendations especially mentioned in points 7, items a-f among other vehicular traffic array, combined construction of additional motorway, driver-vehicular traffic on all of the sides of the Shalamar Gardens. To be able to implement all the recommendations, Indonesia believes that the State Party requires a considerable length of time and extensive resources. In this regard, Indonesia wishes the Committee to give the State Party an extension to

accomplish all the recommendations. Indonesia also requests the State Party to engage in dialogue and work closely with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in the implementation of the recommendations. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

[Arabic spoken]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. As our distinguished colleague from Azerbaijan has already mentioned, we have reached a consensus on the amendments proposed by ourselves and by our colleagues on the Committee. The essence of our amendments is that we consider that the State Party needs to provide to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies environmental impact assessment including visual impact assessment and vibration analysis that has already been completed by the State Party and mentioned by a number of our Committee colleagues. We appreciate that the State Party would like an independent consultant to undertake a feasibility study for different mitigation options for reducing the impacts to the property from the Orange Metro Line. However, we need to be assured that this is undertaken in dialogue with the Advisory Bodies and in consideration of the methods and outcomes of the studies already completed. Such a dialogue and review will provide an appropriate basis for consideration of the best options for mitigation measures of any impacts to OUV through the Orange Metro Line. Our proposed amendments for paragraphs 4 and 7 of the draft decision take this into account. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

We believe that in the future work of this State Party and Advisory Bodies is possible to reach harmonization and integration of this 10th century of the area because with the moving with what is mentioned by Indonesia—all this traffic, etc. and with additional design along the Orange Metro Line it's possible to better harmonize the area because taking into consideration that the city is a living organism through centuries and every century should add something needed for these people who are living there and we support the amendment by Azerbaijan.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Cuba.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. In the previous session of the Committee Cuba helped suggest an amendment that was finally adopted and based upon which we are analysing this document today and we are quite happy about the fact that that agreement had the concrete results in terms of the analysis that we are carrying out about this site. Specifically, we believe that the proposal before us by Azerbaijan is very objective in terms of recognizing the progress made and we would be reaffirming an issue that our Australian colleague talked about, the importance to continue to strengthen communication with the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving Norway the floor. I will be very brief. Just to announce that Norway supports the amendment made by Australia. However, we find the amendment by Azerbaijan, China, etc. to the last part of original paragraph 7 also relevant. We would like to keep the request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies detailed projects that are related to future work prior to--and that is essential—prior to the commencement of these works in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines. Therefore, we would like to suggest merging this last part of that amendment with the replacement text made by Australia to the original paragraph 7. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Mr Chairperson, we have a very brief reaction to this. The Uganda delegation is in unison with other delegations in giving a chance to the concerned State Party, time to respond to the recommendations by the reactive monitoring mission. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to the State Party. Pakistan, please, two minutes.

The Observer Delegation of Pakistan:

[Arabic spoken]

[English spoken] Mr Chairperson, excellences, first of all let me thank the government of Azerbaijan for the excellent arrangements for this important session. Since our arrival, we have enjoyed the warm hospitality of the Azeri people in the beautiful city of Baku. At the outset I would like to reaffirm Pakistan's unwavering commitment to the protection and conservation of our heritage. The new Government in Pakistan is fully committed to this cause; my presence here as the Minister of Tourism demonstrates this political commitment. We would like to thank the Members of the World Heritage Committee for their understanding and support as well as the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their guidance and engagement.

Mr Chairperson, we welcomed the reactive monitoring mission which visited Lahore in April 2018. We value their recommendations, which were given in the spirit of helping Pakistan to better preserve the World Heritage property. We have carried a detailed examination of reactive monitoring mission's recommendations and stand committed to implement them in a manner that conforms to our international obligations and domestic socioeconomic responsibilities. We have already implemented some of the recommendations while for the remaining ones we are engaging an international consultant for which the process has already been started. We pledge to keep the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in the process. The Committee is already aware that the Supreme Court of Pakistan has also formed a special committee of experts to independently monitor the conservation of the site in relation to the Orange Metro Line project. An advisory committee on the heritage is also been formed by the central government to oversee the preservation of all heritage sites.

I may draw the attention of the Committee that at this particular property is composed of two distinct monuments, the Shalamar Gardens and the Lahore Fort located at two different places in the city. Recently, the conservation report of the Lahore Fort has been acknowledged and appreciated by UNESCO. This demonstrates our commitment to meet our international obligations with regard to the conservation of our World Heritage properties.

Therefore I would like to assure the august Committee about our sincerity and commitment to remain engaged with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to ensure that the OUV of the property is not compromised in any manner whatsoever. Thank you. *Salaam alekum*.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Rapporteur, I would like to apply to the Rapporteur because we have two proposals and as far as I understand there is a certain consensus between the Parties so may we have the draft decision on the screen?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Yes, the Rapporteur is trying very hard to keep up with these draft decisions. What we have so far is two proposals for amendments, one from Australia and one from a group of countries: Azerbaijan, China, Kuwait, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Tunisia and the Republic of Tanzania. And I will just, I understand that Norway has proposed a minor amendment, which is combining two of those amendments, but we'll just get to that as we read through the decision. And I do understand that there is some consensus there, which may be not reflected in this decision yet but we will start and see how we go.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 remain un-amended. Paragraph 3, the group of countries has proposed for deletion in its entirety. Former paragraph 4 which is now paragraph 3 has been amended or proposed for amendment by Australia and this would read, Acknowledges the efforts made by the State Party to address some of the Committee's requirements with regard to the conservation of the property and the directions provided by the Supreme Court of Pakistan, in particular in relation to the construction and operation of the OLM project, such as the planting of trees which may screen the view of the OLM from the property and the test operations to evaluate vibration levels, and requests that the method and outcomes of all monitoring activities including Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) including a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), and the vibration analysis previously undertaken by the State Party be communicated to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Then moving along, former paragraph 5, the group of countries proposes for amendment would read, Notes the creation of the special committee of experts and technical committee under orders of the Supreme Court which oversee and monitor the Orange Line Project, and further recommends that similar regulatory committees will—I think we can delete the—oh, no sorry—will be set up. That's fine—will be set up by the Directorate General of Archaeology for Orange Line related operations and future projects to enable informed decision-making processes, in compliance with the provisions of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines.

Former paragraph 6 is not proposed for amendment by any delegates. Then things look a little confusing here. This is former paragraph 7, which is being proposed for amendment by both of these sets of amendments. Australia's proposal is for a paragraph which would read, Urges the State Party, in dialogue with the Advisory Bodies, to discuss the recommendations of the 2018 Reactive Monitoring mission concerning the mitigation of the OLM's impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, in light of the outcomes of the Visual Impact Assessment, and the vibration analysis undertaken by the State Party, as a basis for a feasibility study of mitigation options. So that's the first proposal by Australia. And then there is an alternative to that proposed by the group of countries which I understand there may have been some agreement on this one—but that reads, Takes note the insufficiency of the implementation of some of the recommendations formulated by the 2018 reactive monitoring mission, and further notes that for the remaining recommendations, the State Party is in the process of hiring reputed consultants to undertake detailed feasibility studies. Further actions

thereof will be taken in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies after the consultant's findings become available.

Then there is a series of dot points which are proposed for deletion by everybody but there is a small amount of text at the bottom which would carry on from the top which would then continue on, and further requests the State Party in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit in relation to future projects, detailed project studies to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies prior to the commencement of these works, which should only proceed once positive feedback has been received—and I understand that the distinguished delegate from Norway was wanting to include that paragraph or that element of the paragraph also to retain that.

Then we move on to former paragraph 8, which is un-amended. Former paragraph 9 also similarly the same and then the final paragraph proposed for amendment by the group of countries and that would read, Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020. And it would finish there. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So should we proceed for the approval of this draft in whole or we have one item, one paragraph where we have some confusion. Let's go one by one. Paragraph 1, clear, paragraph 2, clear, paragraph 3, no objections for taking away this paragraph? No objections. Thank you. New paragraph 3, the version proposed by Australia, can we approve it? I don't see any objections, thank you very much. Paragraph 4. We have some consensus? Thank you. Paragraph 5 remains the same. Here we have the question. So what is the opinion? Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As I said in my initial introduction, we had consultation with Members of the Committee and we agreed and found the proposal made by the Australian delegation as reasonable and we have agreed that we will take the Australian proposal as ours. Thank you.

Chairperson:

No other opinions? Okay, Rapporteur, please, make it clear for us.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. I just would like to ask the Committee or just to confirm with Australia whether we are just keeping the paragraph as proposed in your amendment or are we also including the very end of that rather long paragraph which says, and further requests the State Party, etc. as I understand was amended by the group of countries and proposed for inclusion by Norway or are we agreeing just at the very start of that paragraph?

Chairperson:

Indonesia.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you very much. *Salaam alekum*. Indonesia would like to look at paragraph 6—could we see paragraph 6? Yes. This is a rather long paragraph. Could we ask the Rapporteur if we would like to divide it into two paragraphs? Is it possible? Thank you very much. I see she nodded. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and thank you to the distinguished delegate from Indonesia. It is complicated but what we are doing is trying to highlight the paragraph we are talking about noting that there is still the question of the very end of this very long paragraph also. But I'll just read that for the Committee again. Urges the State Party, in dialogue with the Advisory Bodies, to discuss the recommendations of the 2018 Reactive Monitoring mission concerning the mitigation of the OLM's impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, in light of the outcomes of the Visual Impact Assessment, and the vibration analysis undertaken by the State Party as a basis for a feasibility study of mitigation options. And I think Australia will clarify if they are proposing to keep the very end of that rather long paragraph also.

Chairperson:

Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. We are happy with the amendment proposed by Azerbaijan and others to this paragraph but we would like to keep the remainder of the paragraph.

Chairperson:

Fine. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie se joint à l'Australie pour son vœu de maintenir la fin du paragraphe, tel que proposé par la Norvège.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We move forward and we accept paragraph 6.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. As highlighted.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Paragraph, no changes, paragraph 8, no changes, paragraph 9. Do we agree on this version proposed by the group of countries? No objections?

Mr Jing:

Mr Chairperson, I just want to signal during the discussion that the ICOMOS asked a question relating to the Advisory mission and the State Party also confirmed that. If that has been covered in the current decision I think this is fine.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So the last version paragraph 9, approved. Thank you very much. Now we can move to another question. We are late! I don't want you to stay here for the night session. So again we have another item, which was initiated by Azerbaijan concerning Historic Monuments at Makli, Thatta in Pakistan. Please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. With the same logic that we already pronounced in the draft decision on Shalamar Gardens we propose the deletion of the last phrase which is in our view a prejudgement on what has been done already by the State Party and I would like to

appreciate the work of ICOMOS and ICCROM and also acknowledged the positive outcome of the investment and preservation efforts of the State Party. So in the last paragraph there is in our view a bit premature wording, which says that it recommends to the World Heritage Committee to consider this issue in the absence of substantial progress the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. I would like again to repeat that in our view it's a bit prejudgement and we would like to delete the last phrase. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Mr Jing, please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson, distinguished Committee Members. I think in response to the questions and comments made by the honourable ambassador of Azerbaijan, the state of conservation working document in front of you that the summary of conservation issues of the property is available 43 COM 7B on pages 159-161 in the English version and pages 164-166 in the French version. In the Committee's previous deliberations it was recognized that the property was in a generally critical state in terms of the physical conservation and also with regard to the absence of an appropriate management structure. On that basis the Committee asked for a reactive monitoring mission in 2010.

As requested by the Committee, a joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property in January this year and commended a number of positive changes since the previous mission of 2016. These positive developments include the a clearer demarcation of the property with boundary walls, relocation of infrastructure and the establishment of a modern burial site that contribute to the property's general management and a serious commitment on the part of authorities to facilitate ongoing dialogue with local communities and formally recognize the living aspects and values of the property. Concerning the state of conservation, a number of significant monuments in need of stabilization during the 2016 Joint Mission have since undergone some structural intervention. Specific recommended measures were also implemented for some of the most important monuments, such as the Mausoleum of Jam Nizamuddin and Jamia Majid.

Furthermore, the Management Plan for the property requested by the Committee in 2009 remains incomplete. The Committee has requested a number of these actions over an extended period of time. The World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM would therefore recommend that the Committee request the State Party to implement all recommendations of the 2019 reactive monitoring mission and to inform the World Heritage Centre of any major projects in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

In our view, in absence of substantial progress the Committee may wish to consider the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 44th session in 2020. The draft decision 43 COM 7B.73 can be found on page 161 in the English version and on page 166 in the French version. Mr Chairperson, with your permission ICOMOS will provide further comments on this property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. ICOMOS and ICCROM recognize that the State Party has made progress with management and conservation of the property from relocation of some encroachments, establishing a contemporary burial area outside the property and control of side access and security. Overall monitoring and maintenance of the site has also improved

including monitoring of weather and monument damage. However, much still needs to be done to address considerable longstanding serious threats to the fabric of the property and other attributes of its Outstanding Universal Value. The actions taken to manage the property are not yet commensurate with the threats to OUV and have not delivered the outcomes sought by mission recommendations. The 2019 reactive monitoring mission observed that a number of important monuments remain in dire condition and that some restoration works by third parties are not appropriate and the documentation facilities for the storage displaced significant historic fabric need urgent attention.

Mr Chairperson and Committee Members, having regard to the suggestion from the honorable delegate from Azerbaijan that the recommendation before the Committee is premature, I would highlight on behalf of ICOMOS and ICCROM that the Committee has requested over an extended period that important actions be taken to address the threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. In this regard by extended period I am referring to mission recommendations still unfulfilled from 2006, 2010, 2012 and 2016. These not-completed actions include completion of the submission of the Management Plan, which has been repeatedly requested by the Committee since 2007, Emergency Risk Preparedness provisions, a framework for visitor management, improvements to the inventory and storage systems for displaced elements and remnant architectural surface decoration, submission of the minor boundary modification request, preparation of a regulatory plan for the buffer zone, conservation work on important monuments and coordination of conservation activities in accordance with appropriate standards.

In the view of ICOMOS and ICCROM, the time has come and there needs to be a binding timeframe. However, notwithstanding the current threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, it is acknowledged that the State Party is acting to achieve its conservation and should be offered a further opportunity to complete urgently the required tools and actions, particularly implementation of previous Committee Decisions and all of the recommendations of the 2019 mission. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as I understand, the new draft doesn't have any changes in the sense of the document. From the other side, we agree with the position of ICOMOS and the Centre itself. The proposal of Azerbaijan consists that we must not use the matter of the inscription of the List of World Heritage in Danger as a threat to push the government forward and I think there is no big difference in approach between the previous matter and this one.

So I would like to propose to put this draft decision on the screen and we will proceed with the last paragraph only. So all the text remains the same. Please, show us the last paragraph. So the proposal is to withdraw the words after 2020. If there are no serious objections from Committee Members can we approve the document as a whole? Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. This is a lovely site and it deserves good conservation, so Norway would like to point to the fact that there was a consensus yesterday that the List of the World Heritage in Danger is in fact a list for positive changes. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. We accept this opinion but we can't reflect it now in the draft decision. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Very simply, China supports the Azerbaijan amendment to the text. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So there is a group of countries proposed such kind of proposal. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Indonesia would also like to support Azerbaijan's proposal. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Chairperson, it has been the position of the delegation of Tanzania and we believe this is the common wisdom of the honorable Committee Members that when there is a noticeable improvement of the property and clear engagement by the State Party to implement recommendations of the Committee that you continue a dialogue. My delegation recommends Committee Members to encourage the State Party to complete the required actions particularly the Management Plan and implement the other recommendations of the 2019 mission. Chairperson, my delegation echoes our full support to the amendment proposed by the distinguished delegate of Azerbaijan.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I place the question like that, are there any objections here or not? I don't see any and I apply to you to approve the document in whole. Thank you very much. Approved.

Now I would like to invite you due to the necessity of return to the discussion of the previous matters as we agreed at the end of the morning session. May I ask Mr Feng Jing and all of you to apply to the document where we have the list of adoption without discussion to finish with this matter for the next five to ten minutes? You can do it now, please. The List of Asia Pacific Region for which the report are proposed for adoption without discussion. There are several properties and we will have a chance to finalize this.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The following sites are from cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Asia-Pacific region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Historic Centre of Macao in China, The Great Wall in China, West Lake Cultural Landscape of Hangzhou in China, Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Group of Monuments at Hampi in India, Mountain Railways of India in India, Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the Subak System as a Manifestation of the Tri Hita Karana Philosophy in Indonesia, Meidan Emam, Esfahan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region in Iran, Fujisan, sacred place and source of artistic inspiration in Japan, Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape in the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Great Burkhan Khaldun Mountain and its surrounding sacred landscape in Mongolia, Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha in Nepal, Baroque Churches of the Philippines in the Philippines, Golden Temple of Dambulla in Sri Lanka, Historic City of Ayutthaya in Thailand and Historic Centre of Bukhara in Uzbekistan. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as it was already listed in the preliminary agenda and the document submitted to all Committee Members I propose to approve the advised decision to make it without any discussion. I don't see any objections. Thank you very much. Approved.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Mr Chairperson, my delegation tabled an amendment to the draft decision on Crossroad of Cultures.

Chairperson:

But we didn't come to it yet.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Sorry, sorry.

Chairperson:

Now we are returning to the two items that remained opened from the previous day. We have two documents, the decision on the Kenya Lake System paragraph 7B.33 and we have document on the Sundarbans, Bangladesh paragraph 7B.3. I would like to inform the honorable Members of the Committee that due to the fact that the drafting group worked out the decision. Now the Secretariat and staff are working on the translation of the draft proposed for Sundarbans that is why we now discuss only the Kenya Lake System to permit the Secretariat to make the professional translation of the text from English to French and now we are coming to the Kenya Lake System and then we will go to Samarkand items before lunch. If we will not reach the end of the discussion before that then we will follow with Samarkand at the beginning and we will discuss the matter of Sundarbans as soon as the translation is ready, if you don't mind. Now, please welcome. We would like to have—where is the decision? Can we put it on the screen? Decision 7B.33. Here it is. Prepared by the drafting group. Rapporteur, the floor is yours.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. The drafting group has proposed some amendments to paragraph 3. So 3 a) would read, To strengthen the protection of the areas between Lakes Nakuru and Elementaita, to ensure that the 2011 boundaries of the property are clearly identified to enable the State Party to deal with the illegal developments to develop and implement strict and clear regulations to prohibit developments in close proximity to fragile habitats and in the critical buffer zone of the property, including by integrating such provisions in the draft Management Plans. Paragraph 4 is un-amended. Paragraph 5 would read, Welcomes the progress of the State Party in addressing the ruling of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights through the development of a joint integrated Management Plan for the Lake Bogoria National Reserve ecosystem by the Endorois Welfare Council and the Baringo County Government and urges the State Party to one, expedite the development of this overdue plan and benefit sharing arrangements, two, submit the final draft of the plan to the World Heritage Centre for review, and three, continue its efforts to implement the above ruling of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights. And the rest of the decision remains unchanged. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as I understand, during these days there were certain discussions and consultations between Committee Members and agreement has been achieved with the draft decision proposed just now to you. If there are no objections can we precede with supporting this draft decision? The World Heritage Centre , please.

The Secretariat:

We just wanted to make one suggestion because you are referring to the ruling but you have taken out the specification of which ruling. I suppose this Commission has many, many rulings

so I think it is better to keep the Endorois ruling so that it's clear which ruling is referred to. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Okay. Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. We can add that into paragraph 5 at the end. Is that what you are proposing?

The Secretariat:

I think in the first sentence, Welcomes the progress of the State Party in addressing the ruling of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights Endorois ruling. So that it is clear which ruling we are referring to.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I think we can accept this addition. Thank you very much. I don't see any objections so we consider the draft decision on 7B.33 approved in whole. Thank you.

Now we have to proceed to the next Item, the delegation of Azerbaijan, which requested the state of conservation report on Samarkand–Crossroad of Cultures in Uzbekistan to be opened for discussion. I would like to hear some explanations from their part. Please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The delegation of Azerbaijan would like to open discussion on this Item to give some clarification with regard to the report provided by the Advisory Bodies. First of all, we are thankful to the Advisory Bodies for their work, but we would like to highlight that no reactive monitoring mission has visited the site in the last years and most of the paragraphs of the proposed text of the Decision are based on the third party information only without any verification with the State Party.

The World Heritage Centre's state of conservation report refers to the high-level reactive monitoring mission that visited another property in Uzbekistan, namely Shakhrisyabz. The mission was also on a one-day trip visit to Samarkand upon the request of the State Party itself. So it is another evidence that the State Party is willing and ready to work with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies.

We feel that it is very important that any conclusions to be included in the Committee decision on this site, Samarkand, should be based on in-depth analysis of the situation on the ground and take into account its complexity. So our point is that with a one-way visit that was not done specifically for this site, cannot be used to base our assessment of the situation. We would like to commend the State Party's readiness and intention to invite a reactive monitoring mission to this property in the coming months to clarify most of these issues. This mission's task will be very important and its report will serve as a basis for this Committee's further decisions. In this regard, it is this Committee's responsibility to ensure that the upcoming mission will visit the site without any prejudgement.

The State Party also indicated on many occasions that it has informed the World Heritage Centre about upcoming development projects from the very beginning and a high-level delegation visited UNESCO Headquarters to discuss the locations of the site and future projects. Not all the facts presented in the state of conservation report have been considered in the draft decision. The State Party informed in the SOC report that no designed proposal has been yet finalized and no construction activity started. Implementation will start only after the validation of projects and heritage impact assessment by the World Heritage Centre and

ICOMOS. In this regard, we feel that any statements about unwillingness of the State Party to present the heritage impact assessment of the projects are not valid.

The proposed decision also requests the State Party to present information on the implementation of all the paragraphs including the Master Plan and management plan of the property. We believe that it might be impossible for the State Party to complete these tasks by 1 February 2020. That is why we are proposing alternatives, to ask to prepare this document by February 2020 or request the status of the implementation or progress made so far in this regard. Given the considerable gap that needs to be filled in such a short time, we feel that the proposed timelines to produce this series of plans, regulations, guidelines, manuals are not proportionate with the available resources and capacity both in financial and human terms.

Using this opportunity and the presence of the honourable Deputy Prime Minister of Uzbekistan I would be also happy if, Mr Chairperson, you would give him the floor to clarify these issues for the Committee. I thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will have it in account. Now, Mr Feng Jing, please and ICOMOS.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The case in front of us, I think it has been ongoing since last December where a discussion on the state of conservation of this property was not initially foreseen for the current Committee session. Developments on site and also the looming threats to the property have prompted an early review by the Committee. As the distinguished ambassador of Azerbaijan pointed out, ongoing dialogue between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS has been happening since last December, where the Secretariat requested the State Party to provide clarifications on the third party information in line with paragraph 174 of the Operational Guidelines. Much of the information is shared with the State Party as a sort of third party information. Regrettably, however, despite the Committee's request of Decision 39 COM 7B.73 the State Party did not follow due process in notifying the Committee and the World Heritage Centre prior to making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse regarding a major restoration or new construction which may affect the OUV of the property. This is in conformity with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

During the high-level mission to Uzbekistan in January 2016, the State Party indicated that two industrial sites had been cleared in the buffer zone to allow for the construction of a convention facility for the Shanghai Corporation Organization Summit in 2022 and made reference to the demolition of two other buildings within the property and intended for new construction. However, no details on the demolitions have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre so far, nor any documentation on the structures demolished nor the sites cleared nor any plans on new construction, nor HIA for the numerous interventions already completed, ongoing or planned.

The number and variety of major construction projects in Samarkand city, both planned and ongoing is significant and many are progressing fast to meet the 2022 deadline for the Shanghai Corporation Organization Summit. The plan to construct a variety of infrastructures and tourism facilities is a source of concern especially the multifunctional project, the Samarkand City Tourist Zone that involves the demolition and redevelopment of a number of areas within the property, its buffer zones and beyond. Together, the number of proposed and ongoing projects, the speed required to complete many of them by 2022 and the absence of adequate guidelines, regulations and tools, are very likely to threaten the OUV of the property.

Therefore, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies recommend that the State Party be requested to provide an in-depth study of all projects that may affect the World Heritage

property, its buffer zone and the wider setting as a matter of urgency and to prepare to issue construction permits. It is essential that full details of the technical documents and planning tools be thoroughly reviewed and mitigation measures considered for all projects, planned, ongoing or implemented. Modifications may need to be considered for any contracts or permits already in place. Additionally, the Master Plan needs to be reviewed and approved before detailed plans can be envisaged for specific areas.

It is therefore recommended that the State Party be requested to invite a joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property at its earliest convenience. Mr Chairperson, the draft decision can be found on page 23 in both language versions of the document. With your permission ICOMOS will now provide further comments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. The Shanghai Corporation Summit which will be hosted by Samarkand in 2022 has prompted the development of what is called a multifunctional Samarkand City Tourist Zone project that includes not only the development of hotels to service this Summit but also other projects to improve areas of the city especially along the route from the airport and some of these projects appear to include the demolition and redevelopment of some areas. Although the State Party has provided a list of projects and it is clear that there is an urgency to complete them mostly before the Summit takes place in 2022. So far, no documentation has been provided of the precise locations or the scope and details of these projects, some of which are on the property and some just outside in the buffer zone. It includes two areas that involves the demolition of houses and relocation of residents. Given the very tight timescale there does appear to be an urgency to allow due assessment of these projects before work commences.

As we have heard, no details and only third party information on what is planned and whether work has already started the current situation is far from clear. The development needed to accommodate the Summit has also been combined with other development to provoke tourism and both a link to the development of a new Master Plan. While we welcome the development of this new Master Plan, which includes improvement to traffic arrangements, there are concerns that this document will not be produced until after many large development projects have already been accomplished.

So all in all, we consider there is a degree of urgency to clarify the situation through requesting the State Party to provide all the necessary documents and impact assessments as soon as possible so that we can clarify what if any impact there is on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have some applies for comments. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Ma délégation voudrait d'abord prendre note des commentaires faits par le Secrétariat et par l'ICOMOS concernant les impacts potentiels, je dis bien potentiels, des réalisations envisagées sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle (VUE). Ma délégation voudrait aussi faire remarquer que l'État partie de l'Ouzbékistan a déployé d'importants efforts pour renforcer la conservation et la gestion de la ville historique de Samarkand. Et en ce qui concerne le développement du tourisme faisant l'objet du projet de décision, l'État partie a également informé l'UNESCO, conformément à l'article 172 des

Orientations, concernant l'intention de construire un certain nombre d'infrastructures sans que cela n'augmente forcément de façon compromettante le taux de fréquentation et n'affecte également la VUE. Les sites choisis pour implanter d'ailleurs ces infrastructures ont même été discutés avec l'UNESCO.

C'est pourquoi je rejoins l'État partie d'Azerbaïdjan pour solliciter effectivement qu'on puisse examiner le projet de décision qui a été soumis et que l'on donne ensuite l'occasion à l'État partie, l'Ouzbékistan, de pouvoir fournir de plus amples informations, qui finiront certainement par nous convaincre de la nécessité de réviser justement le projet de décision pour tenir compte de ces changements importants qui ont été relevés mais qui, comme l'ICOMOS même l'a souligné, pourrait n'être que potentiels. Je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

We would like to support the statement of Azerbaijan. And I want to add that I think the State Party put great effort because 1995 was the decision to make the Master Plan and I was one of the coauthors of this plan, that is part of the inscription in 2001 and I believe they have the power and good will to complete all the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies and then I think that taking into consideration the short period of time for this meeting will be to put all experts available to complete this project and then especially to send a new mission to check the situation, not to be dependent on third party information but they have probably some private small interest to complain. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

[Arabic spoken]

[English spoken] Indonesia would like to thank the Advisory Bodies for the report on the state of conservation of the Samarkand–Crossroad of Cultures (Uzbekistan). We would like also to praise the State Party for the efforts carried out to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property despite the need to develop a number of infrastructure and tourism facilities within the property and its buffer zones. Indonesia recognizes that the State Party has conducted many substantial efforts to prevent all possible adverse impacts of the development project, including by developing a new Master Plan with heritage urban landscape approach, drafting new traffic schemes, updating its management plan, preparing a detailed project proposal related to Shanghai Cooperation Organization Summit and submitting a document entitled, Urban Design Guidelines for Priority Project in Samarkand to the World Heritage Centre just recently. On this note, Indonesia expresses its concern about the existence of prejudgment and misjudgment on the draft decision not to mention some statements in the state of conservation report are missing. In order to make the draft decision consistent with the reality on the ground Indonesia would like to support the amendment proposed by the delegation of Azerbaijan. Thank you very much. *Assalam alekum*.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Mr Chairperson, the State Party made in the last two years impressive efforts for strengthening the conservation and management of the historical site of Samarkand. Regarding the tourism development that is the object of the draft decision, the State Party informed UNESCO, in conformity with Article 172 of the Operational Guidelines, about the intention to build six hotels and to refurbish five existing ones with no increase in height and the selected locations have been discussed with UNESCO in order to ensure that this development would not compromise the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. A team of experts prepared specific architectural urban design guidelines for urban development site to be followed by the selected architects. We do understand that the final design proposals and heritage impact assessment will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre as soon as they are completed. These facts need to be integrated into the decision and statements, which are not in conformity with the above, need to be amended. Mr Chairperson, you may find it necessary that the Committee benefits from further information from the State Party, which would be given an opportunity to make a statement on the matter at hand. We thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would start by commending the report by ICOMOS, which we thank very much. According to this report, we understand that there are important concerns that need to be addressed by the State Party. But we also understand from the report that there has been significant progress on the part of Uzbekistan in the protection of all World Heritage properties in the country and particularly of Samarkand—Crossroad of Cultures as has been duly acknowledged by the report. The State Party has also reported that the Master Plan is close to completion integrating a detailed plan for the historical area and buffer zone, a tourism management plan and a comprehensive conservation and development strategy while the requirement for the Heritage Impact Assessment has been incorporated into the national legislation. We therefore believe that considering the consistent evolution in the scenario and the importance of the site for sustainable tourism as well as for the cultural identity of Uzbekistan, it would not be the case at this time to consider its inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. So we support the amendment proposed by Azerbaijan and I would also highlight that the presence of the Deputy Prime Minister of Uzbekistan to this meeting reflects the relevance the country attributes to the role of this World Heritage Committee as well as the national commitment with the preservation of this extremely important site, not only to Uzbekistan but to the whole world. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. First of all, we wish to state that we support the amendment to the draft decision by Azerbaijan and others. We fully concur with all the previous speakers. We wish to commend the State Party for their enormous efforts and we appreciate the Deputy Prime Minister is actually the person involved in overseeing all of these efforts. I think we would like to use this opportunity to encourage dialogue between the State Party and the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies. We hope that the Chairperson would give the distinguished Deputy Prime Minister of Uzbekistan the opportunity to speak. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to the last speaker, Kuwait. We have five more minutes and then we will have another five apply so we will follow it after lunch. So now Kuwait and then announcements by Ms Rössler.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

I promise to make it very brief, Mr Chairperson. First of all, let me start by saying that the State Party has made major efforts currently at both national and local levels to improve the effectiveness of property management and to preserve the OUV. The State Party reported that the Master Plan is close to being completed and an integrated detailed plan for the historic area and buffer zone with the requirement of the Heritage Impact Assessment, which has been integrated into legislation, which is a very positive thing from the State Party. We see State Party involved in several not just this site but also another site that we discussed last year and how they have shown their willingness to improve and preserve the heritage of their sites. I have just one comment. We are looking at the report from the Advisory Bodies—it has a very negative nature and we recommend a reactive monitoring mission in coordination with the State Party to clarify a lot of the negative aspects in that report where we see potential, and to have concrete information to have a report that reflects things on the ground. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we end the discussions and three o'clock, 15h00 so please. Now the floor is going to Ms Rössler.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président. il y a une réunion conjointe du groupe arabe et de l'Organisation de la coopération islamique (OCI) à 14 heures, salle B7. Il y a aussi une réunion des experts arabes, au troisième étage, couloir B, à 14 heures. Now for the side events. We have from 1:15-3:00 p.m. the third cycle for periodic reporting exercise for the Arab States region in Room A8. From 1-2 p.m. the German World Heritage Foundation in Room B2 and from 1:10-2:00 p.m. the World Heritage Network with Tsukuba University in B3. The update of the IUCN Outlook in Room B3 at 2:10 p.m. and of course we have the Budget Working Group in Room A7 from 2-3 p.m. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Have a nice time and see you at 3:00 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.

FOURTH DAY – Thursday 4 July 2019

EIGHTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 5.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev
later: H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil)
later: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Honorable delegates, Members of the Committee, dear friends, we have to start the work of the afternoon session so I would like to inform you that first of all before we will start to give the floor to the speakers on the list I would like to make one announcement. I had an apply from the host country operational team. They distributed to all of you the guests and participants of the session in order to facilitate the transportation from the accredited hotels to the airport. Therefore, we kindly ask you to fill out the forms that three hours before your flight departs you have to be there in the hotel lobby. That is why we want to facilitate this to make it comfortable for you. That is why we need in advance to know the time of departure of everyone who is a registered participant of the session. Please don't forget to fill out this form and submit it to the staff that will collect it from you. Thank you very much. Now we proceed with the discussion of Samarkand.

The floor will first go to Tunisia, but I would like to inform you that the draft decision on the Sundarbans is also ready. As we agreed, we will proceed immediately after the translation is ready so after the discussion of the Samarkand file we will return to Sundarbans. Please, you are welcome. Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie voudrait tout d'abord remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS d'avoir fourni un certain nombre d'informations cruciales pour la compréhension de ce site et la sensibilité de son traitement par notre Comité. Il a été question d'une situation complexe, qui tient compte d'activités futures annoncées par le gouvernement, d'une situation problématique de conservation ; je crois que tout cela est important et doit être pris en considération. À telle enseigne que nous appuyons la demande du représentant du Centre du patrimoine mondial quant à la demande d'étude approfondie, et notamment relative à l'impact des constructions futures, et cela nous conforte dans notre idée que le projet d'amendement est donc en cohérence avec pareille demande puisque l'État partie est au cœur de l'action de protection du site, notamment pour les années futures. Et la Tunisie, qui appuie la demande d'amendement, souhaite, Monsieur le Président, que l'on écoute l'État partie, d'autant plus qu'ici nous bénéficions de la présence d'une représentation politique de premier ordre de cet État et qu'on pourra donc avoir une idée précise de la lecture et de la stratégie de l'État partie pour faire face à cette urgence. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ambassador. Tanzania, now.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. The delegation of Tanzania joins the previous speakers to commend ICOMOS for their analysis of this site. The site is threatened with threat emanating from management systems, development pressures and inadequate management tools. We are informed through the state of conservation report that the State Party has undertaken some

necessary interventions including the preparation of the Master Plan, management plan, comprehensive survey and mapping of the property. We also note that some of the information used from the analysis came from a third party. At this juncture, our delegation encourages a dialogue with the State Party so as to clarify issues that seem not to represent relevant facts on their particular site. Chairperson, our delegation for that matter supports the draft decision presented by Azerbaijan because this draft decision aligns itself not only with the analysis by ICOMOS but also clears the doubtful information. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Chairperson. Kyrgyzstan would like to thank the Advisory Bodies for the provided report. Kyrgyzstan also notes that some of the decisions in the draft decision have been developed based on third party information. That is why Kyrgyzstan supports the amendments and suggestion made by Azerbaijan and encourages the reactive monitoring mission to the property. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. First of all, we would like to thank the distinguished delegation of Azerbaijan for having opened the debate about this particular site. We think there are very solid criteria for reviewing the draft decision and along those lines I believe that the debate has really helped us to understand certain things, but I would very much like to hear the criteria from the State Party in question and what commitment it has with the conservation of this site. That is to say we are ready to support an amendment to the draft decision that goes along those lines. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Norwegian delegation welcomes and takes note of the report of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. Our main priority as a Committee Member is to maintain and protect OUV. All the Member States in this room have entrusted us with this task. We commend the State Party with the committed work but the developments happened very fast. We take note of the tendency to move the decisions and also the perceptions regarding the Danger List, which many of us applauded two days ago in this very room. We reiterate our position that we see the Danger List as a possibility list rather than a blacklist. This is why Norway supports the original draft decision. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I think that we now have the possibility to give the floor to State Party to answer the questions raised during the discussion. Uzbekistan, are you ready?

The Observer Delegation of Uzbekistan:

Yes, of course.

Chairperson:

Please. Welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Uzbekistan:

Mr Chairperson, distinguished delegates, I would like to congratulate Azerbaijan on hosting this session on the highest level and express my gratitude for warm hospitality. First, it is true that our Government is strongly involved in the preservation of the World Heritage sites and takes decisions at the highest level in the legislative and regulatory framework. I'll give you just one example. Last week, the Uzbek Parliament adopted a law that punishes as a crime any destruction of the heritage. Second, we consider that dialogue with the World Heritage Centre is crucial to manage the World Heritage properties in our country. We would like to strengthen this relation with more interaction and involvement. Third, I would like to inform you that the Shanghai Cooperation Organization Summit will receive 16 heads of state. It is a very high-level event of great importance for the Asian continent and an opportunity for the World Heritage property to show how it is possible to combine modernity and heritage preservation on the contemporary Silk Road. Due to the high-level importance of the 2022 Summit and considering the Outstanding Universal Value of Samarkand city, we are committed to having a very strong collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to prepare the projects related to this event. As my colleague from Azerbaijan said, I confirm that we will not begin any of these projects before the approval of the World Heritage Centre. But this collaboration should be a priority in our agendas, both the government of Uzbekistan and the World Heritage Centre. A specific task force and a fast track process should be implemented.

We would like to assure the international community of our confidence and the great support of UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies and international experts to prepare the best conditions necessary for preservation and sustainable development of Samarkand to reveal its extraordinary heritage. I would like to use this opportunity to invite all of you to attend the international conference on tangible and intangible cultural heritage conservation that we will host in Samarkand in August 26 under the auspices of UNESCO. I thank the host country once again for the warm hospitality. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, honorable Deputy Prime Minister of Uzbekistan. We take note of your intervention. Now I would like to give the floor to the representative of the nongovernmental organization, Institut d'aménagement et d'urbanisme. Please.

Observer NGO (Institut d'aménagement et d'urbanisme):

Madame la Présidente, excellences, honorables délégués, Mesdames et Messieurs...

Chairperson:

Monsieur le Président.

Observer NGO (Institut d'aménagement et d'urbanisme):

...j'ai pu observer à Samarkand, en Ouzbékistan, que les recommandations du Comité du patrimoine mondial sont aujourd'hui très prises au sérieux par les autorités. Elles donnent lieu en effet à des décisions adoptées au plus haut niveau pour empêcher des réalisations qui détruiraient le patrimoine urbain historique. Les autorités témoignent d'une volonté affirmée de définir un cadre précis, projet par projet, pour assurer la meilleure intégration des aménagements destinés à revitaliser les centres anciens. L'équilibre est chaque fois subtil à trouver et le dialogue entre les autorités, les experts du patrimoine et le Centre du patrimoine mondial est certainement le moyen le plus sûr d'éviter les erreurs et d'assurer l'intégration harmonieuse des interventions. Cela se traduit par l'établissement de recommandations

architecturales et urbaines, un rapport de 230 pages, qui a été remis récemment au Comité du patrimoine mondial, établi pour l'aménagement de chaque site dans la zone historique, la zone tampon et même en dehors de la zone tampon, adoptant ainsi les principes des paysages urbains historiques. Des projets architecturaux sont actuellement en préparation sur la base de ces recommandations ; ils feront prochainement l'objet d'une évaluation de leur impact patrimonial et seront soumis à l'UNESCO.

La construction des hôtels prévus pour la conférence de l'Organisation de coopération de Shanghai de 2022 n'a pas démarré ; les délais sont très courts pour mener à bien ces projets. La procédure de l'UNESCO et de l'ICOMOS devra être conduite avec diligence au regard du contexte exceptionnel de ce patrimoine monumental et urbain et des exigences posées par la tenue de cette conférence des chefs d'État.

Je voudrais souligner que les difficultés rencontrées par Samarkand sont similaires à celles rencontrées dans de nombreux pays en développement et en transition. Vous le savez, la préservation et la mise en valeur des paysages culturels et des centres historiques nécessitent la mise en place d'outils spécifiques qui se distinguent des normes et règles en vigueur. Les documents d'urbanisme traditionnels sont en effet souvent incompatibles avec la préservation des formes urbaines, l'utilisation de matériaux traditionnels ou le maintien de la relation toute particulière des tissus urbains historiques avec les monuments et les paysages culturels. Cela nécessite donc du temps, une mobilisation considérable, encore aujourd'hui largement insuffisante, de l'expertise internationale et locale pour apporter les réformes nécessaires. Les dispositifs actuels d'appui sont encore trop limités. Nous devrions renforcer nos capacités en agissant en partenariat avec les réseaux internationaux d'urbanisme et les grands réseaux d'élus locaux qui sont des acteurs essentiels de la gestion des sites du patrimoine mondial.

J'appelle donc volontiers le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les experts du patrimoine, et tout particulièrement ceux de l'ICOMOS, à réfléchir ensemble à la mobilisation de moyens plus importants pour venir en appui auprès des gouvernements et des pays en développement et en transition. Il s'agit de les soutenir dans leur volonté de réformer l'urbanisme afin de mieux répondre aux défis posés par la préservation des paysages culturels du patrimoine mondial.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Please respect the time limit. I apply to future speakers; we have limited time. Now we don't have any applies for interventions.

I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur to present to us the draft decision, submitted by different countries. Please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As flagged, a group of countries have presented some amendments to this decision led by Azerbaijan. The first five paragraphs are not proposed for amendment.

Paragraph 6 is proposed for complete deletion as is paragraph 7 and then a new paragraph 6 is proposed. That would read, Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, in accordance to the provisions of paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the infrastructure development and detailed project proposals related to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization Summit in 2022 once completed, including the multi-functional project Samarkand City Tourist Zone. The next paragraph is also proposed for complete deletion.

Then we have a new paragraph 7. The new paragraph would read, Reports on the social and other measures taken relating to possible demolition of houses and residential areas. Then

new paragraph 8 a) amended to read, The full scope of the development projects, including hotel development, refurbishment projects and the Samarkand City Tourist Zone project. Then the last paragraph amended to read, Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the progress in the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Should we go paragraph-by-paragraph? China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. At the request of the State Party concerned, we would like to propose a small addition to the text, one more clause. Can I read it out?

Chairperson:

Go on.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you. I'll read it slowly.

Chairperson:

To which paragraph, please?

The Delegation of China:

It could be a separate paragraph all together, wherever it suits. I'll read the text first and then perhaps the Rapporteur will be kind enough to suggest where to put it. Thank you. Requests the World Heritage Centre to consider in priority the assessment of the design proposals and HIAs that will be submitted as to allow the State Party to meet the deadlines for the International State Summit they are hosting in 2022. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Indonesia is also concerned about the time limit for the State Party to face with the programme that they already tried to do in 2022 so we will support the amendment proposed by China. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

So what is the opinion, should we go paragraph-by-paragraph or we are coming to the consensus with approval of the new version of the decision as a whole? I don't see objections. So can I proceed? Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. Just minor amendments to the new paragraph, if I may. Sorry, just for the language. New paragraph 10, Requests the World Heritage Centre to consider as a priority the assessment of the design proposals and HIAs that will be submitted, delete as--to allow the

State Party to meet the deadlines for the International State Summit—yes, and we would probably suggest the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, if you were comfortable with that.

Chairperson:

That seems reasonable.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So, I don't see any objections for approving the document in whole. Thank you very much. Approved.

As you are all aware the special group was preparing the new draft decision on the Sundarbans file, 7B.3. The working group did a very serious job and prepared a very serious document, which as far as I understand reflects a certain consensus between all the parties participating in the discussion. From this point of view, I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur to give us the information about the text and we will see how we can proceed. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The drafting group has proposed no amendments to the first three paragraphs.

Paragraph 4 has got an addition at the end of the paragraph, which reads, and further requests the State Party to provide information on dredging activities. And there is a new paragraph 5 or replaced paragraph 5 which reads, Welcomes the State Party's actions, such as the implementation of the integrated freshwater inflow management plan, the implementation of Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART), the development of the Tiger Action Plan (2018-2027) and National Tiger Recovery Programme (NTRP), expansion of the wildlife sanctuaries and the adoption of the Bangladesh Delta Plan 2100 to protect and expand the Sundarbans. And then as you can see 5 has been replaced.

Paragraph 6, Notes with great concern the likely environmental impacts of large-scale industrial projects on the property's OUV, and urges the State Party to take all necessary mitigation measures to address the concerns previously expressed by the Committee and the 2016 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission. Paragraph 7, Expresses concern that 154 industrial projects upstream of the property are currently active, and reiterates the Committee's request in Paragraph 4 of Decision 41 COM 7B.25 and welcomes the commitment of the State Party to continue the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) requested by the same decision.

Paragraph 8, Requests that the State Party implement the relevant recommendations of the SEA to all current and future projects and recalls the obligation of the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, detailed information including environmental impact assessments for development projects, which have the potential to influence the OUV of the property before they commence in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines before work commences or any irretrievable decision is made. Paragraph 9, this paragraph has moved from below but and that is also regrets would now be regrets because of that move. Former 8 is proposed for deletion entirely.

Next paragraph, Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to assess the state of conservation, in particular

the level of threats to the hydrological and ecological dynamics which underpin the OUV of the property and recommends that this mission takes place by the end of 2019. And the final paragraph reads, Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020 so that the Committee can decide on whether or not to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. And I would just note at this stage that that last addition perhaps reflects the conversation of the drafting group but is certainly not the standard language of the Committee. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So as far as I understand, the draft decision was submitted to all the participants of the discussion and the Committee Members and they agreed to proceed with this draft. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We don't have any objection since we were members of the drafting group, so we agree with the draft decision as it is now. I just would like to highlight general observations. Firstly, we would like to highlight the repeated postponement of the decision of listing properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger can undermine the authority of the World Heritage Committee. Secondly, we would like to highlight that in our view the balance between heritage conservation and sustainable or less sustainable development should not be found by the World Heritage Committee but by the States Parties concerned. There are a number of tools available for each of us to reach this balance, among them the most important are apparently the different assessments which should be prepared and applied for the development projects by the States Parties prior to the commencement of any construction activity in order to allow the implementation of the necessary mitigation measures identified in the assessment documentation. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for these comments. They are noted. I would like to thank all the participants of the group, which worked together to create this document, and for the consensus, which was found. I understand that it was not an easy job because the document is very serious. And I am greatly appreciative on behalf of all the Committee Members for these activities. Thank you very much. And let me approve the document. Thank you very much. Approved. May I give the floor to the State Party of Bangladesh.

The Observer Delegation of Bangladesh:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I take this opportunity to thank all the Members of the Committee for having taken keen interest in the conservation of the heritage site while remaining conscious of the developing needs of Bangladesh. We hope to benefit from such future engagements. We are reassured by the overwhelming endorsement by the Members of the Committee for all plans outside the buffer zone of Sundarbans Forest far away from the site helping to meet the energy needs of almost 50M people of Bangladesh. We gratefully acknowledge the appreciation of the measures taken and value the concerns of the Committee for conservation of heritage sites and shall leave no stone unturned to achieve the goal. Let me end by quoting a line from our Nobel Laureate poet Tagore who wrote our national anthem. Quote: [*Bengali spoken*]. To translate: "Mother, oh mother, Bangladesh. Flood of tears swell at the slightest injury to you". In short, that is the abiding principle of our existence. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, honorable Minister. The NGO. Please introduce yourself.

Observer NGO (World Heritage Watch):

I think there is a technical problem here with my computer. So I'm hoping to open the file to make a statement immediately. I'm sorry for this problem. World Heritage Watch.

Chairperson:

But we are finishing with the item. We will not give the floor to the other items.

Observer NGO (World Heritage Watch):

Yes, yes, I understand that.

Chairperson:

You can make the statement on your own without looking at the computer. You know what is written there.

Observer NGO (World Heritage Watch):

Okay, I can make a start. For us the idea that a coal-fired power plant could be a contribution to the sustainable development of any country is a contradiction to established scientific knowledge. Coal-fired power plants emit CO₂ gases which are a key factor contributing to climate change and global warming which in turn contribute significantly to sea level rise and countries like Bangladesh will be the first and foremost to suffer from that. Sea level rise in Bangladesh will inundate large parts of the country and will uproot millions of people and wreak havoc for the economic, social and environmental situation of the country. So by no means coal-fired power plants could be considered to be improving the situation of the country. Furthermore, countries, which build or finance coal-fired power plants upstream from the Sundarbans, are in direct violation of Article 6.3 of the Convention, which prohibits inflicting damage on the World Heritage sites of other countries. And furthermore, countries that serve on the World Heritage Committee and finance such projects are in a deep conflict of interest and we call upon the Committee to establish protocol by which countries that have such a conflict of interest should be excluded from the decision-making in such cases. We cannot accept that such countries that have ratified the Paris Agreement and have committed to limit the rise of global warming will in international law and other conventions approve projects, which are in direct contradiction to the Paris Agreement.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will take note of that. Now we are moving to the next question, the next file.

I now invite Ms Sidorenko from the Europe and North America Unit of the World Heritage Centre, and ICOMOS to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties located in this region and opened for discussion. You have the floor, Ms Sidorenko, please.

Le Secrétariat :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien Ancienne cité de Nessebar (Bulgarie) se trouve dans le document 7B à la page 128 en anglais et à la page 176 en français. Le rapport présente les facteurs menaçant le bien, qui se résument de manière suivante : absence de plan de gestion et de conservation ; pression du développement urbain ; absence du plan de développement détaillé du bien et de sa zone tampon et de la révision du plan directeur du développement général ; absence de la gouvernance claire et de la gestion du bien basées sur sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle ; constructions illégales.

Le rapport note le constat de la mission de suivi réactif conjointe Centre du patrimoine mondial/ICOMOS, d'octobre 2018, que l'état de conservation du bien est impacté par des facteurs négatifs représentant à la fois un péril prouvé et potentiel pour la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Les attributs de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle étaient détériorés et dans certains cas irrémédiablement dégradés. Les progrès accomplis par l'État partie sont reconnus, mais ne suffisent pas à contrer les menaces qui pèsent sur l'intégrité, l'authenticité et la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, comme le confirment les observations de la mission de 2018. C'est pourquoi, conformément au paragraphe 179 des Orientations, le bien est proposé pour l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Le rapport de mission a été envoyé à l'État partie le 14 mars 2019, et il a été demandé à l'État partie de transmettre au Centre du patrimoine mondial les éventuelles erreurs factuelles relevées. Le 14 mai 2019, le Centre a reçu les commentaires émanant de l'État partie ainsi que des erreurs factuelles relevées. Le 7 juin 2019, une réunion entre le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial et le Ministre de la culture de la Bulgarie s'est tenue à l'UNESCO. Le 14 juin 2019, le rapport de mission, avec des corrections mineures, a été transmis à l'État partie. Il a été demandé à l'État partie de soumettre des informations détaillées quant aux mesures mises en œuvre ou programmées en réponse aux décisions précédentes du Comité et aux recommandations de la mission. En réponse à cette demande, le 26 juin dernier, l'État partie a soumis au Centre du patrimoine mondial et à l'ICOMOS les informations demandées.

Avec votre permission, Monsieur le Président, l'ICOMOS présentera les résultats de l'évaluation technique des informations reçues de la part de l'État partie. Le projet de décision vous est soumis à la page 178 en anglais et à la page 185 en français. Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. ICOMOS and ICCROM acknowledge that over recent years, there have been welcome improvements to the management and conservation of the property. However, key steps, which have been identified in mission reports from 2012, 2015, 2017 and most recently 2018, are yet to be addressed. They include particularly the updated conservation management plan, the elaboration of a detailed development plan for the property and its buffer zone, revision of the general development Master Plan and convening an inter-ministerial working group to ensure clear governance and management of the property based on its Outstanding Universal Value.

The October 2018 joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, which undertook a thorough evaluation of the property, found that the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value had deteriorated and in some instances irredeemably spoiled, in particular the tangible traces of numerous civilizations are hardly discernable in the urban environment. Most of the typical townhouses, which testify to the supreme mastery of the architecture of the Balkans as well as the east Mediterranean region had been altered or transformed. The medieval churches no longer dominant the urban ensemble and the spirituality of the town that was a remarkable spiritual heart of Christian culture is lost. Overall, the urban fabric of high quality has lost its coherence and its historic appeal owing to the great number of minor alterations combined with the major transformation of the coast.

Mr Chairperson and Members of the Committee, these conclusions strike at the heart of the reasons for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List. The state of conservation of the property is thereby impacted by negative factors, which represent both ascertained and potential threat. Uneven involvement and commitment from national and local

administrations and stakeholders have prevented a coherent and effective response to the negative factors affecting the property. Nessebar requires a shared clear vision centered on the preservation and promotion of its Outstanding Universal Value. ICOMOS and ICCROM consider that the circumstances of this property mean that in Danger listing would offer a much needed opportunity to deploy a structured framework of agreed corrective measures and thereby to support the State Party in addressing significant and longstanding threats to the property's Outstanding Universal Value. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we open the floor for interventions. Australia, then Brazil.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Australia has had some discussion with the State Party of Bulgaria during this meeting in relation to the issue of large ships and cruise terminals that were expressed as a major concern in the ICOMOS report that we have with the draft recommendation. Our discussion with the State Party suggests that this may not be a current threat to the property and we'd like to ask the State Party to provide some clarification and update us on the situation in relation to large ships docking at the site. Thank you.

Chairperson:

It's clear. Now, Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like first of all to thank the Advisory Bodies for their very important report and I would comment that we have recently had the pleasure of witnessing some successful cases of sites in different regions removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Those were very good examples of the efforts made by the States Parties to accomplish the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies in order to reaffirm the OUV of their properties. However, we believe that the countries need sufficient time to comply with the requirements of the Advisory Bodies after the visit of the technical mission to the site. In the case of the site we are now analyzing, as far as we are informed a mission visited the site in October 2018 and presented its report in March 2019 to which the State Party could only respond in May this year, two months before the 43th meeting of the World Heritage Committee.

In this circumstance, we believe the State Party should have more time to be able to comply with all the requirements made by the technical missions which is the reason why we are proposing an amendment to the draft decision with the support of Kuwait, Cuba and Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are informed that the conservation and management plan is underway, that a general and detailed development plan has been revised with the supervision of the Ministry of Environment and Water. With regard to the movement of residents, visitors, goods and vessels involved in the ancient city of Nessebar among other points that might be of interest to this Committee, I am sure that the Bulgarian delegation, present at this meeting, would be pleased to provide additional clarifications. I thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like to echo my dear colleague from Brazil, the same thing—we submitted a draft amendment for several reasons. Let me go straight to them. First look at the history—it's gone through several political changes since 1990. So after changing

from public state owned to private and a lot of the comments from the Advisory Bodies, some of the about 44 units have been there, there have been some additions to them and out of those with the recent government and the recent commitment for the last couple of years when we saw major change trying to preserve the city—50% of those units have been returned to their original status and the rest of them they are still under court. We have to keep in mind once we try to retain certain buildings or places privately owned is not as easy as government owned where you can change them by legislation. There are people living there and you have to take the correct measures and keep the integrity of the people. But on the ground we see there is major change over the last two years. We see movement so why obstruct that movement and put it on the in Danger List? Let's help that movement. The State Party admitted that several years ago there were issues and they are trying to correct it at the political end from their legislation and also on the ground.

I would also like to take the floor later on after we hear from the State Party regarding the Advisory report about the cruise ships because the definition of cruise ship is your talking about ships that can hold between 1000-5000, that's what we see in Venice and major cities but looking at their report and the pictures that seriously I highly doubt can hold cruise ships as described in the Advisory Bodies and again, let me say that the definition of cruise ships is that it can take up to 5000 passengers per trip. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like to thank the Advisory Bodies on their report on the state of conservation of the Ancient City of Nessebar in Bulgaria. Indonesia understands the concerns of the adverse impacts that might be caused by some of the development taking place in the property. Indonesia takes note that the State Party has already put some effort to protect the integrity, authenticity and the OUV of the property as is also acknowledged in the report of the Advisory Bodies. Indonesia recognizes the commitment of the State Party to the protection of the property's OUV despite the need for continuous development, which is imperative for almost all States Parties. The State Party's commitment is also evident in its decision to have a joint mission conducted under two UNESCO Conventions, the World Heritage Convention and the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.

Mr Chairperson, to accomplish all the key recommendations of the Advisory Bodies is not easy in a very short span of time. We have been informed that the State Party has put its concern on some of the information and conclusion in the Advisory Bodies' report, which are not in accordance with the real conditions. Therefore, Indonesia would like to request, Mr Chairperson, to allow the Advisory Bodies and the State Party to give more clarification on this disagreement. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will do it later. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Hungary would like to pick up only one point from the evaluation. As far as we know the sea here is very shallow. And because of the archaeological remains it may not be changed and deepened. It means that no big ships can come near the property. Hungary thinks that there is no danger in this aspect but of course proposals to give the floor to the State Party to get a clearer picture and statement in this aspect. Otherwise, Hungary supports the proposal of Australia and the other States Parties for amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS pour l'ensemble des éléments d'information qui nous ont été présentés. Je crois que cela est fort utile pour notre étude de ce cas. Ce qui est certain c'est que la situation mérite l'attention de ce Comité quant à l'état de protection et de conservation de ce site. Beaucoup de choses ont été dites, et la Tunisie rejoint la demande qui a été présentée par l'Australie pour qu'on écoute l'État partie apporter ses clarifications. D'autant plus qu'il y a, semble-t-il, quelques incertitudes sur la véracité de quelques éléments qui ont émaillé le rapport ; je ne reviendrai pas sur la question du port, mais je crois que cela mérite un éclaircissement. En tout état de cause, nous rejoignons la demande d'amendement, notamment en ce qu'elle invite l'État partie à demander une mission élargie mixte de consultation du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'ICOMOS afin d'évaluer l'état de conservation actuel au vu des éléments dont nous disposons et des éclaircissements qui nous seront donnés par l'État partie. Nous souhaiterions donc les écouter sur ce point. Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, my delegation would like to thank the Advisory Bodies for their report. We share some of the concerns raised in this report, indeed. But at the same time we need to acknowledge that the 2018 reactive monitoring mission mentioned in the report that the State Party has developed legal instruments for the conservation of the heritage in general with special concern for the World Heritage properties and the new rule contains guidelines and regulations that have immediate repercussions on inappropriate practices. Restoration of churches in ongoing and the results are visible.

According to the State Party report, the State assures that high priority measures have been taken to preserve the OUV of the Ancient City of Nessebar. On the basis of these measures taken by the State Party work is being carried out on finalizing and adopting the following documents: Conservation Master Plan, General Development Master Plan, within one month it will be submitted to the municipality of Nessebar for coordination with the Ministry of Culture, and after the completion of the environmental impact assessment also with the Ministry of Environment and Water.

At the same time I would like to join the previous speakers in posing the questions to the State Party to respond to those issues that are reflected in the report and also given the fact that the additional information provided by the State Party is not reflected in this given the short time, we would be very happy to hear from the State Party on those issues.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I think now it's time to give the floor to the State Party. As far as I know the Bulgarian Minister is here. Are you ready?

The Observer Delegation of Bulgaria:

Yes, thank you.

Chairperson:

Welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Bulgaria:

Yes, Mr Chairperson, I will speak on behalf of the Bulgarian delegation. First of all, Mr Chairperson, let me congratulate Azerbaijan on the successful hosting of this session of the World Heritage Committee and let me wish success on behalf of the Bulgarian delegation to all participants. We would also like in the beginning to stress our great appreciation for this opportunity and this very constructive approach that was adopted by the Committee Members allowing us to express the view of the Bulgarian State Party on this important for us and for the World Heritage item. Mr Chairperson, in the period 2017-2018, in only two years the Ancient City of Nessebar received two missions: one joint Advisory mission of the Convention of Underwater Archeology and ICOMOS and the joint reactive monitoring mission of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. The reports from these two missions were received by Bulgaria as it was mentioned in the presentation earlier, in the beginning of 2018 and in March 2019.

Since the Bulgarian State Party has implemented some crucial measures including legislative changes to guarantee the overall preservation of the site. In the current month of June, the Bulgarian Parliament is expected to approve amendments to the Cultural Heritage Act that will guarantee the connection and interaction between the conservation and management plan that is in the process of being finalized and the other planning documents, namely the general development urban planning and the detailed development planning.

Regarding the current state of conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site during that period, we have to stress here that a full monitoring report by the Ministry of Culture was conducted on each individual monument within the property. On the basis of this monitoring report the conservation and management plan of the site is being finalized. At the same time the municipality of Nessebar is in the process of updating the general urban plan and the detailed urban plan of the property in order to be submitted for examination and approval within the next months. The municipality of Nessebar continues to work on the development of projects for conservation and restoration on several individual monuments, public spaces and infrastructure within the property. In the end of 2017, as an example of the good cooperation between the Bulgarian State Party and ICOMOS we would like to note here that thanks to these joint efforts and exercise an educational programme on heritage impact assessment was conducted in December on the fishing ports of the city. The project and the assessment were submitted to ICOMOS and were positively examined by the Advisory Body.

Mr Chairperson, finally, allow me to inform the distinguished Members of the Committee and the audience about some facts regarding the Port of Nessebar. The city of Nessebar has only one passenger terminal and no commercial ports at all. Based on the information on the maritime executive agency of the Republic of Bulgaria, there are only three berths that are allowed in the Port of Nessebar. The depth of the water varies from 4.1-7m and the length of the quays is between 75-160m. More than one ship at a time has not moored at the port even at the strongest tourist year for Nessebar, which was 2013 with a daily capacity of passengers of about 500 people which is many times less than in other similar locations and is an indication of the size of the ships, namely relatively small passenger cruise ships that can enter the port. For the entire 2016 only four ships had moored in the port with a total of 761 passengers. In 2017 only one ship with 102 passengers and in the last year, 2018 and 2019 there were none. No cruise ships moored in the Nessebar port.

Chairperson:

Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Bulgaria:

We would like to remind also that Nessebar has a traditional port function of the peninsula from antiquity to the present day.

Chairperson:

Sorry, Minister, may I ask you...

The Observer Delegation of Bulgaria:

I will just conclude and I would like to say finally that this port has existed from the 60s of the last century and since then from the 60s it has not been neither expanded neither deepened. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Minister.

Chairperson:

We will take note of your information. I think Committee Members has gotten sufficient information from your intervention. Now as far as—I don't see any comments. ICOMOS. Please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. If I may, I think it would be helpful to the Committee if I were to respond to some of the interventions and I particularly thank the honorable Minister from Bulgaria for raising a number of issues. Can I report that it is absolutely correct that there were missions undertaken in 2017 and 2018? The 2017 mission had a particular focus on capacity building and training and has been mentioned on underwater archeology. It was the 2018 mission that undertook the thorough analysis of the urban fabric and there are some inconsistencies between the two reports. It is the 2018 one that paints a more concerning picture. It is also the 2018 report that did the detailed work for the evaluation and I think it is already clear in the information before the Committee with acknowledgement for the need for removal of 45 illegal construction works and that being only half of the work is required, that there is a problem with the incremental degradation of the urban fabric of the city.

It was the 2018 report that has determined that the property's Outstanding Universal Value is subject to ascertained and potential threats and I would emphasize that while that report does raise concerns about the foreshore, port area and cruise ships were not reason that the mission report concluded that there were these fundamental threats.

With respect, Chairperson and Committee Members, to the tasks to be completed, I do note the intervention from the honorable delegate from Brazil, but I point out that the 2018 report was evaluating the condition of the property and making further recommendations. The tasks that have not been fulfilled date from the missions in 2012 and 2015. There has been an opportunity. There is also an acknowledgement of the considerable work that the State Party has done but there are some significant tasks to be completed, some of which have been mentioned but in the short term certainly also including a moratorium on new changes to the property even if they are done in accordance with old permits so that the work of removing inappropriate intrusions doesn't have to be expanded, then to allocate the financial and human resources for implementation of the conservation management plan and the general development plan, the monitoring and control of the open spaces of the Ancient City, development of guidelines for new design, preparation of a technical manual for conservation and assistance for homeowners among other things.

The honorable member from Tunisia suggested that it might be helpful to have a larger mission report, however, it is the view of the Advisory Bodies at this point that this is not necessary. There has just been a very thorough report done in 2018, there has indeed been dialogue subsequent to that report with the representatives of the State Party and what is required at the moment is not further missions—although ICCROM and ICOMOS stand ready to support through dialogue and capacity building as necessary—what is required now is the implementation of a longstanding list of actions that are needed to conserve the Outstanding Universal Value of this extraordinary property. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for this explanation. Now, as far as I understand, we have two different drafts but the sense of these two drafts is consistent. I better give the floor to the Rapporteur to explain. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Chairperson, just to clarify, yes there are two different amendments proposed. The key difference between the Australian and other countries and Brazil and other countries, the different lots of amendments is that Australia has left in or not asked for deletion paragraphs 5 and 7 until we heard from the State Party in relation to the cruise ships and the port issues. Australia is quite happy to go with the amendments for those paragraphs proposed by Brazil and the other countries and there are very little differences between the two amendments otherwise.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. That was what I wanted to tell that is why I give the floor to the Rapporteur to finalize the texts provided.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. With those amendments, I think that we can just agree as we go along with these very minor changes from both parties. The third paragraph the proposal is to remove the word, some in terms of progress. The fourth paragraph would read, Notes with great concern that the 2018 Reactive Monitoring mission found that the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property are deteriorated. And then there is a choice here between just finishing the sentence there or saying, and in some instances spoiled—a very minor change.

Paragraph 5, I think we are now agreed or Australia is comfortable with the removal of, as Brazil has proposed to finish the sentence after, and to remove the substantial threats of the OUV of the property, full stop or semicolon. Paragraph 6, Urges the State Party to devise a strategy for the future of Nessebar, based on sustainable, etc. Again a very minor amendment to remove the word, different.

Paragraph 7 is now agreed to be, I believe both amendments are consistent to completely delete that paragraph. Is that the right paragraph? Sorry, can I just confirm that that former paragraph 6 is the one that Australia is now comfortable to delete? Beautiful. Thank you. So we'll just delete that one. And the next one so there we are.

Paragraph now 8, Strongly requests the State Party to—a minor suggestion there from Australia. Part 8 a) remains the same, 8 b) would read, Finalize, adopt and implement the Conservation Management Plan which incorporates an updated Sustainable Tourism Management Plan, Detailed Development Plan and General Development Master Plan, including guidelines for urban design, based on the OUV of the property, as well as continue enforcing the existing protection regimes. Part c) would read, Further develop the overall

sustainable mobility programme to ensure the smooth circulation of residents, visitors and goods within the property, and between the mainland and the property. A new d) which would read, Continue to allocate financial and human resources required for effective implementation of the updated Conservation Management Plan and updated General Development Master Plan. And e) again another minor change, Continue to implement from Australia and other countries and then other countries proposing to remove, fully all of the recommendations.

Paragraph 9, Urges the State Party—here we have a choice—oh no, it's okay, urges the State Party to continue to undertake research in anticipation of a future minor boundary modification request in accordance with Paragraphs 163 and 164 of the Operational Guidelines to include all underwater archaeological remains of the ancient town. That is a proposed addition.

Paragraph 10, we have a choice here also so Australia and other countries are proposing, also requests the State Party to invite an ICOMOS Advisory mission to the property to provide advice in relation to: a) The further development of the sustainable tourism plan for the property and b) The conservation of the property as a living urban landscape. I would just suggest here that again we are not able to request the State Party to invite a mission but perhaps we could strongly recommend and that would also be suggested for the other countries' proposal in relation to the mission which is, the Brazil one which would be also strongly recommends instead of requesting the State Party to invite an enlarged joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Advisory mission to the property to assess its state of conservation and ascertain the progress made by the State Party. Just in terms of language here if we are going to use the word enlarged it needs to be in reference to something else. We could just say large or it needs to be larger than something and I'm not really sure whether just large would suit. I'm looking at Brazil here as to whether we can invite a large Advisory mission or it needs to be larger than something else. We might just leave that for the moment. Perhaps the countries could consider what they mean by that. And then paragraph 9. That's very easy, that's all gone.

And then the final paragraph again we have some alternatives. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2021, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies the conservation management plan, detailed development plan and general development Master Plan for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 45th session in 2021 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. The alternative from Brazil and other countries would be, in 2021 with a view to determining whether any threat to the property constitutes an ascertained and potential danger to its OUV and would warrant its potential inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. So again, quite similar. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to propose to start with the first paragraph and go one-by-one to finalize the approval of the document. So paragraph 1, no changes, paragraph 2, no changes, paragraph 3, minor changes. I think there are no objections on that. Paragraph 4. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

The Brazilian delegation, we agree to the proposal suggested by Australia, to strike out the last part of the paragraph. So that would be fine for us.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we approve the version proposed by Australia, Hungary and Norway. Thank you. Paragraph 5. No objections? I don't see any. Paragraph 6. One word is taken out. I think there are no objections. Paragraph 7, we have a common understanding of this deletion.

Thank you. Old paragraph 7 also deleted. Paragraph 8. Can we see it in whole? So a), b), c) we approve like proposed. Thank you. Part d) there is not contradiction between the countries and the text can be accepted like that. Thank you. Paragraph 9, please. We can approve it? No? Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. In our amendments that we submitted I think there's a word missing from the text up there, which was to include all underwater archeological remains of the Ancient Town.

Chairperson:

In which paragraph?

The Delegation of Australia:

In paragraph 9, the final part of the paragraph. Underwater archeological remains of the Ancient Town.

Chairperson:

Fine. No objections? I don't see any. Paragraph 10.

Chairperson:

I'm waiting for the consensus in this position. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Just to clarify our amendments. We wanted to give very clear directions about what an Advisory mission would be advising on. We are very happy to use the text from Brazil below as long as the points a and b about the specificity of the Advisory mission are retained in there. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Brazil.

The Delegation of Brazil:

We thank the Australian delegation and would be glad to go along with their suggestion to include those two guidelines for the mission.

Chairperson:

Thank you. No objections? So please, Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

So I'm just going to confirm--paragraph 10 would read, Strongly recommend the State Party to invite an ICOMOS Advisory mission to the property to provide advice in relation to: a) The further development of the sustainable tourism plan for the property; b) The conservation of the property as a living urban landscape. And then remove the enlarged bit.

Chairperson:

Delete the alternative to see clearly. Thank you. So paragraph 10, no objections? Thank you. Paragraph 9, old 9. We delete 11. Minor changes but there is also an option. Please, we are waiting for your comments. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

We included those quite specific documents in the text just to give us something for the future World Heritage Committee to measure against progress rather than just the simple statement of progress conservation objectives, whatever. But we wanted to include those specific documents.

Chairperson:

Other options? Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

We also raise no position to the Australian amendment on this point.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So please delete—thank you. And paragraph 11 approved in this version. Next. That is the final version? Thank you. So we approve the draft decision in full. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

As far as I know the State Party wanted to say something. The Bulgarian Minister, you are welcome for two minutes.

The Observer Delegation of Bulgaria:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Honourable Mr Chairperson, honourable Members of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies, ladies and gentlemen, at first I would like to thank all the honourable Members of the Committee for the opportunity to report within the current 43th session of the World Heritage Committee. Conservation and promotion of cultural heritage is one of the main principle priorities of the Bulgarian government. Our country is one of the richest countries in the world in terms of cultural heritage with 40,000 cultural sites. We are proud to announce that seven of them are part of the World Heritage List of UNESCO. It's great recognition for us and great motivation to pursue efforts in protecting them. Proof of this is that every year the government increases the national financing for conservation of world heritage.

Our country participates actively as well in the work of various international organizations, including UNESCO and the Council of Europe. Cultural heritage was one of the main priorities of the Bulgarian Presidency of the Council in the first part of 2018. In the prepared and accepted conclusions, Bulgaria proposed to bring the cultural heritage to the forefront of the public policies of the European Union. In this document, a number of measures are recommended to be taken by the Member States, the European Commission and in close cooperation with UNESCO and the other international organizations. Last but not least, the conclusions were in the heart of the European Commission's development of a dedicated cultural heritage action plan which is already in effect and is about to be implemented.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Ancient City of Nessebar and the protection of its Outstanding Universal Value has an important role in the agenda of our government working closely with the municipality and all the stakeholders for the realization and finalization of the conservation management plan, the general special plan and the detailed special plan of the property. Nessebar is an archeological reserve but also a living city which makes its management more complex and request decisions that will help protect its values. These decisions should guarantee the citizens' rights and the sustainable development of Nessebar.

I cannot help but be thankful for the extremely important partnership role of the municipality of Nessebar and to all stakeholders especially now as we join efforts to engage citizens in the process of preservation. At last please allow me to extend my utmost gratitude to the Member States of the Committee, the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and other organizations for the crucial support to our efforts and contribute to a significant expansion of our capacity of the preservation of the Ancient City of Nessebar. I hope that our joint and effective work will continue in the future and I assure you that we will make every effort to comply with your recommendations and to preserve the Ancient City of Nessebar, one of the most remarkable achievements of human civilization. Thank you very much.

H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil) takes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I will now invite Ms Anatole-Gabriel to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Please, you have the floor.

Le Secrétariat :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. La liste des rapports de l'état de conservation qui est proposée au Comité pour adoption sans discussion est la suivante : les Centres historiques de Berat et Gjirokastra (Albanie) ; le Centre historique de la ville de Salzbourg (Autriche) ; Paris, rives de la Seine (France) ; Vallée du Haut-Rhin moyen (Allemagne) ; Budapest, avec les rives du Danube, le quartier château de Buda et l'avenue Andrassy (Hongrie) ; Zones archéologiques de Pompéi, Herculaneum et Torre Annunziata (Italie) ; Venise et sa lagune (Italie) ; Contrée naturelle et culturo-historique de Kotor (Monténégro) ; Ensemble culturel et historique des îles Solovetsky (Fédération de Russie) ; Kizhi Pogost (Fédération de Russie) ; Paysage culturel de la forteresse de Diyarbakir et des jardins de l'Hevsel (Turquie) ; Éphèse (Turquie) ; Kiev : cathédrale Sainte-Sophie et ensemble des bâtiments monastiques et lauriers de Kievo-Petchersk (Ukraine) ; Paysage minier des Cornouailles et de l'ouest du Devon (Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord) ; Palais de Westminster et l'abbaye de Westminster incluant l'église Sainte-Marguerite (Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord) ; Stonehenge, Avebury et sites associés (Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord). Merci, Madame la Présidente.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I don't think it's open. If there are no objections from the Committee on this state of conservation report I declare the decision read adopted. Thank you. I would now like to give the floor to Observers who have asked to speak. So the Vatican has the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation du Saint-Siège (Observateur):

Merci beaucoup de me donner la parole. Le pape François en particulier et le Saint-Siège en général, souhaite que la restauration et la reconstruction de la cathédrale, bien protégé par l'UNESCO, implique la reconstitution d'origine d'une œuvre, retrouvant le fait générateur qui en a créé la signification. C'est une priorité de prendre en compte les besoins du culte et de pratiques qui y sont liées et qui doivent continuer à s'y exercer. Il est crucial de sauvegarder cette signification. À la cathédrale sont annexes et interdépendants, d'une part, la vie religieuse et les formes dans laquelle elle s'exprime et, d'autre part, le culte et les structures qui la regardent. Les éléments qui seront reconstruits doivent répondre à la finalité pour laquelle le bâtiment fut érigé. En effet, la forme conserve et transmet sa beauté seulement si elle adhère à la finalité de manière à conserver la visibilité de son identité.

L'homme ne se limite pas à vivre sur la Terre, il l'habite poétiquement, non pas tant parce qu'il est un rêveur, mais parce qu'il est à travers la poésie, c'est-à-dire la construction créative. Il

transforme un espace en un lieu. Pour la communauté des chrétiens qui veulent venir à la cathédrale, il est nécessaire de donner non seulement un bien culturel, mais aussi un lieu où il est possible de faire une expérience de la signification et de la même foi qui a créé l'édifice. Cesare Brandi, théoricien de la restauration, dit qu'un restaurateur doit mettre en œuvre toutes les procédures qui assurent et conservent l'œuvre sans altérations et sans ajouts. Le Saint-Siège souhaite que la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel, y compris sa fondamentale dimension religieuse, est une condition incontournable de sa valorisation. Merci de votre accueil.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have the information that the delegation of the United Kingdom and Great Britain and Northern Ireland indicated that it wants to take the floor. If present, please take the floor.

The Observer Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. As this is the first time the United Kingdom has taken the floor, I want to express our profound thanks to the Minister and authorities of Azerbaijan for their generous hospitality in hosting this meeting and the accompanying programme of cultural events. The Cornish Mining World Heritage Site Steering Group and the State Party have undertaken comprehensive work to address all the previous Committee decisions relating to this site and the recommendations of the Advisory missions. We believe that protection of the OUV of the site has been strengthened as a result of these actions including the use of planning performance agreements to extend decision-making time scales to allow the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies more time to comment, the adoption of supplementary planning documents and the creation of a World Heritage site advice officer post within the site management team. Several proposals that had potential to harm OUV have been refused in recent years as reported to the World Heritage Centre. We believe these demonstrate the effectiveness of these new procedures.

The State Party wishes to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their ongoing engagement for development where the Committee has expressed past concern and requested involvement. This has resulted in projects which protect the OUV of the site while strengthening the role of heritage in the life of the community. The State Party is concerned that the tone and content of the report is not reflective of this constructive dialogue between the State Party, the local planning authority, UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies. I want to place on record the view of the United Kingdom Government that this is indeed a well-managed and comprehensively protected site.

Finally, there are several factual inaccuracies and omissions in the report which could have been addressed had the report been shared with the State Party prior to its publication. The views expressed in the report came as a surprise to us when we first saw them just three weeks ago. The publication of these views without prior reference to us is a matter of concern and regret to my Government. Therefore, we wish to put on record our disagreement with the decision as now adopted and request that this statement informs future Committee decisions so that they more accurately reflect the positive work, which has been accomplished as a result of regular dialogue and exchange. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor now to Europa Nostra who has requested to speak. Please, you have the floor.

Observer NGO (Europa Nostra):

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. On behalf of our large movement of heritage NGOs across Europe including Italy, Europa Nostra deeply regrets that the World Heritage Committee has decided to adopt its decision with regard to Venice and its Lagoon without even opening the discussion. As you all know, threats to Venice and its Lagoon are numerous. They are not decreasing but increasing with an ever-growing pressure of tourism and the effects of climate change. However, given the limited speaking time, Europa Nostra wishes to concentrate on the serious threats caused by cruisers.

Only one month ago, we witnessed an alarming accident caused by the persistent traffic of the giant cruisers in the San Marco Basin and the Guidecca Canal! Miraculously, only five people were wounded and nobody died. But this accident has once again brought to the fore the considerable threat, and even a security risk, which cruise ships pose to Venice, its inhabitants and visitors. Apart from the threat to the cultural heritage of Venice, the cruise ships bring huge environmental threats to the fragile ecosystem and the morphology of the Lagoon. This includes the cruisers' considerable contribution to air and water pollution, which causes serious health risks to people while also having a negative impact on historical monuments. Last but not least, nobody can deny that they cause an unacceptable visual pollution. For all these reasons, we deplore that the Committee's decision does not refer to this accident and its implications.

We also deplore that this Committee has decided to change its decision adopted in 2016 to prohibit the largest ships and tankers to enter the Lagoon. Regrettably, the Committee has today endorsed a route that will keep the cruisers within the Lagoon. This route is promoted by the City of Venice with the support of the cruise industry. I am sure you will all agree that the role of UNESCO is to preserve World Heritage and not to give its support to the cruise industry. The Committee should also not give its blessing for a plan for which the State Party has not prepared the requested environmental and heritage impact assessments, and at the time when the various alternatives, including the proposal of re-routing the cruisers outside of the Lagoon, are still under discussion by the Government of the State Party. Europa Nostra believes that there must be a way that this World Heritage Committee avoids making such a grave mistake by modifying the related paragraph of its decision.

For all these and many other reasons, let me reiterate the firm position of Europa Nostra that the time has come for Venice and its Lagoon to be inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger. This is not to punish the State Party, but rather to help and support it to take the right measures to preserve Venice and its Lagoon for present and future generations. We are fully confident that with the combined efforts of the State Party, UNESCO and all relevant stakeholders, as well as with the possible support of the European Union, this can be achieved. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We would like to hear from an NGO that has requested the floor. Please, you have the floor.

Observer NGO (Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site Steering Group):

Your Excellency, as chairperson of the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site Steering Group thank you for giving me the opportunity to address your Committee. As this is a site cared for by its community it is a site where people are passionate about their cultural heritage, a site, which has benefitted from heritage for generations, a site where residents have benefitted from sustainable tourism, a site which benefits from a dedicated and passionate team caring for it, a site where many different agencies, NGOs, local and state government come together to work in the best interest of a World Heritage site status.

The report has several factual inaccuracies and key omissions which could have been addressed easily had the report been shared with the State Party and site steering group prior to its publication. The release of this report in the public domain without reference to these bodies is of great concern. As the State Party has put on record the protection and management regime is now in place, is robust and protects the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value individually and collectively and protects the authenticity and integrity of the site. The adoption by the State Party and local partners of the recommendations of the 2015 Advisory mission and the 2017 World Heritage Committee decision have improved the state of conservation of the property and have strengthened the measures that are in place for the site's longterm protection and management. The enhanced protection of the site requested by the World Heritage Committee is fully operational.

I, the partnership board, residents, NGOs, local government and the State Party are strongly of the view that the World Heritage site is not at risk. There should be no recommendation today for the Cornish Mining Landscape World Heritage site to come back in front of the next World Heritage Committee. I wish to put on record our disagreement with the decision as drafted and now adopted. I request that this speech is appended to the minutes of this meeting as a matter of public record. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I pass the floor now to the other NGO that has requested to speak. Please take the floor.

Observer NGO:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I have comments on three different sites: Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany), Venice and its Lagoon (Italy) and Stonehenge. So I request your permission to use all together six minutes.

Concerning the Upper Middle Rhine Valley I speak on behalf of the Citizens Initiative Rhine Passengers. We have a few remarks regarding the draft decision. Concerning a permanent Rhine crossing we ask the Committee to urge the State Party of Germany to undertake through the State of Rhineland-Palatinate the following measures before planning a permanent river crossing: to adopt a mobility concept for all types of road users in the Middle Rhine Valley including an evaluation of additional traffic due to the termination of the ferry service. Second, to review all previous expert opinions on road traffic including the bridge design completion based on applicable legal regulations and credible statistics. Third, to formally acknowledge the ferries as an essential part of the Outstanding Universal Value of the cultural landscape of the Upper Middle Rhine Valley and four, to ensure that no major highway and bridge are constructed through the Middle Rhine Valley.

Concerning rail-related noise levels, the property needs immediate measures to be taken. We ask for limiting the speed of trains, noisy freight trains should not run at all during the night and dangerous goods must be completely banned from the Valley. In the long run, freight transport must be re-routed away from the narrow Rhine Rift Valley. Concerning already implemented changes, the example of the Koblenz funicular shows that promises of temporary installations would have been made by the German State Party cannot be relied on. The remodeling of the Loreley open-air theatre has destroyed the visual integrity in the heart of the World Heritage area. It is now widely visible in the Valley. This will not be changed by replanting of trees, which would not reach the necessary height to hide the roof.

Future projects such as the roof top elimination called the "crystal" will do the same--there will be above the height of the roof, of the trees. We ask UNESCO to ensure that no further ground will be made available for the construction of buildings and the landscape such as the planned hotels on the Loreley Rock and the Gunderodehaus in Oberwesel and that any further

intervention be made only with full respect of nature conservation regulations. Thank you for your attention.

Concerning Venice and its Lagoon, I am reading a statement by Mr Franco Migliorini. UNESCO has delayed the judgement on Venice to 2020. We observe that UNESCO has received incorrect information on the alternative route inside the Lagoon, which would cause millions of cubic metres digging, stone banks and it is not grounded on a technical project. We are astonished by the Committee's change of views from 2015 request, in particular among the projects located outside the Lagoon, only one is viable but it was never taken into account by the competent authorities. The integrity of Venice depends on the integrity of the Lagoon. No Venice without its Lagoon, UNESCO itself has stated. But the presented project of tourism governance in Venice, no measure has been adopted to support the residents, no action against the present regime of short-term tourism grants has been taken. Systematic exemptions to the claim block of tourist accommodation have been introduced.

Additionally, a 10,000 low cost bed-hotel complex is under construction around the Miestre rail station for day-trippers, ticket exempt. Its realization at the border of the buffer zone was never mentioned to UNESCO by the Italian State Party. The morphological plan of the Lagoon was rejected in 2018 by the Ministry for Environment requiring a complete overhaul related to the effect of cruise ships and mostly on the Lagoon. Due to the expected MOSE frequent closures, the only solution will be the port outside the Lagoon. The connection between MOSE, if it will work, climate change, and cruise port is completely missing in the Italian response.

Chairperson:

Can you please wrap up as soon as you can? Thank you very much.

Observer NGO:

I am closing in a few seconds. All changes in a heritage site must be subjected to HIAs and SEAs or at least to the national equivalent. This commitment was never mentioned in the Italian response. There is so much about Venice.

Concerning Stonehenge the Stonehenge Alliance and the Alliance of United Kingdom Conservation, Heritage and Environmental organizations are pleased to support the World Heritage report and the draft decision. Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you, thank you for your report and for your understanding. We now move ahead to the evaluation of cultural properties in the Latin America and Caribbean with the discussion of the Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile). For the this property to be discussed, I would like to give the floor to the Delegation of Brazil, which requested the state of conservation report on Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile) to be opened for discussion, to present to the Committee the reason why it made such request. Please, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you. Madam Chairperson, this is a very small amendment. Brazil has asked for this draft decision to be discussed at the request of the State Party with regard to heritage impact assessment. Madam Chairperson, as you know in Chile and also Brazil, culture and heritage impact assessments are mainstreamed in environmental impact study procedures and in the case of Valparaíso the impact assessment for Terminals 1 and 2 close to the property have been ongoing since 2017 and they have been informed to the Centre in the last state of conservation report. In the draft decision it requests the State Party to submit an assessment of the impact of Paseo del Mar and vehicular access to Terminals 1 and 2. But since the impact

has already been addressed in the environmental impact studies for both these interventions we have submitted a draft amendment simply to add the expression “the appropriate impact assessment.” The idea is to provide clarity and legal certainty to the Chilean authorities as well as to avoid rework and duplication. With this small amendment it will be clear to the State Party the need to submit to the Centre the ongoing environmental impact assessment so that they don’t need provide a new implementation. Perhaps we could see the small amendment on the screen.

In closing Madam Chairperson, Brazil would like to join the Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM in commending the State Party for the substantive SOC report it has provided. It has addressed the Committee’s past decisions and recommendations as well as the factors affecting the property that were identified in earlier reports and decisions. Madam Chairperson, Brazil is confident that both these intervention foreseen in the vicinity of the property will enhance its OUV. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to invite Mr Mauro Rosi, Chief of the Latin America and the Caribbean Unit of the World Heritage Centre, and ICOMOS to respond to the comments made by the Brazilian delegation. Thank you. You have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Nous comprenons que l’amendement proposé par le Brésil sert à clarifier le texte de la décision sans en altérer le sens, par conséquent nous n’avons pas de réserve ou d’autres commentaires à faire, à formuler à son égard. Merci, Madame la Présidente, et je pense que l’ICOMOS aussi souhaiterait prendre la parole.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. ICOMOS concurs that this is a useful amendment, which aligns the wording of the decision with the relevant Chilean statute. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I would ask the Rapporteur to project the text—I’m sorry? The delegation of Kuwait has the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

I would like to also echo what was said by the delegation of Brazil. We also agree on these minor changes in the draft amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we ask the Rapporteur if there are any comments? If not perhaps we could move to the analysis of the text. Are there any comments on the text? I see no comments so I believe we can declare this decision adopted. Thank you very much. I will invite Mr Mauro Rosi to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Please, you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The list of the cultural properties for the Latin America and Caribbean region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion reads as follows: Brasília (Brazil), Churches of Chiloé (Chile), Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia), Maya Site of Copan (Honduras), Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panama) and Historic Centre of Lima (Peru). Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report and I see none; I declare the Decisions read out adopted. Thank you very much. I would at this point invite Colombia to take the floor since I understand the Colombian delegation would like to make a statement. Please, take the floor. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Colombia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

[Interpretation from Spanish] This is the first time that I'm taking the floor. I'd like to take the opportunity to thank and congratulate the Republic of Azerbaijan for their wonderful hospitality. We'd also like to thank the World Heritage Committee for giving us the opportunity to provide a brief update regarding the site at Cartagena. Joint work was done with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in December 2017 when ICOMOS did a technical advisory mission to Cartagena, which produced a comprehensive report, which helped us to face the challenges that are mentioned in the decision. I mention this because the state of conservation report that we submitted commits us to respect the Convention, to uphold the OUV of the property within the framework of existing heritage legislation in the country. We have the necessary governance and financial structures to incorporate the advice that we've received.

One of the projects does protect the historic centre of Cartagena and protects the natural and cultural heritage features and this will be included in our 2020 state of conservation report. In December 2018, the Ministry of Culture assessed the OUV of Cartagena and as ICOMOS said we addressed the concerns regarding the inalterable changes that were made to the San Felipe Castle and we committed ourselves to taking all the necessary measures to ensure that the impact of this undertaking would be mitigated. A number of legal processes are currently underway to deal with the problems affecting the water tower. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Now we move to Africa. And for the next property to be discussed, I would like to give the floor to the Delegation of Burkina Faso, which requested the state of conservation report on Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) to be opened for discussion, to present to the Committee the reason why it made such request. So the delegation of Burkina Faso has the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente. Je voudrais tout d'abord saluer le travail que l'ICOMOS a effectué en 2018 sur le bien culturel dénommé Palais royaux d'Abomey, au Bénin. C'est un travail professionnel qui a révélé certes les problèmes que connaît le site, mais dont l'objectif est surtout d'éviter que ce site ne perde certains de ses attributs. C'est en réponse à des préoccupations de valorisation que le Bénin envisage la réalisation d'un musée sur une des parties du site, avec comme objectif de créer une attraction supplémentaire ; créer les conditions de sécurité pour accueillir le bien culturel à restituer au Bénin, et qui était partie précisément d'Abomey ; utiliser intelligemment l'espace des palais royaux d'Abomey en assurant un entretien qui renforce la sécurité, particulièrement contre les feux de brousse ; générer des ressources propres pour la gestion du bien ; créer les conditions pour accroître de façon substantielle les revenus des artistes et artisans installés sur le site depuis plusieurs années.

Le projet de musée que prépare le Bénin, au-delà d'un programme d'investissement, est surtout un projet de développement qui participe d'une meilleure conservation du site et renvoie à la nécessité de concilier patrimoine et développement durable. À cet égard, l'État partie s'engage à prendre les mesures nécessaires pour ne pas porter atteinte à la valeur

universelle exceptionnelle du bien, en veillant à ce que le projet s'intègre harmonieusement dans le cadre existant, et à faire rapport au Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 44^e session sur l'état de conservation du bien et sur les mesures prises pour mettre en œuvre les recommandations.

La démarche d'ouverture des débats sur les palais royaux d'Abomey vise à apporter des éléments supplémentaires sur le bien culturel avec des amendements proposés au projet de décision, portant essentiellement sur la conception du projet. Madame la Présidente, je demande que vous puissiez donner la parole à l'État partie du Bénin pour des informations complémentaires, et je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Before we pass the floor to the State Party I would like to ask Mr Moukala, Chief of the Africa Unit of the World Heritage Centre, and ICOMOS to respond or to react to your intervention. Thank you very much. You have the floor.

Le Secrétariat :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. En effet, nous avons donc eu des consultations avec l'État partie et nous avons recommandé que l'emplacement de même que les formes du futur musée soient choisis en faisant strictement attention à ne pas porter atteinte à la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. L'État partie nous a apporté ses assurances qu'il collaborera étroitement avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives sur ce point. Et si vous me le permettez, Madame la Présidente, je vais donner la parole à l'ICOMOS pour compléter les éléments. Merci.

Chairperson:

Ok. S'il vous plaît.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We would to start by saying that ICOMOS strongly supports the idea of a museum but cannot support the current proposals. A new museum focused on the Kingdom of Dahomey would in our view be very timely. The Kingdom is one of the best researched in West Africa with physical remains spread across Abomey and other towns in southern Benin. Significantly, considerable archaeological research has been undertaken in Dahomey in the past two decades. The museum could present an integrated approach to the material heritage of the Kingdom that would be unparalleled across West Africa, reflecting a symbolic and political landscape from the 17th to 19th centuries.

The property includes the remains of 10 palaces that served as residences to the king, and his estimated two to eight thousand dependents. Each king built a new palace. They are set out in a spiral pattern. This plan had a clear political purpose and therefore is of extreme importance. Within the palaces, the courtyards around which the buildings were arranged are also important. They were stages upon which the notable dignitaries of the day vied for royal favour. The Dahomey Royal Palaces and their settlement landscapes are thus absolutely essential to an understanding of the complex symbolism of the Kingdom. Today the full meaning of this integrated cultural landscape is hard to comprehend with overgrown courts, dilapidated buildings and insensitive new additions. The difficulty with the current proposal for the museum is that the proposed location is within the large Court of the Amazons located between two royal palaces. The proposed museum buildings based on traditional forms but much larger and with modern materials such as artificial straw could contribute to a false interpretation of the palaces as well as confusing their layout and disrupting the differentiation between what were private and public spaces.

The museum would cover some 4000m² with the remaining open spaces in the court being used for car parking. Thus the site and the proposed design cannot be seen as acceptable in terms of their highly adverse potential impact on the integrity and authenticity of the palaces and thus on Outstanding Universal Value. In our view, ideally the museum should be placed outside the palace complex and the mission identified one possible site or if inside it would need to be much reduced and sited on the edge of the court. As the state of conservation report makes clear, the mission considered that many of the palace buildings are in an advanced state of deterioration and this is confirmed by the State Party and they are heading towards irreversible decline and a potential loss of Outstanding Universal Value. The proposed state-of-the-art museum could sit very uncomfortably within this environment and the extreme contrast is also reflected in the management and funding of the museum and the palaces.

In ICOMOS' view, there is a need to reassess the museum project to allow consideration of how it could support conservation of the palaces as otherwise in the decay there is the possibility that the museum might take over from it. During the Committee, ICOMOS has had an opportunity to discuss all our concerns with the State Party. We understand that there is now a change of view and that new design approaches are being considered and both of these are welcomed. We would also welcome the opportunity for dialogue on the museum project with the State Party and how it might be combined with the conservation of the palaces which together we consider could be an exemplary project and we look forward to further discussions with the State Party on this way forward. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the delegation of Benin. Please, you have the floor.

La Délégation du Bénin (Observateur):

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Le Bénin tient à remercier l'Azerbaïdjan pour l'organisation parfaite de cette 43^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Nous nous réjouissons aussi de l'excellente collaboration de toujours entre nos équipes et celles de l'ICOMOS, de l'ICCROM et du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Nous avons demandé l'ouverture de ce point pour les raisons suivantes. La décision insiste sur le projet de nouveau musée d'Abomey. Je voudrais rappeler que ce projet est destiné à régler deux problèmes : être un soutien pour le site ; accueillir les objets à restituer par la France, par décision du Président Macron. Ces objets sont partis de ce lieu précis et nous ne souhaitons pas voir évoquer l'argument que le pays n'a pas les capacités techniques pour recevoir ces objets. Par ailleurs, le programme global inclut une attention pour la conservation de la totalité du site en respect de toutes les dispositions de la Convention. En fait, les premières idées de plan de musée ont changé depuis décembre 2018. Il convient aussi de souligner que ce projet améliorera les conditions de travail et les revenus d'une cinquantaine d'artisans, femmes et hommes, de différents corps de métier installés là depuis des décennies. Des emplois induits sont attendus.

Nous souhaitons ainsi que soient affinés quelques points de la décision. Nous proposons de supprimer la mention relative à la Banque mondiale. Nous partageons le souci de lutte contre les incendies sur ce site et allons l'étendre à l'ensemble des budgets. Nous nous sommes mis d'accord avec l'ICOMOS et le Secrétariat pour travailler ensemble afin que ce projet de musée soit une réussite du point de vue de l'ensemble des dispositions idoines de la Convention. Les ajustements suggérés par le Burkina Faso s'inscrivent dans cet esprit de travail collaboratif que nous souhaitons maintenir avec les organes consultatifs et le Secrétariat de la Convention. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I think we can now move to the adoption of the decision 43 COM 7B.103 on the understanding that there are no further comments to this topic. I would ask our Rapporteur then to project the text and to make any suggestions you might have. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We'll just go through Burkina Faso's amendments. The first seven paragraphs are unchanged.

Paragraph 8 is slightly reworded. Also notes the proposal for a major museum focusing on the Kingdom of Dahomey as part of a wider development and investment programme, *Bénin révélé*, developed with Presidential approval, and covering numerous projects in nine sectors, with national funds and resources negotiated with various partners. The next paragraph is unchanged also.

Then a new paragraph 10, Recommends that the State Party ensure that the new museum effectively enhances the understanding of the property and the interpretation for visitors in its final implementation. Paragraph 11, Recommends that the location as well as the forms of the future museum be chosen with care so as not to damage the OUV of the property. Then the next three paragraphs are proposed to be deleted entirely.

Then former paragraph 13 now to be 12 would read, Recommends that the State Party ensure that the new project encompasses conservation of the existing palaces and in particular the future revenue generated by the museum can also support conservation and management of the property. Paragraph 14 is proposed to be entirely deleted. Then a new paragraph 13, Recommends that the State Party consider establishing a comprehensive strategy for the sustainable funding of the site's conservation.

Paragraph 14, Requests the State Party to submit the final architectural project proposal for the future museum to the World Heritage Centre for review by its Advisory Bodies before its implementation. I think we better move before its implementation to make that clear so what that should read is Requests the State Party submit the final architectural project proposal for the future museum before its implementation to the Centre. Yes I think that is a bit clearer.

Then paragraph 15, Also requests the State Party to establish a special fire and safety plan for the site and install in the immediate future appropriate fire detection systems in the main buildings and ensure all fire extinguishers are operable. And then I think paragraph 16 is un-amended and that's the end. Those are the amendments proposed.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I believe all amendments were well read out and explained. I understand that I can count on your agreement to the amendments proposed. Australia has some comments. Please, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Australia:

Madam Chairperson, in one of the paragraphs, if you scroll down towards the bottom the fire management plan, it refers to a site rather than to the property and we considered that proper wording it should be, and probably the funding for the site's conservation. In a couple of places there is site rather than property.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The Rapporteur will perhaps it more uniform. In the meantime we would like to listen to our colleague from Angola. Thank you.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je ne sais pas si la procédure serait de regarder paragraphe par paragraphe, ou on va peut-être apporter nos contributions à d'autres paragraphes. Quelle est la procédure en fait ?

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. On va distribuer le texte et, pour gagner un peu de temps, je vous demanderai de formuler vos commentaires ou vos suggestions aux paragraphes spécifiques. Merci beaucoup.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci bien. Donc je vais au dernier paragraphe en fait, le 16.

Chairperson:

The Rapporteur will project the paragraph to which you have comments.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

D'accord. Si les membres du Comité sont d'accord avec les amendements portés sur les autres paragraphes, pour le paragraphe 16 sa dernière partie, qui commence par « enfin », devrait être supprimée.

Chairperson:

I would like to listen to the delegation of Norway. Thank you.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson, for giving Norway the floor. I'm sorry to bother you this way but we are a bit confused about the discussion. Could we start from the top? Because what we feel is that there are some many changes with regard to the text from the draft decision that we started with so we actually would like to have a discussion from the top if that is okay. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Yes, absolutely. We just thought that you all had the text and that you already had the time to look at it. It was just for the sake of time but anyway we will go paragraph-by-paragraph from now. So, paragraph 1, any comments? Can we approve it? The delegation of Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Sorry, Madam Chairperson, we wanted to intervene before when our distinguished delegate of Angola was speaking. Just to say that Chairperson, our understanding that both the State Party and the Advisory Bodies agree on the usefulness, desirability and benefit of the proposed project of the museum. So my delegation would like both the State Party and Advisory Bodies to continue dialogue to find consensus on an appropriate location for a future museum, the scope and the design of the project to enhance the OUV. For that, my delegation of Tanzania support the amendment proposed by Burkina Faso and our distinguished delegate from Angola. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We took note of your comment and suggestion. Can we proceed paragraph-by-paragraph on the decision? So having approved paragraph 1, paragraph 2, I think we have no amendments as well as to paragraph 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. We have no

suggestions for amendments for paragraphs 1-7. Even so do you want to see one-by-one? No. So we can consider paragraphs 1-7 approved. Thank you very much.

Paragraph 8. Are there any comments? No comments, I see none. I'm sorry if I don't see because the light is in our eyes. Please raise your hand again. I see no comments to paragraph 8 so I think we can declare it approved. Thank you. Paragraph 9 as well. I think there was no amendment to it so consider it approved. Paragraph 10. Any comment? Approved. Paragraph 11. Any comments? I don't see any so approved. The delegation of Norway, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We are just hesitant about the wording because we think it's important that we might keep the wording that ICOMOS proposed in the draft decision. And that was that it's seriously undermining the OUV of the property. It might be a softening of the language if some of the other Committee Members might agree with us but I think it's important that we don't lose track of keeping the OUV. Thank you.

Chairperson:

I ask the distinguished delegation of Burkina Faso if you agree with the proposal made by Norway?

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Madame la Présidente, il me semble que la proposition d'amendement que nous avons faite correspond exactement à l'esprit de discussion qu'il y a eu entre les parties, à savoir l'État partie, l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Ce faisant, nous pensons que nous pouvons nous contenter de la formulation en l'état. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. Spain.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. Our delegation would like to echo the comments that were just made by the delegate from Norway in that we continue to be concerned about the issue of the museum. According to the Advisory Body, it seems that that could have an affect on the OUV and this is quite concerning. Unless the State Party can explain to us that in some way this project has actually been turned around somehow our delegation would feel more comfortable if this section were actually kept in the text. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Angola.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Madame la Présidente, si on a bien suivi les interventions de l'ICOMOS et de l'État partie, en fait il y a des pistes de solution qui sont possibles. L'ICOMOS n'a pas rejeté l'idée de construire le musée, mais il a proposé deux possibilités, cela veut dire qu'il y a possibilité de continuer à travailler sur le projet pour le mettre en œuvre. Donc le dialogue est encouragé entre l'ICOMOS, le Centre et l'État partie pour affiner le projet et pouvoir le mettre en œuvre. Pour le paragraphe, nous suggérons donc que le mot « gravement » soit supprimé. Pour « ne pas porter préjudice », oui, on est d'accord, mais pas « gravement ». Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. Any more comments? So I would ask our colleagues from Norway and Spain whether they would be comfortable with the proposal made by the distinguished delegate of Angola? Okay?

The Delegation of Norway:

Yes, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Spain? *Muchas gracias*. So as I understand the paragraph stands as it is, paragraph 11, as it is projected on the screen. If there are no more comments I will consider the paragraph approved. Angola wants one more clarification.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

C'est L'Angola et pas l'Ouganda.

Chairperson:

Où apparaît l'Ouganda ?

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Non, le Rapporteur avait écrit Ouganda, c'est l'Angola qui a proposé [l'amendement].

Je m'excuse, peut-être que vous n'avez pas le texte devant vous. C'était écrit Ouganda et pas Angola. C'est corrigé maintenant. Voilà.

Chairperson:

Excusez-nous, s'il vous plaît. Merci beaucoup. Je crois qu'on peut approuver maintenant, ça va ? D'accord ? Approved. Thank you. Next. I will ask the Rapporteur to project the text of the next paragraph.

Rapporteur:

Former paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 are proposed for complete deletion. And then the next paragraph, new paragraph 12 reads, Recommends that the State Party ensure that the new museum project encompasses conservation of the existing palaces and in particular, that the future revenue generated by the museum can also support conservation and management of the property.

Chairperson:

Are there any comments on the text projected?

Rapporteur:

Can we just add an "s" after ensure please so it will read, Recommends that State Party ensures.

Chairperson:

Are there any comments to this paragraph? No comments. Can we consider it adopted? Thank you. Adopted. Madam Rapporteur, next.

Rapporteur:

Former paragraph 14 proposed for complete deletion. New paragraph 13 reads, Recommends that the State Party consider establishing a comprehensive strategy for the sustainable funding of the property's conservation.

Chairperson:

Are there any comments? Yes, Uganda. Please. You have the floor.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I'm proposing a simple correction in fact. To add "s" after consider so that it reads, Recommends the State Party considers. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We had already pointed out this minor addition to the Rapporteur. Thank you very much. Anymore comments? We can consider this paragraph approved. Approved. Thank you very much. Madam Rapporteur, let's move to the next.

Rapporteur:

Requests the State Party submit the final architectural project proposal for the future museum before its implementation to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Chairperson:

Are there any comments on this paragraph?

Chairperson:

No comments. We can consider it approved. Approved. Madam Rapporteur, let's move to the next.

Rapporteur:

Also requests the State Party to establish a special fire safety plan for the property and install in the immediate future appropriate fire detection systems in the main buildings, and ensure all fire extinguishers are operable.

Chairperson:

Are there any comments? Approved. Madam Rapporteur, let's move to the next.

Rapporteur:

Here we have a proposal from Angola and the United Republic of Tanzania to delete, with a view to considering in the absence of significant progress in the implementation of these recommendations and in the case of confirmation of the ascertained danger to Outstanding Universal Value for possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Norway, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We would like to keep the last part, please, with a view to considering and so on.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Madam Chairperson, we'd also like to keep the last part of the paragraph. We think that although there is certainly in the amendments that have been made there is a move to collaboration and dialogue around the museum and we are pleased to see the request for a sustainable funding mechanism, ICOMOS has highlighted some very serious and urgent conservation measures that are required to stabilize the buildings on the property and therefore we would like to retain the second part of the paragraph. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. If this Committee is to be consistent, we have been trying to refrain from using such wording to the State Parties and we have always tried to encourage States Parties to continue working. But, Chairperson, if you go to paragraph 183-189 of the Operational Guidelines, it gives a clear procedure on how we put sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It clearly says we have to get corrective measures identified. Instead of writing such language, probably we could ask ICOMOS and other Advisory Bodies to try to look for the corrective measures before we put sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. I am aware of sites that have been on the List of World Heritage in Danger for 15 years and still there are no corrective measures put in place. We understand back in our places where we come from it's also difficult. You are put on the in Danger list, and then you stay there forever. The Tanzanian delegation wouldn't want to discuss too much but it's only that we have been trying in our own working mechanism to refrain from using that kind of language. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Spain, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. Briefly, we echo what's been said by Norway and Australia because we also believe that it would be a good idea to say that enough progress is not made that it's possible that it will be inscribed on the Danger List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Indonesia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Yes, Indonesia would also like to retain and keep the red lines. Thank you very much. *Salaam alaikum*.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any more comments? Burkina, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Madame la Présidente, la délégation du Burkina Faso soutient la proposition de l'Angola parce que, effectivement, on peut comprendre cette mention comme une anticipation sur quelque

chose qui n'est pas encore arrivé. Du reste, comme l'a dit la délégation de Tanzanie, c'est une disposition que le Comité essaye d'éviter au maximum et nous avons déjà agi en conséquence pour d'autres projets dans la même situation. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Guatemala, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. I would just like to make pretty much the same comment. This very day, two different decisions were looked at and we eliminated such wording from those decisions so to be consistent as a Committee we should do the same thing here so that we don't have two assessment and decision taking standards. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Angola. Very briefly because we are running out of time. Thank you.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

C'était juste pour dire que, si on a bien suivi les interventions, nous devons faire confiance à l'État partie et également à l'organe consultatif pour travailler. Donc nous appuyons une fois de plus la demande d'effacer cette partie. Merci.

Chairperson:

Madam Rapporteur, after the intervention of our distinguished delegate from Angola, how would the sentence read?

Rapporteur:

I understand from the distinguished delegate from Angola that we would just keep his amendment to remove, with a view to considering in the absence of significant progress in the implementation of these recommendations and in the case of confirmation of the ascertained danger to Outstanding Universal Value for possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. And that deletion has been supported by Angola, Tanzania, Burkina Faso and Guatemala with Norway, Australia, Spain and Indonesia wishing to keep that text.

Chairperson:

Any suggestions on the side of Committee Members? Thank you. Burkina, you have the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Madame la Présidente, je pense que l'intervention du Guatemala vient trancher. Il y a quelques instants, nous avons eu une position vis-à-vis de dossiers similaires. Même s'il y a égalité, restons dans la logique du Comité. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. Azerbaijan, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. My delegation is also in favour of deletion of this part as it was already mentioned by many colleagues that we need to be consistent in the decisions that we are taking and we ask the State Party to submit the report on the state of conservation by February 2020 so let's wait until this time and receive the information that will be provided by the State Party and then based on this information on the implementation of the

recommendation of the reactive monitoring mission we can make an assessment of the situation. So as we have already expressed several times that this wording is sort of a prejudgment or implies sort of a failure on part of the State Party so we would prefer also to delete this part. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Tunisia. Thank you, Azerbaijan. Tunisia, very briefly, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Je serai très bref, Madame la Présidente. D'ailleurs on n'est pas intervenu dans ce cadre puisque les idées essentielles étaient développées, on n'a pas voulu rallonger le débat. Mais sur ce point, je crois d'abord que le point 17 prévoit un rendez-vous avec l'État partie pour la 44^e session, c'est-à-dire l'année prochaine, ce n'est pas loin, et l'intervention du représentant de l'État partie a montré, à mes yeux, une prise de conscience de la situation. Je crois que même le projet d'amendement initial ne prévoyait pas cette suppression. C'est dans notre discussion et dans une logique de cohérence globale de nos décisions que cette proposition est venue par l'Angola et nous la trouvons bienvenue, donc nous appuyons la proposition de l'Angola et le groupe de pays qui va dans cette direction.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I understand that some countries still requested the floor but if as far as I understand, there is agreement regarding deleting the last part of the paragraph. If Uganda and Indonesia are in the same sense, and Cuba, if you are going to say the same thing then maybe we can accelerate. And Zimbabwe. Just to gain time I understand that the Committee in its majority is in favour of deleting the last part of the paragraph. Is it so? Okay, Indonesia, you want to speak. Thank you.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

I just want to not really to keep it but if you give a verbal report on this. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I believe we then can approve the paragraph, okay, with the deletion of the last part of it. Thank you very much for your cooperation. Approved.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. For the next property to be discussed, I would like to give the floor to the Delegation of Burkina Faso, which requested the state of conservation report on the Lamu Old Town (Kenya) to be opened for discussion, to present to the Committee the reason why it made such request. Please, you have the floor, the delegation of Burkina Faso.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente. Je m'en vais vous donner les raisons de la demande d'ouverture du débat sur la Vieille ville de Lamu au Kenya. L'État partie du Kenya estime avoir fourni les informations demandées par l'organe consultatif avant le rapport sur l'état de conservation, contrairement à ce qui a été mentionné au paragraphe 3 du rapport. Et s'agissant de l'extension de la zone tampon du bien, l'État partie trouve que la requête est irréalisable en raison de l'occupation actuelle de la zone alentours.

Quant à l'étude d'impact sur le patrimoine concernant le projet de l'aéroport de Manda, qui a été demandée, il s'agit simplement d'une restauration et non d'une nouvelle construction qui nécessiterait une étude d'impact. Par ailleurs, concernant le projet d'usine de charbon de Lamu, l'État partie informe que la consultation des parties prenantes est en cours et que, à ce

stade et à cet égard, le projet est suspendu. Au regard donc de ce qui précède, des amendements au projet de décision ont été proposés et je voudrais, une fois de plus, Madame la Présidente, que vous puissiez donner la parole à l'État partie concerné pour de plus amples informations. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

First I would like to pass the floor to Mr Moukala and ICOMOS to react on your comments. Thank you very much. You have the floor Mr Moukala.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The Committee has expressed its concern over the potential impact of the LAPSSET project on the property since 2009 and repeatedly requested the State Party to submit a map demarcating the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone and a strengthened management plan. Also regarding the LAPSSET project is however continuing with a shipping channel and docks already under construction. At the time of writing the National Environmental Tribunal judgement is pending on the issue of environment impact assessment license for the Lamu coal plants. With the focus on the LAPSSET project, other factors affecting the property's authenticity and integrity, such as deterioration of dwellings, threats to the safeguarding of its Islamic and Swahili culture, and the need for protection of the fresh water supplies, are not being reported on. We have also noted on the amendment proposed by Burkina Faso that the court law decision has been mentioned and we have not received the actual content and it could be very difficult for us at this stage to acknowledge this document without having knowledge of what really the court law has decided. I give the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. ICOMOS would just like to comment briefly on the issues, which this state of conservation report has been opened. We would like to recall that the Committee has made many requests for the State Party to provide adequate documentation. ICOMOS still does not, I fear, have full details of the overall scope of the LAPSSET project. If we are to gain a clear understanding of the interrelationship between the LAPSSET project and the property this can only be readily achieved if the necessary documents are provided.

We are not requesting full documentation on all aspects but sufficient documentation to understand the scope so that we can request more documentation if it is needed. Documents are also needed on the property boundaries and particularly the buffer zone--both have been requested by the Committee--if we are fully to understand the interface between the property and this project.

On the coal plant, we consider the pause that is now taking place is an opportunity for an HIA to be undertaken and in order that the outcome of that can influence further discussions on whether or not the coal plant goes ahead. The need to protect the setting of the property through a formal buffer zone has long since been requested by the Committee and in ICOMOS' view is urgently needed. The State Party has indicated that there does now appear to be some confusion as to how a buffer zone would need to be protected. What is needed is adequate protection through planning tools. Gazetting the buffer zone as a protected area is not necessary and certainly a buffer zone does not mean removal of traditional activities such as farming. We consider the request for a buffer zone to be delineated is essential for the protection of the property.

We suggest that discussion on how protection might be arranged should be discussed during the reactive monitoring mission, which unfortunately had to be postponed in February, but is to be rescheduled. Similarly, we also consider that the question of the impact of the proposed

work on the airport could also be discussed at the forthcoming mission. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. If there are no comments on the part of Committee Members, I would like to pass the floor to the State Party of Kenya, to the delegation of Kenya. I'm sorry, Kenya. Uganda had requested the floor but it was a bit hidden. Uganda, you have the floor please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, honourable Chairperson. The delegation of Uganda notes that there are some critical matters that will affect the local community if the buffer zone of the Lamu Old Town is extended to incorporate the entire Lamu and Manda Islands. The proposed line of action within the draft decision will create hostility and exacerbate negative attitudes towards site management. We need the support of the local communities. The Lamu Old Town already has an adequate buffer zone of water catchment and the mangrove ecosystem. Consequently, taking up community land will present challenges to the site management. The Ugandan delegation takes note of the case forecourts of law on the environment of the Lamu where the State Party has been required to revise the strategic and environment assessment for the LAPSET project. We have also learned that the State Party has commenced these revisions. It is in this regard that the State Party should be urged to complete these processes as a requirement before the projects are commenced. We thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I would pass the floor now to the delegation of Kenya. But with the observation that the more we speak the longer we will stay here this evening, because we still have some items ahead of us that have to be concluded today. So thank you very much. Kenya, you have the floor.

The Observer Delegation of Kenya:

Madam Chairperson, the State Party of Kenya wishes to highlight the current status of our fulfilment of obligations to the Convention towards the conservation Lamu Old Town World Heritage site. Kenya gazetted the current buffer zone for the property and this includes the Lamu water catchment area and the Manda Ras Kitau skyline. These were gazetted in 2002 and 2008 respectively and are adequate for the protection of the OUV of Lamu. The requested revision of the buffer zone around the property to include at a minimum all of Lamu Island would be too restrictive for the local communities especially in the use of their farmlands. Honourable Chairperson, I also wish to state that the revision of the LAPSET include the recommendations of HIA of 2015 as requested, and a SEA is underway. And Kenya commits to submitting this report to the World Heritage Centre upon its completion. Finally, I wish to inform the Committee that Kenya plans to carry out additional studies as recommended by heritage impact assessment of 2015 as well as a fresh environmental impact assessment for the Lamu Coal Project as recently determined by the Kenyan Court whose details will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre once we get back home to Kenya. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I believe we can move now to the adoption of decision 43 COM 7B.107 and I would ask our Rapporteur to project the text. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We've received one set of amendments. The first two paragraphs are unchanged. The third one would read, regrets that the State Party provides

only limited information on the state of conservation of the property, and reiterates its requests to the State Party, as a matter of urgency, to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies: a) An updated clearly delineated map of the property and its enlarged buffer zone, which should be formalized through a request for minor boundary modification in line with Paragraph 164 of the Operational Guidelines, b) to f) unchanged then.

Paragraph 4, 5 and 6 are also un-amended. Paragraph 7. b) would also be amended. I'm just going to read the very top of 7, just to put it in context because the language needs a little bit of changing. Further requests the State Party to revise the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the LAPSSET project by--and I think I would change it here to, urgently implementing. Sorry this is b)--so instead of urgently requested after the LAPSSET project, by urgently implementing the decisions of the courts of law, in respect to the development of Lamu Coal Project that requires the State Party to revise the project EIA. That's just b) in context with the top of 7 there.

Then paragraph 8, would be revised. This would need to say also requests the State Party to complete the revision of the LAPSSET SEA. And that's the last amendment proposed. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I see that the delegation of Tanzania requested the floor? Please. Thank you.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Ambassador Madam Chairperson. Tanzania wouldn't speak before the adoption but it seems there is no contradiction but we just wanted to support the amendments. Thank you, Chair. Especially, yeah, it's fine; I think it's okay. We support the amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, I hope you will go in the same direction. You have the floor.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We will also be going in the same direction without too much hesitation at this time of day. We would in 7 b) ask for a little addition. After the sentence ending to revise the project EIA we would put a comma and insert, ensuring that the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is the baseline for the EIA. And then in item 8 there is also a small comment, please. So I'll wait for the Rapporteur. We also consider that it should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre and reviewed by the Advisory Bodies, please. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Okay, you're finished with your comments? Thank you. Zimbabwe.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. To be brief we support the amendments that have been proposed by Uganda. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. If we can go back up to 7 b) we don't know what the decisions of the courts of law, we don't have any information about what those decisions were or any

reference to those decisions and we don't know whether we can approve that as it is or whether the Committee can approve that.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any more comments? Maybe Burkina Faso can help us in answering the question posed by Australia? Thank you.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Madame la Présidente, je voudrais demander de passer la parole à l'Ouganda, la délégation de l'Ouganda, sur cette question.

Chairperson:

Uganda. Would you take the floor on this topic? Thank you.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. We would request that you give an opportunity to the State Party of Kenya to briefly elaborate on this matter. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Kenya, could you please take the floor on this topic.

The Observer Delegation of Kenya:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Madam Chairperson, the court has ruled that we do a fresh environmental impact assessment, the assessment should be done immediately for the purpose of involving the local communities on the ground and their sentiments are put into consideration before any activities are taken. So the court has ruled in favour of the petitioners who petitioned the project and therefore unless that environmental impact assessment is concluded with the involvement of the local community then that is where we are. And the government of Kenya is heading towards that.

Chairperson:

With this clarification by the Member State can we move for adoption of this paragraph? Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Madam Chairperson, I think that we need some formal reference to what these decisions are. We don't know—it doesn't say which courts they are, what the decision numbers were, what they are in relation to.

Chairperson:

Could Australia propose an alternative language for this then that we would submit to the Committee Member that proposed the amendment?

The Delegation of Australia:

Given that we don't have the information for that we could suggest reinstating the deleted text proposed for deletion by Uganda because it doesn't specifically refer to the court's law decisions. But otherwise I don't think that we can agree to that amendment without further information about what those decisions are.

Chairperson:

Would you be more comfortable if we associate those court decisions to ICOMOS or IUCN recommendations, the Advisory Bodies' recommendations--if they are in compliance with the recommendations?

The Delegation of Australia:

We would have to refer to ICOMOS and IUCN—ICOMOS in this case, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, would you try to help us in this regard? Thank you.

ICOMOS:

I think without further information on precisely what the legal courts have said it's impossible to refer to their decision. The original text was trying to highlight the need for the potential impact of pollution from the coal plant to be addressed. I presume that is actually what the court of law is asking for, what a revised EIA would do. So it would seem preferable to keep the original wording unless we can be much more specific on what the court of law is actually asking for.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I think Norway requested the floor. Please, go ahead.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Only an attempt to facilitate, could we possibly ask Uganda who proposed this to sit together with the distinguished colleagues from Kenya and outline, specify the legal decisions which courts of law we are talking about and return with this in a paragraph that can be adopted later. Is that a possibility? Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your suggestion. I will pass the floor to the distinguished delegate from Tunisia. Thank you.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je voudrais rejoindre l'intervention et la dernière remarque de l'honorable représentant de la Norvège sur la question de la précision que l'on doit observer autour de la référence à une décision de justice. Je crois qu'il serait sage de laisser cela en contact avec l'État partie parce que ça pourrait être une décision de premier degré et à laquelle on ferait référence dans notre acte, sous notre décision, et qui ensuite peut faire l'objet d'un appel ou d'une cassation. Par conséquent il vaut mieux s'assurer du niveau juridique de cette décision dans l'ordonnancement national du Kenya, et je rejoins donc totalement la remarque faite par l'honorable représentant de la Norvège.

Chairperson:

Thank you, thank you very much. So I would at this point request the distinguished delegate of Norway and Burkina Faso and Uganda to get together and try to get a common text so that we can approve it by the end of this session or hopefully later in this session. Thank you very much.

H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan) resumes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Dear colleagues, we now go to the Fossil Hominid Sites of South Africa of South Africa. So the delegation of Burkina Faso requested the state of conservation report to be opened for discussion, and I would like to give the floor to the delegation from Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Concernant les sites des hominidés fossiles d'Afrique du Sud, de l'avis de l'État partie, le rapport met l'accent sur une partie du site, en l'occurrence les composantes Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai et environs, et tout particulièrement sur le drainage minier acide, considéré comme une menace potentielle particulière par l'organe consultatif. Cette vision restrictive du rapport d'état de conservation n'est pas acceptable pour l'État partie. Telle est la raison essentielle de la demande d'ouverture de débat sur les sites des hominidés fossiles d'Afrique du Sud. Des amendements ont été proposés pour cette décision, ce projet de décision. Je demanderais également pour ce dossier-là que l'on puisse donner la parole à l'État partie pour de plus amples informations. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Any comments from the Committee Members? Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I know it's late...

Chairperson:

Sorry, sorry. We will first give floor according to procedure to the Centre and ICOMOS.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have had extensive consultation with the State Party and in particular I just want to underline that the State Party submitted a well-structured Vulnerable Fossil Site Risk Prevention Strategy for the Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai and Environs component of the property. The Risk Prevention Strategy sufficiently illustrates that acid mine drainage does not pose a significant continuous threat to many of the fossil attributes. It also includes the appropriate monitoring and emergency response mechanisms. The monitoring and possible interventions strategy included in the Risk Prevention Strategy should be translated into the final integrated management plan. With the consultation we were able to reach a mutual understanding position, which will be reflected in the amendment. If you allow me, Mr Chairperson I give the floor to ICOMOS, please.

Chairperson:

Please, ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you. Very briefly, we had a discussion with the State Party as indicated. We have explained the meaning behind paragraph 6 so no amendments are needed in relation to the risk prevention strategy. A small amendment has been agreed with the State Party under paragraph 9 which ICOMOS fully supports. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you. But then we agree to the amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Chairperson, the delegation of Tanzania is aware of the discussion between the State Party, the Centre and ICOMOS on a common understanding. The reason Tanzania proposes to the distinguished Committee Member to make a mini-amendment on the draft decision to strengthen the effort to the State Party to enhance constructive dialogue between all stakeholders. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Chairperson, thank you. We support this minor amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I give the floor to the State Party, South Africa? Anyone? Please, you are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of South Africa:

Thank you, Chairperson. Honorable Chairperson and Advisory Bodies, we would just like to add that South Africa is committed to the conservation and protection of not only World Heritage sites in South Africa but all protected areas. We have specific legislation that deals with World Heritage, which was promulgated as far back as 1999, which is the World Heritage Convention Act, and it is also complemented by other subsidiary legislation. We have a South African World Heritage Convention Committee appointed by the minister who oversees the implementation of the Convention. We would like to indicate to the Committee as well as the Advisory Bodies that we will do our best to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not compromised. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We take note. Angola, please.

The Delegation of Angola :

Thank you, Chairperson. Angola, as well follows with attention the fruitful discussion the State Party had with the Advisory Bodies and the Centre. So they found some consensus that will help us adopt the amendment proposed by Tanzania without losing time. I think we can proceed with the draft.

Chairperson:

Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Mr Chairperson, the Ugandan delegation is in support of the amendment to the draft decision that focuses on the purpose for which paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines was drawn. We thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. It seems that we have an agreement on this draft. I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur. Please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. And if we could just have that paragraph, sorry, the decision on the screen. We have just one minor amendment as flagged to paragraph 9 of this decision. So all paragraphs to paragraph 9 remain unchanged.

So we'll just scroll down to paragraph 9 with the minor amendment only and this would just to remove both inside and outside the various buffer zones. So that is the only amendment proposed for this draft decision. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I consider that we can approve this text in whole, not to discuss it paragraph-by-paragraph. You don't mind? Thank you very much. Approved.

Now we are moving to the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Please, Mr Moukala.

The World Heritage Centre:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The list is Asmara: A Modernist African City in Eritrea, Rock-Hewn Churches, of Lalibela in Ethiopia, Forts and Castles, Volta, Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions in Ghana, Aapravasi Ghat in Mauritius, Osun-Osogbo Sacred Grove in Nigeria, Island of Saint-Louis in Senegal, Koutammakou, the Land of the Batammariba in Togo. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. It is proposed to approve this list without any discussion. I hope there are no objections. Thank you very much. We approve.

So now we are returning to the file 7B.70. Kathmandu. May I give the floor to the Rapporteur? The working group provided the draft decision, the result of the dedicated work, so please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As you recall, the first eight paragraphs were adopted already. So if we turn to paragraph 9, the drafting group is comfortable with paragraph 9. Paragraph 10 would read, Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020, with a view to considering in the absence of significant progress in the implementation of the above recommendations to address the ascertained danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Paragraph 11 reads, Underlines that the State Party's cooperation in conducting the requested and overdue mission will be a key consideration for the Committee at its 44th session. Paragraph 12, Finally reiterates, consistent with Decision 40 COM 7, that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, should not be viewed negatively by the State Party; its purpose is to marshal international support to help the State Party effectively address the challenges faced by the property by engaging with the Advisory Bodies to develop a programme of corrective measures to achieve the desired state of conservation for the

property as provided for under paragraph 183 of the Operational Guidelines. Those are the amendments of the drafting group. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So should we proceed paragraph-by-paragraph or the drafting group already proposed the solution to the matter? Thank you very much. We approve the file in whole. Ms Rössler, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. There are a number of sites open under 7B as you have discussed for example, Lake Ohrid is open until we close under Item 8B and also for Lamu there is the drafting group as you heard and as you know the Chairperson already announced that Items 7.2 and 7.3, the draft decisions for 7.2 and 7.3 are also open and we come back to these Items after Item 8B.

With your permission, Mr Chairperson, I would also like to make a number of announcements. First of all, dear delegates don't leave this room with your headsets. They should be left here in this room to be charged. Otherwise you won't hear anything tomorrow. Secondly, the Bureau meeting is in the Bureau room at 9:30 a.m. and the budget group has finished its work today and tomorrow we will start with the Operational Guidelines group at 2 p.m. Then you have at 6:30 p.m. the Qhapaq Ñan event "Sharing experiences and good practices" in Room 8A and at 6:10 p.m. Communicating World Heritage by the Austrian-German National Commissions in B2, and at 6:10 p.m. World Heritage and Conservation of Wilderness and Large Landscapes and Seascapes by IUCN in Room B3. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We are going according to the schedule. Tomorrow morning we will be here at 10 a.m. and we will start the discussion on the nominations. The Bureau meeting will be tomorrow in the same room at 9:30 a.m. As usual, we are proposing you to go to one of the nice sites in Baku. We have the exhibition of the archeology in the Museum of Art where you will find a very interesting collection of different artists from all over Europe, Azerbaijan and other places around the world. So have a nice evening and if there are any questions you can apply to the Secretariat with them before tomorrow morning's session. Thank you.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

FIFTH DAY – Friday 5 July 2019

NINTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Today we are on the fifth day of our session. Welcome all of you again and good morning. Honorable delegates, ladies and gentlemen, members of delegations, I would like to inform you briefly about the matter that was discussed recently at the Bureau. The decision was taken by the Bureau to recommend to the Committee Members to proceed in the following way. We will start today with the examination of Item 8 concerning nominations to the World Heritage List. In this regard, there is a slight change in the timetable of this morning's session. It is proposed to examine Item 8A at the end of the examination of Item 8B. It means that we will start with Item 8 and then pass to 8B.

Therefore, after proceeding to 8B which concerns the nominations to the World Heritage List according to the order of the examinations that can be found on page 4 of document 8B. With certain changes that were also agreed to during the morning meeting of the Bureau, that the discussions of the nominations of Bahrain and Australia under numbers 9 and 11 will be done tomorrow. In spite of the speed of our discussion and how many files we will observe today by all means the proposal is to put the Bahrain and Australia discussion to the next day. So if you don't mind we will approve this proposal of the Bureau, if there are no objections and I don't see any.

We will now start with our agenda Item 8, devoted to the Nomination Process and to draft decision 43 COM 8. I invite Mr Balsamo, Head of the Nomination Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to briefly present document 8. You have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. At its 42nd session, in its Decision 42 COM 8, the Committee decided to include for the first time in the draft agenda of its 43rd session a general Item 8 to allow discussion on the nomination process. The examination of this Item is now open and shall remain open to the Committee Members until the termination of discussion of all sub-items under Item 8.

Document 43 COM 8 presents the outcomes of the reflection meeting on reforming the World Heritage nomination process that was held this year in Tunis from 23-25 January 2019 upon the invitation of the Tunisian government and with the financial support of the Australian government. Annex 1 of this document presents the outcome of the outline consultation survey on the reflection concerning the nomination process, which was instrumental to define the areas in which the experts in Tunis should have focused their attention. The meeting and the survey were both fundamental steps underpinning the ongoing reform of the nomination process.

It is important to recall that the World Heritage Committee decided to review the nomination process bearing in mind the Global Strategy. Its Decision 42 COM 12A also made a specific reference to recommendation no. 3 of the IOS Comparative Mapping Study of Forms and Models for use of Advisory Services by International Instruments and Programmes which recommended that the World Heritage Committee take action to address the deviation

between the recommendation of the Advisory Bodies and the decisions made by the Committee.

Among other recommendations, the Expert Meeting in Tunis proposed a mandatory procedure for preliminary assessment for providing indication as to whether a site is suitable for nomination, to ensure a more effective use of resources to bring forward higher quality nominated sites while at the same time reducing costs required for the preparation of nominations and to reduce the number of nominations that are unlikely to succeed. The meeting suggested that the review of the referral procedure, which was requested by the Committee at its 42nd session, be postponed since it was considered premature to recommend amendments in isolation of a full package of integrated reforms.

The outcome of the Tunis meeting was presented to the ad hoc working group and during the following meetings, the ad hoc working group under the chairpersonship of Azerbaijan and guided by the set of principles and recommendations of the Expert Meeting further debated, refined and elaborated on the relevant aspects of the reform. And as you know, the work and recommendations of the 2018-2019 ad hoc working group are presented in document 12 and will be examined on Tuesday. Following the set of recommendations coming from the principles on which the reform should be based, the Committee at its current session is expected to examine the outcome of the work of the ad hoc working group in view of translating the results of the ongoing reflection into a provision for examination and potential integration into the Operational Guidelines by the Committee at its 44th session in 2020.

Document 8 also mentions the organization of the Expert Meeting on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts and in this context its worth recalling that as noted in document 5A so far only limited voluntary contributions have been committed by State Parties.

Finally, document 8 suggests that the 50th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 2022 may provide a good opportunity to undertake a reflection on the Global Strategy. Draft decision 43 COM 8 which will be discussed at the end of all sub-items under 8 is on page 3 of the English and page 4 of the French version of document 8. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your presentation. I would like to inform you that this item will remain open, to take into account the debates held under Agenda Items 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D and 8E. The Draft decision 43 COM 8 will therefore only be adopted once we have completed the examination of Items 8A through 8E. I would like to know whether there are any comments on this agenda item? We have Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Australia is very pleased with the comprehensive body of work undertaken in reviewing the nomination process since our meeting in Bahrain last year. It shows what can be achieved when the Committee turns its mind to reform. We've laid the foundation for changes that will resonate through the years and underpin the credibility and integrity of the World Heritage List.

It is important to recall the world from which this mood for change has sprung, the growing politicization of the work of this Committee. In Manama last year, we witnessed decisions to inscribe properties where the technical evaluation concluded that they did not have Outstanding Universal Value. Such decisions diminish the World Heritage List. In recent years, we have also seen some properties move from deferral to referral and even from to not inscribe to referral, running strongly counter to the technical advice provided by the Advisory Bodies. Most recently we saw such cases in Manama and Krakow.

This year, we bear witness to the folly of that pathway with previously referred properties now recommended for deferral or non-inscription. We can't help but wonder whether some of those properties might have been listed by now if the State Party had received their evaluation and draft decision positively and taken advantage of the sound technical advice provided to reshape their nomination.

In Manama, we had a long discussion about the time at which Outstanding Universal Value was recognized and decided in Decision 42 COM 8 that OUV is recognized at the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List and that no recognition of OUV is foreseen prior to this stage. This is a principle we must uphold. States Parties and civil society carefully watched our deliberations last year as they do this year. A number of States Parties intervened to speak powerfully of the bad conduct and practices they witnessed. This year, we suspect in recognition of last year's misadventures a number of States Parties have withdrawn nominations: Spain, Monaco, France, Belgium, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Italy and the United Arab Emirates. We thank them for their sound judgment and their implicit decisions to uphold the credibility and integrity of the Convention.

Mr Chairperson, we have much to look forward to. The path laid by the Tunis Expert workshop and the deliberations of the ad hoc working group under Azerbaijan's excellent leadership is one we must walk together. The proposal we will consider later in this meeting to establish a mandatory preliminary assessment process before formal nominations are lodged together with other reforms which are proposed, has great potential to strengthen the dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies and yield consistently better nominations. We urge the Committee to embrace these reforms when they are put before us. This is the pathway to upholding the vision of the founders of this Convention established, as it was to create an effective system of collective protection of cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value to all of humankind.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson and I wish a good morning to all colleagues. First of all, please allow us to say that we welcome the addition of the standing Item 8 on the agenda of the Committee to allow more strategic discussions on the nominations. We have read the document prepared by the Secretariat carefully and we see that we have been talking about the deviation from the Advisory Bodies' recommendations for quite a number of years now. We find the table detailing the percentage of deviation is quite alarming because while it is true that disagreements can happen between the expert view of the Committee and Advisory Bodies, when it happens systematically it erodes the credibility of the Committee, the Convention and ultimately of UNESCO. The deviation rate that constantly fluctuates at around 85-90% means that something is not right.

We are hoping that the reform of the nomination process is acknowledged in the document itself will contribute to alleviating this issue by helping States Parties develop higher quality nominations. We believe that the premature inscription of a property which is not quite ready yet to be on the List immediately triggering SOC processes at a time of its inscription puts a strain on the whole Convention system, including the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies' workload. This is not in the interest of the States Parties.

In closing, we wish to recall that every decision we take has to be taken in accordance with the Operational Guidelines, which provides the framework for our work here. As paragraph 23 says, the Committee's decisions are based on objective and scientific considerations and we urge all of us to keep this paragraph at the forefront of our minds as we embark on our work.

In closing, we also join our Australian colleagues now commending the States Parties who have withdrawn their nominations to work more on them and we are very hopeful that these nominations will come back at a later stage with a positive evaluation from the Advisory Bodies. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. First of all, we'd like to thank the Secretariat for the summary they have given us about the new evaluation process which we hope will be improved and in these lines our delegation would like to echo the comments made by Australia and Hungary and thank the delegation of Tunisia for this very important meeting which was, of course paid for by that country itself. Having said that, I would like to ask the Chairperson when would be the procedural moment for us to make an intervention about Spain's nomination that has been withdrawn? We asked beforehand and they said this would be the moment for us to do that. If so, if I can talk I will do so now, if not I can do that after all the other States Parties have talked about the evaluation process. As you wish but I would like to know when that would be. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Is it a general comment?

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] They are general comments but some particular ones as well about this nomination and the withdrawal thereof.

Chairperson:

I think that we have to do it later on when we start the nomination procedures.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] That's fine but please remind us when it is the time to do that.

Chairperson:

Okay. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving Norway the floor. World Heritage is something that belongs to all of us. World Heritage is our unique and shared privilege and responsibility. What is stated in Item 4 therefore is addressed to all 193 States Parties to the Convention. Item 8 describes the worrying fact that among this year's 35 nominations to be decided on by the Committee, we count 15 from Europe but only one from Africa. And to continue of these 35 nominations 27 are on culture while six are on nature. How could these facts ever help us in achieving the goals of the Global Strategy? Norway finds it pertinent to remind ourselves the States Parties to the Convention to do whatever we can to strive for the fulfillment of paragraph 54 of the Operational Guidelines on the establishment of a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List.

Another worrying fact is that the Committee decisions on more than eight out of 10 cases deviate from the Advisory Bodies' recommendations. This is the responsibility of the Committee, of course, but it's also the result of lobbying pressure and expectations from the

other States Parties to the Convention. Norway finds this situation untenable, as it is extremely detrimental to the credibility of the World Heritage system, to quote our document in question.

Our aim for this session therefore is to do our best in accomplishing what is expected of us in the Operational Guidelines in particular, paragraph 23 regarding objective and scientific based decisions as well as paragraph 51 stating that Outstanding Universal Value is recognized only at the time of inscription, never before. Some nominations do not meet the requirements stated in the World Heritage Convention and the Operational Guidelines. This year, the Norwegian delegation would like to commend the Belgium, France, Italy, Monaco, Spain, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates for the withdrawal of their nominations. These countries have chosen not to challenge the Convention and are examples for all States Parties. Our decisions now will shape the future for this Convention and its future credibility and relevance. Norway supports the draft decision. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier le Centre d'avoir présenté ce rapport extrêmement illuminant et instructif sur cette réunion, que mon pays a été heureux et convaincu de recevoir. À ma droite est assis le Directeur de l'Institut national du patrimoine ; il a été la cheville ouvrière du côté tunisien dans sa réception ; permettez-moi de lui transmettre mes remerciements. La question dont nous avons discutée à Tunis est une question centrale sur l'avenir de notre Convention et sur sa capacité d'évoluer et de s'adapter.

Nous avons choisi, depuis la session de Manama, la question du processus d'inscription, je crois que c'est extrêmement important et il y a des questions d'équilibre, il y a des questions de justice, mais il y a aussi une question d'interprétation et de conformité à la lettre et à l'esprit de la Convention. La Tunisie rejoint l'ensemble de ceux qui ont pris la parole avant nous pour dire que c'est une responsabilité. C'est une responsabilité à la fois collective et une responsabilité individuelle. À chacun de nous de porter l'interprétation optimale de cette Convention. Je vous donne pour exemple le cas de la Tunisie qui, pendant les quatre années de son appartenance à ce Comité, s'est abstenue de présenter ses propres dossiers à l'inscription, alors que notre liste indicative comporte au jour d'aujourd'hui 12 biens, dont certains seraient susceptibles d'une inscription relativement courte dans le temps. Donc cela montre que cela nous revient à la fois collectivement et individuellement. Je crois que chacun de nous doit être le porteur de cette Convention, à la fois comme membre de la communauté internationale et aussi comme État partie, au plan individuel.

Je crois que ces réflexions sont extrêmement importantes. Je me félicite que nous pourrions, comme l'a proposé le Centre, prendre la date symbolique du cinquantenaire pour mener des réflexions dans d'autres directions dans le cadre de cette Convention. Les travaux de notre session actuelle montrent qu'il y a un besoin urgent de regarder le sens que l'on devrait donner, la mise en œuvre que l'on devrait donner à une catégorie comme celle de mettre les biens sur la Liste en péril, par exemple. Nous devons mener cette réflexion. Nous devons avoir à la fois le courage et la responsabilité de donner vie à notre Convention. Elle a été écrite et pensée en 1972, nous sommes en 2019, c'est à nous de lui permettre la meilleure interprétation et la meilleure réception possible dans nos différentes communautés. Et je rejoins tous ceux qui ont dit que le patrimoine mondial est une question qui interpelle chaque individu de la communauté des humains. Je crois que cela est le message le plus important que nous devons envoyer à l'ensemble des pays membres et de leurs populations.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have apply for the interventions from some States Parties so the first is the Republic of Korea, please.

The Observer Delegation of the Republic of Korea:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The delegation of the Republic of Korea would like to acknowledge the approach by the World Heritage Centre to proceed with discussion on the nomination process, notably on the sites associated with memories of recent conflicts. We commend the efforts by the Centre to implement the decision at its 42nd session to convene Expert Meetings on Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts at the end of this year and would like to share that the Government of the Republic of Korea decided to take part in this endeavor. The Republic of Korea has been an active advocate of the study of heritage interpretation, organizing five international conferences so far on this topic. We are also looking forward to the establishment of a new category 2 centre on heritage interpretation, to be approved this November at the 40th session of the General Conference of UNESCO. We are pleased to extend our support to the sites associated with memories of recent conflicts and we believe this topic will offer us an opportunity to enhance our understanding and diversify our views on heritage and the history associated with them. In this vein, we would like to encourage the States Parties to participate in this valuable initiative. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have apply from Finland. Please, Finland.

The Observer Delegation of Finland:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As Finland takes the floor for the first time, we would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to Azerbaijan for hosting us with such hospitality and kindness. We thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their in-depth reports and we appreciate the difficulties that the Committee struggles with as it tackles the challenging issues concerning World Heritage sites. However, as we have heard and read, there is an increasing number of World Heritage sites that struggle to protect their Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage sites are the crown jewels of our common natural and cultural heritage. Therefore, it is of utmost concern that many of them are threatened. As international community, we owe it to ourselves and to the future generations to take care of them. Finland is happy to welcome new nominations, especially so as a more balanced World Heritage List is achieved and so that the world's exceptional natural and cultural sites are recognized. Nevertheless, we should try to focus our unfortunately limited resources also on strengthening the protection and mitigation of negative effects on existing World Heritage sites, as these are facing many challenges.

In this regard, we would like to take this opportunity to salute the State Party of Mexico for their readiness to welcome the inclusion of the World Heritage site, Islands and Protected Areas of Gulf of California into the List of World Heritage in Danger. We congratulate Mexico for making this a positive opportunity to solve the challenges of the site. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now the floor goes to Denmark, please.

The Observer Delegation of Denmark:

Thank you, Chairperson. As this is the first time Denmark takes the floor, we would like to thank Azerbaijan for the warm hospitality we have received in Baku and to compliment you for this very well organized Committee meeting. After having witnessed the Committee's discussions and decisions on the state of conservation reports and bearing in mind the 42nd session of the

Committee meeting, the State Party of Denmark wants to reiterate the concerns that we expressed in Manama over the Committee's tendency to deviate from the expert bodies advice in their decisions and the impact it might have on the credibility on the World Heritage List. It seems now as if this tendency is becoming practice. Since the meeting in Manama, a serious and thorough work has been done by the ad hoc working group, summed up in 16 recommendations, all with the potential to contribute to better nominations and more efficiency among the Committee and more confidence among the Committee, the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and States Parties.

Some of the ad hoc working group's recommendations deal with new methodologies or modified formats, that is to say, more technical matters. Others like the proposed code of conduct are dealing with a change in mind set and attitude and are as such dependent on the will among all of us to comply with it once adopted. We congratulate the ad hoc working group and the results so far and want to express our sincere hope that the work will continue in the same holistic and pragmatic way and fulfil the aim.

Now at the opening of discussions of nominations to the World Heritage List, the State Party of Denmark urges the Committee to listen to the advice from the expert bodies and to take decisions based on objective and scientific considerations and we wish you every success in doing so. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I don't see any applies for interventions. Oh, no, we have Sweden, please.

The Observer Delegation of Sweden:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Since this is the first time our delegation takes the floor, I would like to thank the host country for the warm welcome and excellent organization of the meeting. We have closely followed the Committee's discussion these past days and would like to share with you some reflections.

Sweden considers the work on conservation and preservation to be at the very core of the World Heritage Convention. Sustainable development should be fully integrated. We see no contradiction between conservation on the one hand and sustainable development on the other. On the contrary, successful conservation of World Heritage sites goes hand-in-hand with sustainable development, economic, social and environment and thus mutually reinforcing. We would like to underline that inscription of sites that lack adequate protection and management is problematic since many of these sits risk resulting in state of conservation reports shortly after their inscription. Such problems can be avoided if they are addressed in the nomination process. Moreover, hasty nominations have financial consequences. This is important to be aware of especially since the Committee has decided to prioritize conservation over nominations. All States Parties should take into account the Global Strategy for a balanced and credible World Heritage List when preparing Tentative Lists and nominations. The Global Strategy is a tool for a credible implementation of the Convention.

Finally, the work with World Heritage should reinforce the implementation of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development. In this regard, we would also like to underline the importance of taking into account gender equality in the work of the Convention as well as the fundamental role of civil society. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. L'Angola aimerait également faire quelques commentaires par rapport au processus d'inscription des biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, notamment pour la région Afrique. Comme vous le savez, l'Afrique continue à être sous-représentée dans cette liste ; d'ailleurs cette année nous n'avons qu'un seul bien qui va être inscrit. Donc nous demandons au Centre, aux organes consultatifs et évidemment à tous les partenaires qui accompagnent l'Afrique de continuer à apporter leur soutien aux États parties africains en termes de renforcement des capacités et également d'assistance internationale pour des processus en amont, qui devraient permettre aux États parties de préparer des dossiers en meilleure condition pour pouvoir les présenter pour inscription.

Ensuite, les États africains sont concernés également par la question des sites liés aux mémoires et conflits récents, donc nous voulons également sur ces chapitres-là que les activités soient menées de telle façon que des directives claires soient définies afin de permettre aux États parties africains qui sont intéressés par cette thématique de pouvoir présenter des sites pour inscription dans les années qui suivent. Nous pensons que le Centre et les organes consultatifs ainsi que le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain pourraient se mettre ensemble, ainsi que des centres de catégorie 2 d'autres régions qui pourraient venir en renforcement de toute cette stratégie, afin de permettre aux États parties africains de pouvoir s'améliorer, et cela permettra justement que la stratégie globale soit mise en œuvre de manière juste, pour qu'on ait une Liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée, crédible et représentative. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Slovenia, please.

The Observer Delegation of Slovenia:

Mr Chairperson, thank you for giving me the floor and sincere thanks on behalf of our delegation for the warm welcome we experienced in Baku. Allow me a short statement on behalf of Slovenia conveying a message of our shared responsibility for the conservation of World Heritage properties. As mentioned already in the report under items 5 and 12 and just presented by the Secretariat an important reflection on the much-needed revision of the nomination process has been formally launched.

The ongoing reflection is bringing together Committee Members, Observers, States Parties, the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies as well as experts and relevant stakeholders. As we are continuously faced with the growing complexity of the cases examined by the Committee, be it SOC reports or the nominations, we are becoming increasingly concerned for the future of the World Heritage List and what it stands for. We have decided on a proactive approach contributing our expertise and experience, readiness to exchange and willingness to learn.

Allow me to thank the Centre, Advisory Bodies and colleagues from a number of countries. We greatly appreciate their active roles and hope that more States Parties will articulate their views at the forthcoming General Assembly in November allowing for a larger policy debate on many clearly interconnected issues at stake.

Chairperson, some of the visible strengths of the World Heritage system are grounded on the established procedures and mechanisms that follow the methodology of a scientific-based approach and are a part of a well-defined process. We strongly believe we should build upon these principles to avoid tensions arriving at the decision-making stage. Credibility is the key issue connected to the future of the Convention in our view, credibility of the entire set of processes all involve partners and actions that follow on site.

In closing, we look forward to the discussion on the proposed steps of the reform of the nomination process with the preliminary assessment as one of its crucial elements. Slovenia stands ready to contribute further in the framework of the ad hoc working group and beyond. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. And Switzerland.

La Délégation de la Suisse (Observateur):

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Suisse se félicite des efforts qui ont été entrepris durant l'année passée pour améliorer le processus d'inscription. Ces travaux sont cruciaux pour l'avenir de la Convention et nous aimerions remercier les États parties de l'Azerbaïdjan, de l'Australie et de la Tunisie qui ont soutenu et rendu possible ces discussions. Toutefois, les décisions sur les états de conservation des derniers jours ont démontré que nous avons besoin de nous concentrer davantage sur le mandat que nous donne la Convention du patrimoine mondial. Le mécanisme de l'inscription sur la Liste en péril, par exemple, existe, il a fait ses preuves, il aide les États parties, mais il n'a pas été appliqué comme prévu par la Convention et les Orientations, ce qui est regrettable et ce qui ne contribue pas au bon fonctionnement de la Convention, et surtout pas non plus à la meilleure conservation de biens concernés. Dans ce sens et en vue des décisions à prendre sur les inscriptions cette année, nous sommes confiants que le Comité sera conscient de sa responsabilité, et nous aimerions remercier les pays qui ont retiré leur nomination, qui ne sont pas recommandés pour inscription, contribuant ainsi à la crédibilité de la Convention et aussi à la sérénité des décisions du Comité. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler for some comments and answers to questions.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson and I would like to thank the Committee and all States Parties for the very rich debate under this general Item 8. I would like just to comment on a few points, which were raised. First of all, the issue on the sites of memory and recent conflicts, as I explained in our Secretariat's report we intend to do the meeting in December 2019 if we have the funds and we have under Item 5A already a commitment by a Committee Member but we currently don't have enough funds to do the meeting.

Secondly, the whole discussion on conservation. Conservation is the key issue of this Convention; it's the most important Convention globally with 193 countries having ratified it and the key issue is really conservation of both biodiversity and cultural diversity. I noted a couple of points, gender equality we have covered in our Secretariat's report and very importantly of course, the points by Angola on capacity building, especially in the Africa region together with our Africa World Heritage Fund which is a UNESCO category 2 centre and we will certainly strengthen that. That is all I would like to say at this stage because Items 7 and 8 remain open for any further debates. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. This Committee makes decisions guided by experts, but also guided by politicians, but also guided by other means of making decisions. Humans are created with

weaknesses and imperfections, and therefore cannot be perfect and so we cannot be perfect in our undertakings. However, during our discussion on the state of conservation on the World Heritage properties Tanzania has always been against putting a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger before the identification of the corrective measures and before the road map to how it comes off the Danger list. We have heard distinguished delegates of this Committee saying that the guidelines are adequately followed. We would want to be enlightened on how paragraphs 183 and 189 are applied so that we also go out of this room with knowledge from those who are aware on how those paragraphs are used. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Following the discussion in Bahrain, we have done in Bosnia and Herzegovina the whole work changing regulation about protection of national heritage using all the international guidelines and conventions and to prepare to work with other national monuments especially on the Tentative List of World Heritage and I think that every country should first do whole work then to join the international stage. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Ms Rössler, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much. There was one question from Tanzania which is the procedure for the inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and there could be additions by our legal adviser in case of need. So, in 183 it clearly states that when the Committee puts a site on the Danger list, as far as possible, in consultation with the State Party you should have a desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and the programme for corrective measures, and this is directly linked to the provisions in the Convention itself.

Now this “as far as possible”—there are situations where this is not possible. Because normally we would send a mission and the mission then discusses with the State Party the details of the desired state of conservation. We had situations in this Committee, especially in conflict regions, where we are clearly not even able to establish any such desired state of conservation, because we are not able to go on site so there is this provision of “as far as possible”. I am aware that you are concerned about a number of sites which are on the Danger list where this has not been done but the normal procedure is actually we need to work very, very closely with the State Party to define its desired state of conservation. I am absolutely with you that this has not been done for a number of sites. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So I hope there are no other amendments now for the time being because Item 8 remains open as we are agreed along with Item 7 and we will be approving them at the end of the day.

It is now time for us to consider nominations of properties to the World Heritage List. I would like to recall that the relevant working documents concerning nominations are: 8B and 8B.Add. The Advisory Bodies' Evaluations can be found in the information documents: ICOMOS INF.8B1 and INF.8B1.Add and IUCN INF.8B2 and INF.8B2.Add.

Let me also recall that document INF.8B3 presents the list of all nominations received by 1 February 2019 with the indication of those, which were deemed complete. These nominations will not be discussed during our debates here, as they are foreseen to be examined at our next Committee session in 2020 in China.

Document INF.8B4 presents factual errors identified by States Parties in the Advisory Bodies' Evaluations and it was distributed to you on Monday, the first day of the Committee session. I now invite the Secretariat to present this document and read out the list of nominations for which factual errors notifications have been received and to add some explanations. Mr Balsamo, you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. In compliance with paragraph 150 and the Annex to the Operational Guidelines, the notification of factual errors as submitted by the concerned States Parties and reviewed by the relevant Advisory Bodies are presented in the language in which they have been submitted.

It is important to recall that Annex 12 of the Operational Guidelines is the official format of submission of factual errors identifying the Advisory Bodies' evaluations and only notification received by the statutory deadline and submitted in the appropriate form of Annex 12 have been made available and included in document INF.8B4. The comments made by the Advisory Bodies in the right column indicate whether the information submitted is actually considered a factual error or not.

This year, we received 25 factual error notifications concerning the following nominations to be examined: Iran, Hyrcanian Forests; Thailand, Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex; Albania, Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid region; Australia, Budj Bim Cultural Landscape; Austria, Großglockner High Alpine Road; Austria/Germany/Hungary/Slovakia, Frontiers of the Roman Empire–The Danube Limes; Azerbaijan, Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace; Burkina Faso, Ancient ferrous metallurgy site; Canada, Writing-on-Stone/ Áísínai'pi; China, Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City; Czechia/German, Erzgebirge/ Krušnohoří Mining Region; Czechia, Landscape for Breeding and Training of Ceremonial Carriage Horses at Kladruhy nad Labem; Germany, Water Management System of Augsburg; India, Jaipur City, Rajasthan; Indonesia, Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto; Iraq, Babylon; Jamaica, Sunken City of Port Royal – A Relict and Continuing Cultural Landscape; Japan, Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group: Mounded Tombs of Ancient Japan; Lao People's Democratic Republic, Megalithic Jar Sites in Xiengkhuang–Plain of Jars; Portugal, Royal Building of Mafra–Palace, Basilica, Convent, Cerco Garden and Hunting Park (Tapada); Portugal, Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte in Braga; Republic of Korea, Seowon, Korean Neo-Confucian Academies; Russian Federation, Monuments of Ancient Pskov; United States of America, The 20th-Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright; and one for the minor boundary modification proposed by France in Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments.

Before the presentation of the concerned nominations by the Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat will announce the related factual error notification received. And for those notifications of factual errors recognized by the concerned Advisory Body as such and that have an impact on the proposed Statement of OUV, the amendment is already included in the text that will be shown on the screen in track changes. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you, Mr Balsamo. Any objections from the Committee Members? I don't see any. So let's proceed then. Let's now move to the first Draft Decisions of Document 8B concerning proposed changes to names of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. Mr Balsamo, you are welcome again.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. At the request of the Sri Lankan authorities, the Committee is asked to approve a change to the English and French name of the property, Golden Temple of Dambulla, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991. The name of the property becomes Rangiri Dambulla Cave Temple in English and Temple troglodyte de Rangiri Dambulla in French. Draft decision 43 COM 8B.1 is on page 1 in both the English and French working document 8B. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Are there any objections to this change? As far as I know, the Rapporteur hasn't received any amendments or other draft to this item so we can proceed. Thank you. So now I invite you—Spain, I remember. I remember. I now invite you to adopt draft decision 43 COM 8B.1, but before doing so, I would like to ask the Rapporteur if she has received anything?

Rapporteur:

We have no amendments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So it is adopted. Thank you very much. I now invite Mr. Balsamo to present the second name change. Please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. At the request of Ukrainian authorities, the Committee is asked to approve change to the English and French name of Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra, inscribed on the World Heritage in 1990. The name of the property becomes Kyiv: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra in English and *Kyiv : Cathédrale Sainte-Sophie et ensemble des bâtiments monastiques et Laure de Kyiv-Petchersk* in French. Please note that under the request and in agreement with the concerned State Party, three minor corrections highlighted in green have been introduced in the version of the draft decision, which should now be on the screen. Draft decision 43 COM 8B.2 is on page 1 in both the English and French working documents 8B. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We don't have any proposals for the draft. Thank you. Can we approve? Thank you very much. Our next point deals with the withdrawals of nominations to be examined by this session of the Committee and I would like to give the floor first to Spain and then to Mr Balsamo to proceed.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. Dear Members of the Committee, representatives of States Parties, Spain as you know in January of last year presented its nomination for Priorat-Montsant-Siurana, Mediterranean mosaic, agrarian cultural landscape which should have been discussed here in Baku at the 43rd session of the Committee. Unfortunately, this won't be possible since the Spanish State has decided reluctantly to withdraw its nomination as a consequence for recommendation for non-inscription and we consider this unjust. This has been a painful decision. We have the utmost respect for the Advisory Bodies of the Convention and until today they have always undertaken their mission but we do feel that we have a duty to highlight in a constructive manner some of the insufficient and unjust aspects of the evaluation process in our opinion. This has meant that we have had to withdraw the nomination in question. Obviously, we are very disappointed with the incongruences of the evaluation process starting with the actual evaluation mission

that was carried out and then later in the subsequent phases of the assessment and you can see this as evidence in the exchange of correspondence between Spain's Ministry of Culture and ICOMOS. However, we decided to withdraw our nomination in light of this utmost respect that we have especially given that there is an upcoming code of conduct to be discussed here at the Committee and we do this in order to maintain the credibility of the List and the Convention.

In June of this year, the code of conduct is currently in the draft stage, and we think that this means there will be a shared duty on the part of the Centre, the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties to defend the credibility, integrity and the high standards of the Convention from A to Z. So as you can understand, we are not going to be throwing in the towel; we will persevere in pursuing the inscription of this cultural landscape. There have been 12 years of effort and hard work going into this nomination on the part of the men and women who have been shaping this cultural landscape and we are firmly convinced that there is no signs or academic reason why this would not deserve to be defended.

What is more, we believe that this is representative not only of our local geo-cultural specificity but that it also represents those millions of farming men and women, on five continents around the world, who have been working the land in this way working towards maintaining and sustaining small-scale agriculture, respectful of the environment, remaining faithful to their traditions not only for their own survival, but also for sustainability.

That is why we want to state from here and now today that we humbly and respectfully invite as many assessment missions as would be necessary so that we can improve our nomination and submit it at a later stage. We believe that this unexpected result of expert advice for non-inscription would not have come about if we had not unfortunately seen those inconsistencies in the process and that is why we think that this nomination, which is ahead of its time, really does symbolize the philosophy of the United Nations and Agenda 2030 and we will be back. Thank you, sir.

Chairperson:

Now the floor is going to Mr Balsamo to read out the list of nominations withdrawn at the request of the concerned State Party.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. A total of eight nominations were withdrawn, five of them were withdrawn prior to the publication of document 8B, while the other three were withdrawn after the publication of this document and the eight withdrawn nominations are: France/Italy/Monaco: *Alpi del Mediterraneo–Alpes de la Méditerranée*, Italy: Sila Forests Ecosystems, Belgium: Hoge Kempen Rural-Industrial Transition Landscape, Saudi Arabia: The Historic Village of Rijal Almaa in Asir Region of Saudi Arabia, The Delegation of Spain: Priorat-Montsant-Siurana, Mediterranean mosaic, agrarian cultural landscape (1579), Turkey: Historic Guild Town of Mudurnu: Testimonies of Akhism, Turkey: Kızılırmak Delta Wetland and Bird Sanctuary, United Arab Emirates: Sharjah: the Gateway to the Trucial States. Following these withdrawals, the Committee will examine 35 nominations, among which five are for natural sites, two for mixed sites and 28 for cultural sites. Let me take this opportunity to remind you that the complete PDF version of all the nominations that are examined at this session have been made progressively available for consultation on a secure webpage of our website. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any comments? I have an apply from Italy as far as I see, to make a comment. Please.

The Observer Delegation of Italy:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, I would like to express our appreciation to Azerbaijan for the warm welcome and the excellent organization of this Committee. I take the floor on behalf of Italy, France and Monaco on the nomination of an international cross-border property of the Mediterranean Alps, which has just been withdrawn following the joint decision of our three States Parties. We are determined to continue working taking into account the remarks of the Advisory Bodies. This ambitious and highly innovative nomination unites two natural concepts, the Alps and the Mediterranean Sea. It focuses on the extraordinary serial site that connects the southernmost glaciers of the Alps at over 2200m of altitude to deep waters of the western Mediterranean which reach a depth of 2500m, embracing an immense natural heritage. The nomination illustrates a unique geological system of exceptional importance for the study of terrestrial geodynamics, with perspective measure covering 97% of the candidate's size. For decades, Italy, France and Monaco have been actively collaborating at the regional level to protect our mountains and our common sea in multilateral and trilateral agreements. We take into account outcomes of the nomination process in the spirit of consultation and dialogue with IUCN, pursuant to the Operational Guidelines and we commit to keep working together in order to create the conditions to submit again the candidature of the Mediterranean Alps in future nomination cycles. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We take note. Now as we beginning with the examination of nominations, I would like to take this opportunity to recall that Committee decisions are based on objective and scientific considerations, and any appraisal made on its behalf must be thoroughly and responsibly carried out.

The Committee recognizes that such decisions depend upon: a) carefully prepared documentation; b) thorough and consistent procedures; c) evaluation by qualified experts; and d) if necessary, the use of expert referees. The Committee is requested to examine the Draft Decisions presented in the relevant Documents, and, in accordance with paragraph 153 of the Operational Guidelines, take its Decisions.

I wish to stress that for a referred nomination, there is no new nomination file to be prepared and there is no evaluation mission of the relevant Advisory Body foreseen to the site. Also, in compliance with the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, Outstanding Universal Value is recognised at the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List and no recognition of Outstanding Universal Value is foreseen prior to this stage.

I would like to appeal to you all for a strict respect of these important rules during our debates and our decision-making.

We can now proceed with the examination of nominations. This year, we will begin with natural nominations, we will then proceed with mixed nominations, followed by cultural nominations. The order of the examination of nominations is listed on page 4 in both the English and French version of document 8B and I would kindly ask you to follow this order to the extent possible, noting that two nominations numbers 9 and 11 from the list are shifted to tomorrow. For ease of reference, the page numbers of the evaluations in the Advisory Body documents are also shown in the PowerPoint presentations.

As you know, considering the latest withdrawals, currently we have 35 nominations to examine between today and Sunday and, even applying a quite strict scheduling, there will still be an issue of time management as, most probably, we will not be able to achieve the examination of Item 8B by the end of the Sunday session. For this reason, I would like to suggest that the examination of those nominations that are recommended for inscription and do not present any particular potential issue be dealt with in a way to avoid repetitions of interventions aimed

only at congratulating the concerned State Party. I apply to all Members of the Committee as we agreed on behalf of the Committee we will congratulate the State Party and give the floor to their representative to express their view.

To this extent, I will ask for the cooperation of all, Committee Members and Observers alike, as it would be preferable to uniformly apply this standard from the beginning of the examination of all nominations. I apply to the nominees that after the decision please, after the expression of the opinion of the State Party not to arrange celebrations within the hall and express very big emotions here because it prevents us from going further on the examinations of the nominations. Please do it as you wish but please outside this room. I am going to call on ICOMOS and IUCN to be concise in their presentations. And I apply to everyone to please follow the schedule that we approved and we have the timekeeper behind us so you can easily regulate your speeches.

We will start the examination of natural sites now. We will examine five natural nominations. The first one is from China, Migratory Bird Sanctuaries along the Coast of Yellow Sea-Bohai Gulf of China (Phase I), draft decision 43 COM 8B.3. I now invite IUCN to present the nomination. Please, welcome.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Good morning everybody. IUCN's evaluation of this property is on page 3 in both the English and French versions of the IUCN's evaluation report. IUCN met with the State Party of China at its headquarters prior to the Committee meeting, to receive updates and to understand additional commitments for protection. We've also been provided with some 40 pages of additional information during the course of this Committee session but have clearly not had the time to evaluate this in any depth.

The nominated property is a serial site of 16 components as you can see in the map on the left in this slide. Two of the components have been included in the nomination of this first phase, Phase I. Both Jiangsu Dafeng National Nature Reserve, part of Jiangsu Yancheng National Nature Reserve and the newly added area of Tiaozini are all located on the coast of the Yellow Sea. Despite the property's name there are no components yet nominated in the Bohai Sea, which is to the north of this area. Although the two Phase 1 components are among the largest among the envisaged serial property at just over 188,000ha, these remain still a relatively modest representation of what is a vast and complex overall system of tidal mudflats.

The Yellow Sea boasts what is considered the world's largest tidal mudflats due to the combination of shallow water depth, gentle slopes, wide tidal range, marine currents and large river systems permanently discharging vast amounts of sediments. It is exceptionally productive and provides spawning and nursery habitats for many fish and crustacean species. The intertidal mudflats attract a high diversity and enormous numbers of resident and migratory birds. The property supports more than 400 species of birds as well as 26 species of mammals, nine species of amphibians, 14 species of reptiles and over 200 fish species.

These intertidal and coastal systems make a major contribution as an irreplaceable hub of one of the most threatened of the global flyways, the East Asia-Australasia Flyway (EAAF) which links bird populations across at least 21 countries. Large aggregations of birds depend on the coast as a stopover wintering, foraging and breeding ground. Several species in particular depend on the nominated areas and areas adjacent to them for their survival. These include Spoon-billed Sandpiper, Nordmann's Greenshank, Great Knot and the Far Easter Curlew.

In terms of naturalness and intactness the nominated areas are subject to enormous pressures. The overall ecosystem has lost much of its integrity due to the massive transformation, and partial destruction, of much of the coast of the Yellow Sea. Experts

estimate that two-thirds of intertidal wetlands in the Yellow Sea have been lost in the past 50 years. The area is characterised by heavy marine traffic from and to major ports, creating some of the busiest sea routes in the world. The nominated area has been strongly affected by past and ongoing development both on land and in the sea. Recent policy shifts, advocacy, scientific evidence and international cooperation give rise to hope that the area's global importance can be maintained and eventually even be consolidated.

Both Phase I components are state-owned and protected under a range of legal instruments. Resources use is restricted but some fishing and harvesting rights are allocated to local resource uses. Current levels of tourism are limited by difficult and restricted access. Although the two nominated component areas are some of the largest, it is still not clear whether they incorporate all of the attributes contributing to OUV especially for migratory bird species. Birds are adequately protected on site but what is not demonstrated is how this first Phase configuration provides for habitat linkage or ecological function. A better understanding for IUCN of the resilience of the property to external stresses and threats is also needed especially given the intense pressures for land reclamation and development on this coastline.

Concerning criterion (ix), the nominated property is compromised due to upstream dams that have changed the course of the rivers. Sediment dynamics have also been altered by land reclamation, erosion, infrastructure and artificial wetlands and channels. Water and sediment pollution also impact on the naturalness of this system. Concerning criterion (x) the combination of the small representation of the overall intertidal system the Yellow Sea, including the exclusion of key habitats for threatened bird species and other non-intertidal or mudflat habitats, and the profound anthropogenic changes and threats from climate change and alien invasive species call the applicability of this criterion into question. Given this high level of anthropogenic modification pressure on the habitats and the still limited representation of scale and diversity of the large system of the nomination the integrity can be considered marginal from an ecosystem perspective, however, perhaps acceptable from the narrower perspective of critical importance for bird migration.

In summary, IUCN considers that the nominated property has potential to meet World Heritage criteria, however, at this time it does not meet integrity protection and management requirements. A serial approach is the only practical option to protect critical natural habitat and functions across what is one integrated ecosystem. The rationale for our recommendation for deferral is to allow more time to bring forward a single final nomination, which includes the full range of the components.

The draft decision, Mr Chairperson, recommending deferral of the property is set out on page 5 in both the English and French versions of working document 8B. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any comments? Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia thanks IUCN for its very comprehensive evaluation of this nomination. We have carefully considered the nomination and consulted with migratory bird experts with detailed knowledge of the site. These experts come from several countries including Australia. As a result of these deliberations we've concluded that the nominated property is ready for inscription on the World Heritage List. We did not come to this conclusion lightly and recognize this is a significant step up from the recommendation that the nomination be deferred. Judged on its individual merits we consider that the migratory bird sanctuaries along the coast of the Yellow Sea-Bohai Gulf of China Phase I, should be inscribed on the basis of criterion (x).

Therefore, we are very pleased to be the lead proponent for inscription of the property and have proposed amendments to this effect.

The nominated property is an irreplaceable and indispensable hub for birds migrating along the East Asian Australian Flyway, which spans at least 21 countries across two hemispheres from the Arctic to Southeast Asia and Australasia. These flyway countries include Australia and Indonesia. We regard this property as a globally significant example of the shared natural heritage embodied in migratory birds. The nominated property's tidal flats are of exceptional importance to the conservation of the world's biodiversity especially migratory birds and are significant for more than 10% of the East Asian Australian Flyway populations. The nominated property supports international significant numbers of migratory birds species including critically endangered, endangered and other IUCN red-list species including two of the world's rarest migratory birds, the critically endangered Spoon-billed Sandpiper and the endangered Nordmann's Greenshank both of which depend on these tidal flats for their continued survival.

We find much value in the assessment and guidance embodied in the draft decision prepared by IUCN and have incorporated this into the amendments to provide a clear framework to support China in bringing forward the Phase II nomination. Our support for this inscription is made on the understanding that China is in agreement with the six requests set out in our amendments, which should be implemented in time for consideration at the 47th session of the Committee in 2023. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. As far as I understand there is a unanimous proposal on...Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Indonesia would like to second the amendment proposed by Australia to inscribe the nomination of Migratory Bird Sanctuaries along the Coast of Yellow Sea-Bohai Gulf of China with conditions. Together with Australia, we are the only Committee Members who share the migratory water birds that depend on this property. Of more than 20 countries the East Asian Australian Flyway, Indonesia is among the highest proportion of these migratory water birds during migration to the northern breeding seasons. We have designated many protected areas for these species including Deli Serdang in North Sumatra and other islands of Indonesia as flyway natural sites for which this Phase I nomination of China is of critical importance.

Indonesia considers that Phase I nomination well meets criterion (x) and commends the government of China on their recent far-reaching measures to halt threats and ensure the integrity of their coastal wetlands. Without their commitment, the number of water birds that form part of Indonesia's conservation areas would unquestionably continue to decline, no matter what conservation action we take in our country.

Mr Chairperson, given the importance of the Yellow Sea to the entire East Asian Australian Flyway the inscription of this property will contribute towards the conservation of natural heritage not just in the Yellow Sea eco-regions but also across the entire East Asian Australian Flyway that Indonesia is privileged to be a part of. It would also be an outstanding symbol of the conservation of a property for its natural attributes and will hopefully encourage efforts as well in Asia to protect intertidal wetlands. Due to the urgency of the crisis facing these shared migratory water bird populations and the need to maintain momentum for their conservation, Indonesia feels that Phase I of China's Yellow Sea nomination should be inscribed without delay. The support of the international conservation community through its stronger conservation instrument the World Heritage Convention is urgently needed. I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie qui, comme vous l'avez remarqué, soutient l'amendement qui est soumis à ce Comité, tient à souligner l'importance de cette inscription, parce que cela constitue une première étape dans le processus de protection de cet élément naturel et biologique extrêmement fragile. Ce sanctuaire, une fois inscrit, sera déjà un premier pas pour mettre en place un cadre idoine pour répondre aux défis de protection. Je crois que les interventions des honorables représentants de l'Australie et de l'Indonésie, qui sont des pays de la zone et qui sont concernés par le phénomène biologique et naturel de manière plus globale, sont un témoignage précieux et un gage d'une coopération internationale future pour la protection de ces espèces extrêmement importantes. Donc je souligne le soutien de la Tunisie au projet d'amendement.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We would also like to support Australia's draft amendment. As one of the Committee Members, we believe that one of the most important suggestions for the ecosystems and migratory birds is this one. This site houses such important significant numbers of species that are very important and must be conserved. We congratulate and thank the State Party of China for the entire contribution it is making towards conservation on a world basis. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania has followed with keen interest the submission for nomination by China of the 16 components serial and quite extensive but very important property for migratory bird sanctuaries along the Yellow Sea-Bohai Gulf of China (Phase 1). Together with the detailed analysis and subsequent recommendations by IUCN we admit, Chairperson, that the treatment by IUCN of this complex submission was comprehensive and balanced both in context and depth of analysis and we would like to thank them for the work well done. We are also aware that the State Party of China has been following up on this nomination with great commitment and enthusiasm and as such it has maintained continuous and constructive consultation with the Advisory Bodies in efforts to address the major concerns that surround this submission. We are also in possession of supplementary information, Chairperson, on this site that we find very helpful indeed. IUCN does not dispute that the proposed site meets criteria (ix) and (x) but has variably raised some concerns on conditions of integrity, protection and management with some components of this nomination.

The situation that we are facing here, Chairperson, is that we have near extinction and deterioration of scores of globally important threatened bird species, notably the endemic Spoon-billed Sandpiper and the Spotted Greenshank. On the whole, we are noting here declines of between 70-90% of the population of these species over a span of 30 years on record. Given the noticeable geographical and logistical complexity of this nomination we therefore find it logical and indeed warranted to inscribe its components in stages rather than in a holistic fashion as proposed by IUCN. However, we highly encourage the State Party to

China to hasten the plans of working on the nomination for Phase II of this serial nomination so as to further strengthen the conditions for its nomination.

Chairperson, my delegation supports the amended draft decision as originally submitted by Australia so as to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I apply to the Committee Members; the matter is that we have the draft decision already signed by more than 14 Members of the Committee. The interventions as far as I hear are repeating the same idea to support this decision. Are there any objections or maybe some other ideas concerned with that or can we to save time and have the Rapporteur inform us of the new draft decision to begin approving the document? If there is someone who insists on the floor, please you are welcome. If there is something not peculiar changes the sense of the discussion. Azerbaijan, you insist on your word? Then leave it down. Angola, you insist? Thank you very much. May I go to the Rapporteur with the new draft decision?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Yes, as you noted we have 18 countries that have supported this. I'll read them out just once to make it a little easier as we go through the decision rather than listing the countries, just be taken that the group of countries refer to these 18. So it was proposed by the delegation of Australia and then supported by Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Brazil, Cuba, Hungary, Indonesia, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Norway, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe and Spain. And I wouldn't be surprised if a few others also.

The first paragraph remains unchanged. The second paragraph would read, Inscribes the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries along the Coast of Yellow Sea- Bohai Gulf of China (Phase I), China, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (x). And if I just ask the typist we could write there was a "the" missing. Paragraph 3, Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value—which I won't read in its entirety but I know the Committee has considered. Paragraph 4, Underlines the global conservation significance of the East Asian Australasian Flyway (EAFF) and the critical importance of Yellow Sea region habitat for the survival of many species of migratory shorebirds.

Paragraph 5 would read, Notes that the decision to inscribe the property is made on the understanding that the State Party is in agreement with the following requests of the Committee, which should be implemented in time for consideration at the 47th session of the Committee in 2023 in order to address fully the requirements of the Operational Guidelines. Point 5 a) That the State Party submit a single Phase II nomination that includes all the additional components of the proposed serial listing as a whole, in order to reflect the full range of natural wealth and diversity of the eco-region and to meet integrity requirements. Point 5 b) The Phase II nomination a is supported by a comprehensive and detailed overview and analysis of priority conservation areas in the Yellow Sea and Bohai Gulf, including the fourteen additional areas identified in the Phase I nomination, fully taking into account ecosystem and habitat diversity of the coastal system, proposed boundaries, values (including species occurrence, abundance and conservation status), threats, integrity, protection and management. The former point b) would be deleted. And then point c) Confirm, with appropriate support from peer-reviewed literature, the specific presence of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value within the boundaries of the Phase II nomination and their relationship to the inscribed property, including the presence and size of populations of any endemic and threatened species, and of globally significant migratory bird species. Points d) and e) remain unchanged. Point f), Provide evidence of more effective coordination of management of the entire serial property including planning for any increasing tourism

demand, including the development of appropriately scaled and low impact tourism in the property.

Paragraph 6, Notes with appreciation the confirmed commitment demonstrated by the State Party and local authorities to protecting the Tiaozini area of the Yellow Sea, as an integral part of the inscribed property. Paragraph 7 would read, Encourages all related States Parties in the flyway to cooperate with each other in relation to the potential for future transboundary serial nominations, and/or extensions, that more fully reflect the habitat needs and patterns of use of migratory birds along the East Asian Australasian Flyway. Paragraph 8, Requests IUCN to closely cooperate with State Party to ensure that the future nomination can satisfy the requirements provided in paragraph 5 and the target in paragraph 7.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I give the floor to IUCN for brief information.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and thank you to the Committee Members for your views on this property. I didn't detect any specific questions. Perhaps just to respond more generally our views and rationale were well articulated in the evaluation. I won't go through and repeat them here. That said, IUCN recognizes the ambition and conceptual complexity of this large-scale serial approach to conserving what is clearly a critical part of one of the most important flyways on earth. Our evaluation speaks to the values of the nominated properties in this system. We do greatly appreciate the efforts, agility and the commitment of the State Party of China in their response to the issues, which were raised in the evaluation. We very much reiterate while we have not had the opportunity to evaluate, we are fully committed to working with the State Party of China on the recommendations which we see in the amendment draft decision and in particular I would note that of the remaining components which were put forward in this property we understand that there is flexibility to review and look at some of those and we are very willing to work with China in that regard in line as I said with the decision that is before us. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as I understand, most Members of the Committee agree on this text provided to the Rapporteur. If there is no particular objection on the text provided, I would like to propose to you to adopt it in common. I don't see any objections from any Committee Member. Therefore I declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.3 adopted as amended. Approved. *[Applause]* On behalf of the Committee Members please allow me to express our heartfelt congratulations to China for the inscription on the World Heritage List. The floor is yours, China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. Thank you, Committee. The State Party of China would like to express its most sincere appreciation to Australia and other Committee Members as well as a wide range of international NGOs for their recognition of the global importance of the nominated property. We are also grateful to IUCN for their constructive advice. This inscription demonstrates the firm commitment of the State Party of China to the conservation of World Heritage. We have set an example for subsequent sites for the nomination of the East Asian Australasian Flyway. I would like now to invite two very important members of this nomination, Madam Zhou who is the representative of the National Forestry and Grassland Administration (NFGA) and also the Mayor of Yancheng, Mr Cao who owns this Phase II property. Thank you.

Representative of the National Forestry and Grassland Administration:

Thank you, Chairperson. On behalf of the National Forestry and Grassland Administration, I would like to extend our sincere thanks to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the long-

term support and assistance in world heritage conservation in China. The Chinese government attaches a high level of importance on the protection of world heritage and the construction of ecological civilization as a national strategy. During the institutional restructuring of government in 2018 the management of all natural and mixed heritages as well as all kinds of protected areas shifted to the NFGA and conservation measures were enhanced accordingly. This shows the strong willingness of the Chinese Government to protect the biodiversity and important ecosystems and to abide by the green development concept and promote ecological civilization. To be inscribed in the World Heritage List not only means a great honor, but also more responsibilities. The Chinese Government will continuously implement the World Heritage Convention. In the meantime, the Chinese Government will initiate the second phase of the nomination as soon as possible. Thank you.

Mayor:

I'm the Mayor of Yancheng city. Yancheng is a city surrounded by wetlands. For decades, we have made an arduous effort to protect the property. The OUV of this area has been recognized at this meeting, which strengthens our confidence to improve wetland protection and management. In the future, we will continue to enhance dialogue, communication and cooperation, more actively taking part in the global ecosystem governance to ensure the harmonious coexistence of humans and nature and protect our homeland together with you. On behalf of the 8M people of Yancheng city, I would like to invite you to Yancheng to visit our unique wetlands and to see the wildlife and to experience the invaluable paradise for millions of migratory birds. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, honorable Mayor. *[Applause]*. Now Birdlife International on behalf of the NGOs, please, you have two minutes.

Observer NGO (Birdlife International):

Thank you, Chairperson. I from Birdlife International with Eco Foundation Global speak on behalf of the 62 NGOs and experts from around the world including along the East Asian Australasian Flyway who co-signed a letter to the World Heritage Committee Members urging this decision today of inscription under criterion (x) of the first phase of China's Migratory Bird Sanctuaries along the Coast of Yellow Sea-Bohai Gulf of China serial nomination.

We offer our whole-hearted support and gratitude to Australia for the pivotal role they have played in finding a solution for the decision of this Committee and to the other 16 States Parties who co-proposed this amendment which we are convinced will give by far the best outcome for the many threatened birds which depend on the absolutely critical habitat provided by this property. On behalf of those birds, especially the beloved Spoon-billed Sandpiper and of the many people now and of future generations along the flyway and around the world who appreciate them and who benefit from the ecosystems services of the same coastal wetlands we reserve our greatest thanks for China and not least Yancheng city. The vision, ambition and commitment that they have shown to coastal wetland conservation in the past couple of years have been truly astounding and second to none.

Since the submission of the nomination last year, China has made a number of strict and major changes to national policy which will directly benefit not only both Phases of the nomination but also the wetland ecosystem of China's entire coast. These include restricting further land reclamation, while requiring substantial restoration of coastal ecosystems and a ban on new wind farms in ecologically sensitive areas. These will allow China to meet the strict requirements for protection management of the property as required by your Convention. We stand ready to support China in fulfilling the conditions suggested by IUCN and the Australian amendment and in supporting China in their further endeavours in this regard in any way possible.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Once more congratulations to China and now we move to another item.

I now invite IUCN to present the nomination of the Hyrcanian Forests, Islamic Republic of Iran. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr Balsamo you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. This is just to remind the Committee that we received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the Hyrcanian Forests nomination and this is to be found on page 2 of the English version of this document and page 2 as well in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. IUCN, please, you have the floor.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. IUCN's evaluation of the property is on page 17 in both the English and French versions of the IUCN Evaluation Report. The nominated property is situated in the Caspian Hyrcanian mixed forests eco-region stretching 850km along the southern coast of the Caspian Sea. The nominated site is a serial site with 15 components covering two main ecotones separated from the Caucasus to the west and from the semi-desert areas to the east. In total around 7% of the remaining Hyrcanian Forests in Iran, which is 1.85M hectares has been included in the nomination. All components are surrounded by buffer zones and six of them are configured into three clusters.

The 15 components represent examples of the various stages and features of the Hyrcanian Forest ecosystem from swamp forests up to the treeline and subalpine meadows and even some alpine ecosystems. The Hyrcanian Region also includes non-forested rangelands above the timberline, as well as formerly forested lowland areas. The nominated property contains Arcto-Tertiary relicts from broad-leaved forests that 25-50 million years ago covered most parts of the Northern Temperate Zone. The 15 components have been selected as the best and sometime unique existing examples of the relict forest. Apart from this continuous forested belt shared between three provinces there are some smaller forests ecosystem rich in Hyrcanian species remaining in Azerbaijan and a few patches only with scrub forests in Turkmenistan.

The Hyrcanian Forest is considered as an origin for European broad-leaved forests and hosts many relict, endangered, regional and local endemic flora species. The floristic biodiversity is remarkable with over 3,200 vascular plants documented of which approximately 280 taxa are endemic and sub-endemic for the Hyrcanian Region and about 500 species are Iranian endemics. To date, 58 mammal species and 180 birds have been recorded. The Persian leopard and the wild goat are the most threatened and iconic mammals on the property. Many birds on the IUCN red list such as the Steppe Eagle, European Turtle Dove, the Eastern Imperial Eagle, the European Roller and Semi-collared Flycatcher as well as the near-endemic Caspian Tit have also been observed in the region.

The narrow coastal plains along the Caspian Sea are heavily degraded and almost entirely converted into cultivated lands, however, the forest ecosystems have so far been preserved at higher altitudes. The main potential threats identified for the Hyrcanian Forests include unsustainable grazing within the components and overgrazing in their buffer zones; illegal logging and deadwood collection; an unregulated access system with vehicle traffic on forest roads; poaching; and unsustainable tourism. Climate change may also be noted as a potential threat, for example, through changes in precipitation and cloud cover patterns.

Although the boundaries of the components do not align with legally protected areas, the State Party has provided additional information confirming that every component is strictly protected by national legislation and utilization of the area is legally regulated in all components. That said, there is a need to improve enforcement of legal protection and to harmonize the boundaries of the protected areas with the World Heritage property if inscribed by the Committee. The management of the property's components is under the responsibility of three national agencies. The cooperation between these organizations is functioning well and a newly established coordination mechanism across the whole serial property should guarantee full comprehensive management of the site in the future. Each component has a management plan and there are proposals to develop a master management plan for the property, which should be expedited.

In conclusion, IUCN considers the requirement for integrity, protection and management are met and has made some recommendations concerning the need for improved law enforcement and road closure and access management. In summary, IUCN considers that the nominated property meets criterion (ix) as it covers most of the environmental features and ecological values of the whole Hyrcanian Region. IUCN further considers that the nominated property has the potential to meet criterion (x) but there is a need to undertake inventories, which confirm the presence of key species within the 15 components. The draft decision recommending inscription of this nominated property under criterion (ix) is set out on page 5 in both the English and French versions of working document 8B. IUCN has also recommended the potential for this property should it be inscribed to be extended to incorporate the Hyrcanian Forest in Azerbaijan and has been pleased to initiate discussions with the host country here to explore. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. My delegation congratulates the State Party for the successful nomination. We also appreciate the IUCN evaluation of this nomination. We would like to mention that as a unique ecosystem in itself the Hyrcanian Forest has an OUV, which plays a highly important role as a main tool for ecosystem services of the region. As a common and transboundary forest ecosystem the Hyrcanian Forest covers the territory of two countries--as it was already mentioned by IUCN--the Republic of Azerbaijan and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Since 2006, the Vilnius decision which was already mentioned in the draft decision, the government of Azerbaijan took very important measures in the field of conservation and protection of the Hyrcanian Forest as a common ecosystem for future generations as well as protecting it from possible human factors and climate change. During this period, Azerbaijan has established a national park at the base of Hyrcanian reserve in its territory. Regarding this process, Azerbaijan has updated its national legislation, the territory of the national park has been broadened from 20,000 to 40,000 hectares and the buffer zone has also been widened and made precise in important scope. Better conditions have been organized for the population of rare flora and fauna species in the area of the national park and at the same time management of the territory has been increased.

Given all this information, Azerbaijan regrets that we were not able to present a joint nomination with the Islamic Republic of Iran and celebrate the inscription of this unique natural site together, as this could be another testimony of successful transboundary cross-border cooperation that we are enjoying with the Islamic Republic of Iran for the last year. However, we appreciate the recommendation of IUCN for dialogue between States Parties concerned and we would like to emphasize that Azerbaijan is ready and interested in the preparation of a transboundary nomination adding Azerbaijan as part of the Hyrcanian Forest inscribed today.

We would be happy to work in a very constructive way with the Islamic Republic of Iran and IUCN in order to have extensions of this file. At the end, Mr Chairperson, I would like to kindly ask you to add our statement to the summary records of today's discussion. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. It will definitely be added. Now I don't see any other comments from the Committee Members. Do we have any additional draft amendments on this item?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have just a technical correction in the final paragraph of the decision to reflect the appropriate country name for the Republic of Azerbaijan but other than this correction the decision remains un-amended.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. If there are no other proposals or objections I therefore declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.4 adopted [*applause*]. Let me congratulate the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the entire Committee for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List and express the hope that soon Azerbaijan will also join this project. Now the representative of the State Party of Iran, please, you are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We would like to extend our sincere thanks to the distinguished Committee Members as well as IUCN for the decision taken regarding our nomination. Mr Chairperson, in 2016 the Desert of Lut was inscribed. Now the Hyrcanian Forest, from desert to forest the ecosystem diversity. It is a historical event for our country that will introduce this valuable natural treasure to the world. The inscription of the Hyrcanian Forest will open up new horizons bringing about a high level of protection for the Forest and a new vision for future generations. Thanks to all the local communities in five provinces of Iran and the Succow Foundation and also the host country, the Republic of Azerbaijan for their warm hospitality and for the magnificent event. We sincerely invite the Republic of Azerbaijan to join the Hyrcanian Forest World Heritage site by an extension nomination.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

The Observer Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran:

The glowing Hyrcanian Forests, which are amazingly diverse, would wonder if I didn't greet them in poetic verse. Experts have travelled 50 million years back in time to explore the wonderland of Hyrcanian forests, so sublime. One can wander in them joyfully for hours upon hours, surrounded by the mystery of their mesmerizing flowers. Gaze and admire the marvelous wealth of biodiversity, of these rare ancient woodlands beside the Caspian Sea. Their swaying proud branches, which are beyond words, are tipsy with hundreds of types of singing birds. Eagles majestically soar over the mountains so steep, as among the rocks wild goats playfully skip and leap. Majestic Persian leopards mysteriously prowl and roam, reveling in this wilderness that they have made their home. The mysteries of these forests, for millions of years concealed, did not imagine that in Baku to the world they would be revealed. The miracle of World Heritage is making a channel through history to uncover from the dust of ages what has been cloaked in mystery. Bringing to human hearts secrets that on perfumed winds used to blow through this vast enchanted forest millions of years ago. Today I can hear the urgency of the cry of each and every tree begging us to save the environment: dear friends, heed their plea! A chorus sings for the inscription of this precious nomination, birds in flight together to ensure this treasure's full conservation. Dear neighboring Republic of Azerbaijan,

shall I mention that we are eagerly awaiting the Hyrcanian extension. We are eagerly awaiting the nomination from the Republic of Azerbaijan will arrive. Thank you. [applause]

Chairperson:

Thank you for such a poetic intervention. Thank you. Once more we congratulate the Islamic Republic of Iran for this inscription. We proceed to the next item.

I now invite IUCN to present the nomination of Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex, Thailand. The Draft Decision concerning this nomination can be found in document 8B.Add. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr Balsamo you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. This is to remind you that we received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex, which is to be found on page 3 in both the English and French versions of document INF.8B.4. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. IUCN, the floor is yours.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. IUCN's evaluation of this property is on page 7 in both the English and French versions of the ADD IUCN Evaluation Report. IUCN recalls that this property has been through a process of two previous referrals. Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex was originally nominated in and referred back to the State Party by the Committee in 2015 to fully assess a range of issues including concerns raised by the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights concerning Karen communities within the Kaeng Krachan National Park as well as the conservation status and viability of certain populations of threatened species reported from the property. The property was then further considered by the Committee at its 40th session in 2016 and was again referred back in view of the need to continue to resolve concerns raised by the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner including the implementation of a participatory process to resolve rights and livelihood concerns and to achieve a consensus of support for the nomination. The Committee also encouraged the State Party at that time to continue to dialogue with the State Party of Myanmar to address concerns regarding the boundary of the nominated property with respect to the international border between Myanmar and Thailand.

The nominated property presented for evaluation incorporates a significant change in the area that is proposed for inscription so the map on the left, which is not very clear to see—I apologize—but this shows the property as originally nominated. On the right is the adjusted boundary defined in a grid square pattern which was the information provided to IUCN. This adjustment results in a reduction in area of the nominated property of approximately 15% in area. The significant natural values of the nominated property and the area that surrounds it have been documented at length in earlier evaluations. In summary the Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex is a significant part of the Indo-Malayan eco-region. The Complex is located along a section of the 1700km Tenasserim range, which also delineates the international border between the two countries.

The Tenasserim mountains are part of an extensive granite and limestone mountain ridge that is older than the Himalayas. The site is comprised of semi-evergreen, dry-evergreen and moist-evergreen forest. The site is unquestionably of national and regional significance. This is particularly relevant and appropriate for some specific species particularly elephant, gaur and Fea's muntjac which is endemic to this region. Other species represented of global significance include tapir, bears, gibbons and stump-tailed macaque.

The area proposed for inscription remains in the same group of protected areas, which IUCN has previously concluded, provide adequate legal protection but the coordination between the different areas should be enhanced. The new information provided clearly indicates that the State Party has been engaging in a great deal of work to implement the road map that was put in place following the original referral and this is documented in the evaluation. Nevertheless, it is clear that despite efforts by the State Party there is not yet sufficient evidence that the serious concerns previously raised on issues of rights and consent have been addressed satisfactorily.

The Special Procedures branch of the United Nations Office of the High Commission on Human Rights and three special rapporteurs wrote to IUCN expressing significant concerns. IUCN furthermore received direct approaches from local communities concerning lack of awareness about World Heritage and unresolved rights issues. So while IUCN acknowledges the work done by the State Party to address these matters it concluded that more time was needed to reach satisfactory outcomes.

IUCN notes that the change to the boundary results in a significant reduction in the area of the most important nature conservation values that were previously included in the nomination and also reduces the connectivity conservation of the property as nominated. The adjusted boundary follows a grid line pattern and pays no heed to ecological patterns or processes. While extremely important values undoubtedly remain the changes made reduce the potential of the nominated property to meet criterion (x) and potentially criterion (ix) so with no opportunity for a further evaluation in the limited time to assess the revised boundary, IUCN is unable to evaluate the impact on values of this significant change that falls outside of the norm for a deferred nomination.

The draft decision recommending deferral of this property is set out on page 1 in both the English and French versions of working document 8B.Add. IUCN considers the matters raised here cannot be assessed adequately through the referral mechanism, which does not provide opportunities for a field mission thus consultation with either the State Party or affected indigenous peoples and local communities. IUCN is of the view that prior to a further evaluation the preference would be that the State Party engage directly with the United Nations Office of the High Commission on Human Rights to seek a satisfactory resolution of the concerns that have been raised. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any comments? Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway commends Thailand for the persistent work on nature conservation. We are convinced that the property has potential for inscription once the Committee has received sufficient information. As of today we cannot make an informed decision. The area that was evaluated by IUCN in 2014 differs from the current nomination. The changes are so significant that it is necessary to revise the nomination and carry out a new evaluation. A lot may have changed in five years. There are also question related to whether the nomination is sufficiently endorsed by the Karen people, which is another strong argument that a desk review is not sufficient. The current situation portrays significant uncertainty when it comes to the integrity of the property. This entails that some of the most important areas; the ones with the highest biodiversity have been excluded when the area was reduced. Norway supports the draft decision and the recommendation for deferral. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Australia welcomes this nomination of the Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex by the State Party of Thailand. We believe it is a meritorious nomination but regrettably it is not yet ready for inscription. Australia acknowledges that Thailand has worked to address the concerns of the local Karen communities but that there is more work still to be done in that regard. Australia notes that there is no clear independent evidence that consensus agreement for nomination of the property has been obtained from the local Karen communities in accordance with paragraph 123 of the Operational Guidelines. Indeed, we have advice to the contrary from the Karen villages from Ban Bangkloi Bon. Australia notes that Thailand has negotiated with Myanmar to change the western property boundary. The boundary change reduces the area of the property by some 15% and some experts consider that it is likely to compromise the significant biodiversity and nature conservation values of the property. As a result of these factors, Australia considers that the nomination needs to be revised and re-evaluated in relation to criterion (x) and possibly criterion (ix) noting particularly that the most recent evaluation of the property occurred some time ago in 2014. Australia supports therefore the recommendation to defer the nomination.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Indonesian delegation would like to thank IUCN for its report on Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex. After discussing intensively with the State Party, Indonesia feels that the report has not incorporated recent substantial developments that have not been well reflected and hence needs to be updated. Indonesia acknowledges significant progress made by the State Party to address concerns made by the previous Committee's decisions. Just recently last month, the State Party has enacted two new laws namely, the National Parks Act and the Wildlife Conservation Act which provide an enhanced balance between the region and the rights and identity of the local ethnic communities. In addition to that, other human rights based measures are adopted.

With regard to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property we have been informed by the State Party that the report has not presented revised analysis as part of the additional information submitted by the State Party in December 2019. With regard to the delineation of the nominated area, Indonesia is pleased with the recent agreement between the State Party of Thailand and Myanmar resulting from the State Party's technical meeting in April 2019.

Mr Chairperson, in our view the State Party has complied with the recommendations given at the 39th and 40th sessions particularly concerning human rights issues and proposed areas of delineation. The State Party's efforts with related stakeholders have constructed satisfying progress and hence needs to be praised. With the abovementioned explanation there are no reasons why the property should not be inscribed in the World Heritage List. Therefore, the status as proposed by the Advisory Body will not provide incentives; it is an unnecessary setback, which is counterproductive with the conservation effort. In this regard, I would like to request, with the honorable Mr Chairperson's permission, to give the State Party the floor to provide further explanations. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. This is a nomination that has a lot of potential but other delegations said there have been some very important changes

and we would ask just what Indonesia asked for is that we would be very interested in hearing the State Party talk especially to add more information that there seems to have been more information that has come quite recently. If there have been such significant changes, perhaps we could study that a bit but we would very much like to hear the State Party to help us understand why there have been such big changes and to get an opinion, perhaps one that we have been able to reason about, about what seems to be a very well thought out line of reason but we want to understand better. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you, Spain. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Hungary welcomes the efforts of the State Party of Thailand for the protection of the nominated property and also very much appreciates the new information received about the new proposed boundaries of the site. However, because of lack of time and competence, this information cannot be effectively taken into account by our delegation and experts therefore, in agreement with the distinguished delegates of Norway and Australia, we suggest that we keep the original draft decision to defer back the nomination to the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you, Hungary. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. This site was originally proposed for inscription in 2014 and evaluated with a referral at the 39th meeting of the Committee in Bonn in 2015. After submitting additional information to the Committee the site was again evaluated with a referral at its 40th session in Istanbul. Now as the site is once again presented for evaluation by this 43rd Committee IUCN recommends that the nomination be deferred for future consideration. We believe that this evaluation would be highly discouraging for the State Party which has been consistently working on the nomination for the past five years with important developments in this period such as the revision of national legislation to provide a better balance between conservation, the use of environmental resources and the rights of local communities, the constructive dialogue with the local communities on the development of a participatory management process and the active engagement with Myanmar regarding the property's boundary issues.

We also believe that the recommendation regarding the possibility of a transboundary site entails important political decisions that might transcend the Advisory Bodies' technical considerations.

We therefore request that this Committee considers the continued engagement of the State Party in addressing the circumstances pointed out by the Advisory Bodies with visible progress including from the perspective of legal measures. We would therefore support a referral for this nomination. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you, Brazil. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Advisory Bodies for their continuous work with the State Party for this complex dossier for the last four

years. I would also like to echo my colleagues from Brazil and agree with them that we see there is progress with the dossier especially with the legislation and I would also like to hear specifically from the State Party regarding the 2019, the Community Forest Act which deals with the local communities and ethnic groups and how that helps with the United Nations Office of the High Commission for Human Rights, so I think instead of going backwards one step is at least to maintain, a couple of delegations were for referral, and I would like to hear from the State Party specifically about the Forest Act, about the ethnic groups and local communities legislation, the legislation of that Act. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier l'organe consultatif de nous avoir présenté ce rapport. Alors c'est un dossier qui est là entre les mains du Comité et dans le processus d'inscription, depuis un certain temps, une réalité est en train de changer sur le terrain et sur le cadre normatif. Nous suivons attentivement les arguments des uns et des autres mais je crois que c'est extrêmement important de donner la parole, Monsieur le Président, à l'État partie pour nous dire à la fois les mesures qu'il est en train de prendre et surtout le nouveau cadre législatif et normatif qui a été mis en place, ce qui nous permettra probablement d'éclairer la décision de ce conseil et de ce Comité, notamment du fait que l'ensemble des intervenants disent le potentiel extrêmement positif de ce dossier. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. We would like to use this opportunity first of all to commend the State Party of Thailand for their continuous effort in preserving this very important property. Again, it is a matter for the conservation of nature so in a way the earlier inscription of our property echoes somehow again to this every important natural property. Secondly, we are very much in agreement and support what the distinguished ambassador of Brazil has just said that the evaluation process needs to be more consistent. This property has been there for quite some time and the initial referral and all of a sudden now it's downgraded to deferral, somehow needs more clarification. We also feel that it is very important that the distinguished State Party of Thailand should be given an opportunity to present what they have recently done in addressing the concerns of the World Heritage Centre as well as the Advisory Bodies in informing this Committee. I think that we are very pleased to note that they have reached an agreement with the State Party of Myanmar in the demarcation of the border. Therefore, this is a major issue and we have also been assured that the Thai government has taken up adequate measures to ensure the human rights issue. So I would first of all encourage further dialogue between the State Party of Thailand and the Advisory Bodies on this issue and also hope that there will be some solution to be found. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would also like to support the comments made by Brazil as well as other Members of the Committee that have asked the State Party to have the chance to be able to give as many explanations that might be

necessary about this particular nomination and what results the State Party has obtained up to now. I think this would give us a lot more information so that we can take a proper and final decision about this nomination. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. My delegation's statement will be along the lines expressed by several Members of the Committee, which is a matter of concern for the Committee which is consistency of the decisions taken by the Committee and the respect of these decisions by the Advisory Bodies. This issue was discussed in 2015 in Bonn. It was discussed also in 2016 so we need to take into account the position of the Committee and this will not create a dangerous precedence of disregarding the Committee's decision and the guidelines the Committee gives to the Advisory Bodies and to the States Parties. We feel that the State Party faithfully tried to implement those recommendations reflected in previous decisions. The State Party for instance enacted landmark legislation: the 2019 National Parks Act, the 2019 Wildlife Conservation and Protection Act and the Community Forest Act which has in effect legalized the settlement of the local communities including ethnic groups such as Karen which had earlier encroached on the protected areas. So these three laws seek to strike a balance between the imperatives of conservation and rights of ethnic peoples.

Apart from that, we noticed that they had a very long but constructive discussions and dialogue with the State Party of Myanmar on finding a solution on the boundary issues and we learned that there was already an agreement reached with the States Parties on this issue. When it comes to the criteria, also we feel that criterion (x) is satisfied with the information provided by the State Party so in this sense we believe that the opportunity needs to be given and also to the State Party to reflect their views on these issues. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would like to support the proposal made by Brazil since Thailand has been engaging in significant efforts both in terms of reviewing their normative framework as well as in technical aspects in order to foster and strengthen this nomination. They have been doing so for the past few years. In this case we would like to continue to motivate them to preserve this important property. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Chairperson. Kyrgyzstan welcomes the progress done by the State Party in negotiating the boundaries with the State Party of Myanmar and welcomes the progress the State Party of Thailand made in terms of improving its legislation but at the same time we would like to request the State Party to provide more information about the consultation process with the indigenous and local communities. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Chairperson, my delegation welcomes the effort made by the State Party of Thailand and we consider that the number of works that have been done with regard to protection, community involvement but also management of the property. Our position is similar to other previous speakers, most specifically Brazil, Kuwait but also China. Therefore we are of the opinion that this nomination be shifted from deferral to referral status. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I would like to give the floor to the State Party to answer the questions raised by Committee Members.

The Observer Delegation of Thailand:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I was present in Istanbul when the Committee made their decision. We appreciated the concerns that were expressed at that time and since then I wish to assure that we have taken these concerns and we have taken actions in earnest and in good faith and in a very serious manner and progress has been made and we will continue to make further progress.

Now let me go into the details. On the rights of the Karen community, we have sought to resolve this question as part of a long-term, not a piecemeal solution whereby we have enacted as mentioned by many Committee Members already two new laws in March this year. It marks a very important paradigm shift in the sense that we are now working with these communities and permitting them to stay legally whereas they had stayed illegally before and allowing them to continue their livelihood while at the same time engaging with them as stakeholders in the protection and conservation effort, in accordance with the principle of free, prior and informed consent.

Now in this endeavor we have worked closely with IUCN Thailand and surprisingly contrary to the information that has been disclosed we have kept the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights informed. I was present at the meeting when the minister in charge had a meeting with the regional director of the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Bangkok in January. Now as for the demarcation issue of the nominated site—this is a very complicated issue and we have had many rounds of discussions with Myanmar and I am pleased to report that we have been able to resolve this issue amicably through close consultations with Myanmar.

On the question of OUV, we believe the integrity of biodiversity and protection and management plan remains intact and the OUV has not been affected. In fact, we have submitted a comparative analysis of the OUV of the adjusted area to IUCN as required. So we regret deeply that these significant developments have not been reflected in the evaluation report nor in the report given by IUCN this morning and we have submitted all the necessary information within the deadline and so for the above reasons we believe that the decision for a referral runs counter to the positive developments and only serves and let me repeat, as disincentives for countries that have taken action in good faith and a very earnest manner. So Thailand is firmly convinced that given the positive progress that we have achieved that this Complex should be inscribed as a World Heritage site. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. I just wanted to take the floor again to request on behalf of Myanmar, that the State Party of Myanmar wishes also to address the Committee, to make some clarifications because they have reached an agreement with Thailand. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Myanmar State Party, is the representative here? I hope. The floor is yours, please.

The Observer Delegation of Myanmar:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Since Myanmar is taking the floor for the first time, allow me to express my sincere congratulations to the host country for its warm hospitality and well organized arrangement for the meeting. The Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex was submitted by the State Party of Thailand in 2014 and was referred back to the State Party by the Committee at its 39th session. At its 40th session, the Committee again referred the nomination back to the State Party. At this juncture about 34% of the proposed area fell inside the territory of the State Party of Myanmar that is now in line with Article 11.1 of the 1972 Convention and Annex 5 regarding the format for the nomination.

As the Committee recommended the State Party of Thailand to continue dialogue with the State Party of Myanmar to address the concerns regarding the settlement and demarcation of the nominated areas, a meeting was held between the two Parties to solve the issue, as well as to ensure the nominated areas were situated inside Thailand's territory. When Thailand resubmitted the nomination of Kaeng Krachan to the Committee before 1 February 2019, it was found that three areas still fell inside Myanmar's territory according to the map and its relevant coordinates. This map and coordinates had yet to address the concern of the State Party. When the Myanmar and Thailand technical meeting was held in Bangkok from 25-26 April this year, the two sides reached an agreement to move some coordinate points farther inside Thailand.

It is the position of the State Party of Myanmar that, so long as Myanmar State territory has not been breached, and its consensus taken into full consideration, and so long as the nominated areas of Kaeng Krachan fall entirely inside Thailand's territory, Myanmar sees no reason to object Thailand's nomination. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as I understand we have proposals, which are a little in conflict with each other, but I hope we will come to a consensus. I will give the floor to an NGO representative and then we will proceed to the decision.

Observer NGO (International Indigenous Peoples' Forum on World Heritage):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I am speaking on behalf of the International Indigenous Peoples' Forum on World Heritage. We agree with IUCN's assessment that, in order to safeguard the credibility of the Convention, a deferral represents the only viable option to proceed on this nomination, because of the lack of full and effective consultation with the indigenous Karen peoples in the Forest Complex, the failure to seek their consent, and the recurrent violations of their human rights and for Karen, their situation has not improved.

We also agree that the nomination should be submitted in the format of a new nomination after the concerns regarding the rights of the Karen community have been fully resolved and their free, prior and informed consent has been obtained. To ensure that a new nomination fully reflects the needs and priorities of the Karen, it is essential that it is prepared with their full and effective participation at all stages of the process and with the involvement of heritage experts chosen by the Karen themselves. Karen people have not been opposed in principle to the

Forest Complex becoming a World Heritage site, but they do have concerns that the designation might lead to further destruction of their traditional way of life, culture, loss of access to land, restrictions on their use of forest products, and forced evictions.

Over the past decade, there have been at least five attempts to forcibly remove the Karen villages from the Kaeng-Krachan National Park by park officials, military and police. The Karen communities wish to continue their traditional livelihood, their intricate system of rotational farming, which relies on seven- to ten-year cycles and is in itself an outstanding cultural heritage that is deeply connected to the nominated area.

Mr Chairperson, the problems encountered in the context of this nomination mirror the experiences of indigenous peoples with many other World Heritage sites. To a large degree, they are the result of the absence of appropriate operational guidelines that would ensure that indigenous peoples are fully engaged in nomination processes from the very beginning, including tentative listing, and that their consent is obtained before nominations are submitted.

We urge the Committee to address this problem through relevant changes to the Operational Guidelines and the nomination process, to prevent damage to the reputation of the Convention. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. May I ask IUCN for some clarification?

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. IUCN has welcomed and understands the work that the State Party of Thailand has engaged in to address the matters, which were raised by the Committee in previous decisions. Here we have received a lot of additional information. We've been informed of new pieces of legislation adopted very recently, which are not in any of the working languages of the Committee so we have had no opportunity to really assess these. We've also received information on the agreement reached with Myanmar including fresh maps only received this morning. I would like to just emphasis a couple of points which I think will serve as clarifications and assist the Committee in its thinking.

From IUCN's view, there remains serious community engagement and rights issues with this property that need to be satisfactorily resolved. We have had strident representation from the United Nations Office of the High Commission on Human Rights and the three rapporteurs. To my knowledge we have never received the engagement of this Office in a nomination to the World Heritage List previously. We have also within that information received a number of fresh allegations, fresh concerns and issues raised by that Office and the Rapporteurs and as I mentioned we have received direct concerns from the affected communities and you have just heard that for yourselves from an intervention.

The second point I would like to make is not to underplay the significance of the boundary adjustments for this property. This is a 15% reduction and while we acknowledge and applaud the agreement that has been negotiated and reached between Myanmar and Thailand very recently, for us and from a technical perspective this issue is somewhat secondary to understanding the impact on values, understanding the configuration of this property and what has occurred to the value attributes within this system. We simply have not had the opportunity to evaluate and understand that particular aspect of the change.

The last thing I would like to just comment on is a number of Committee Members have mentioned the options of deferral, referral, etc. I think it's important to just state from IUCN's point of view is that deferral is not considered to be a downgrade or negative recommendation. It's a recommendation that gives us the opportunity to work more closely with Thailand on the

ground in the processes, which are made available to us. As was pointed out the field evaluation of this property dates from 2014. We have not had the opportunity to be on the ground again to work with Thailand. We have used IUCN's office in Bangkok in a sense as our surrogate to work with Thailand on a number of these issues but we really need to have a direct, fresh evaluation in our view.

If this property were to be referred again, we potentially have a seven to eight year gap between a field evaluation and a final consideration of this Committee and in our view this does not give us the capacity to provide you with the correct information in terms of your decision-making. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for this clarification. So may I give the floor to the Rapporteur, please?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We've received one set of amendments proposed by the delegation of Indonesia to inscribe this property. The first two paragraphs remain unchanged. There would be a new paragraph 3 which would read, Welcomes the technical agreement reached by the States Parties of Thailand and Myanmar on the delineation of the boundary of the nominated area based on the agreed Minutes and their pertinent coordinates of the Technical Meeting held in Bangkok on 25–26 April 2019 between Myanmar and Thailand.

A new fourth paragraph, Takes note of the progress made by the State Party on the adoption of new legislation namely the National Parks Act and the Wildlife Conservation and Protection Act, aiming to support the local Karen communities to preserve their identity and way of life in the nominated area. A new paragraph 5, Inscribes Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex (Thailand) on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (x).

Paragraph 6, a new one, Takes note of the provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which follows. It would then remove the next three paragraphs so that's former paragraphs 3, 4 and 5. And then would read, Encourages effective implementation of the new legislation in order to ensure the rights and livelihood of Karen community based on their free, prior and informed consent. And the final paragraph would read, Further encourages the States Parties of Thailand and Myanmar to work in partnership on future biological connectivity opportunities between the property and neighboring transnational protected areas within the Taninthayi Forest corridor in Myanmar. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The Centre has something to clarify, please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. If we can scroll back to point 3 of this proposed amendment. I just wanted to raise some concerns as this is why welcome of course the technical agreement reached by the States Parties of Thailand and Myanmar we have to recall that in compliance with paragraph 148 (i) of the Operational Guidelines the evaluation of the States Parties should not take into account or include any information submitted by States Parties after 28 February and in this case we see the dates of this agreement in which we are talking about a new delineation of the boundaries are in late April so I just wanted to remind the Committee that this is not the version of the nomination that was in front of them and it has not been of course evaluated by the Advisory Body. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we are in front of some decision. The matter is that the draft consists of deferral. Some countries decided to follow the proposed draft. Indonesia proposed the version where the site is inscribed in the World Heritage List. More delegates, more Members of the Committee initiated the idea of referral. So can we come to some explanation from those who proposed referral, how we should proceed with that middle decision? Some delegation...Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As it was explained to us recently by UNESCO Advisory Bodies, the situation on the ground was not evaluated after the agreement between Thailand and Myanmar. That was clarified; the information taken into consideration was only prior to that agreement. We are very pleased with the statements made by the distinguished delegate of Myanmar stating that Myanmar has not been against, or on the other hand Myanmar favors the inscription of the site so we would be ready to support the Indonesian amendment. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

So this is another proposal. Addition to Indonesia. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would like to thank the Members of the Committee and also IUCN and the Secretariat. What Indonesia proposed, why Indonesia proposed inscribe is to see that the State Party already does something to progress, improving the process to make a better property in managing a World Heritage site. Again, we think that if we give back in certain situations then we will be longer discussion on the process and I think this is a disincentive for the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any other comments? As far as I understand...China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. Sorry to take the floor again, it's the third time for this issue but I think it is a very important property that merits a very positive consideration. We also at the same time we do recognize some of the concerns raised particularly after the agreement between the Thailand and Myanmar is resolved the property shrinks somehow and whether this will affect something that is for the experts to judge. Nonetheless, we always are of the belief that the State Party's intention for nominating this property is primarily for the preservation of this very important property and on this note it is always better to give the State Party encouragement in this regard. We are prepared to support inscription as well if the Committee can come to an agreement on this. It's been a property under nomination since 2014, so five years already and the State Party has been engaging with the Advisory Bodies and the international legal organizations on human rights, on every aspect so therefore they deserve consideration. Thank you.

Chairperson:

So there are still some difficulties with the approval of this decision due to wording matters, which were proposed by Indonesia, supported by Brazil, now by China. So I consider that we have to follow with our usual and very effective style of work. We will ask some delegates to come to a decision until the end of the day by negotiations, if it is possible. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. I agree with much of what China has said. I think it is a very important property and it's important in our analysis to acknowledge the endeavours taken by the State Party. More than four years now have been spent trying to respond to each of the different issues raised by the Committee in previous sessions and through their various declarations the Committee has asked for these to be implemented. At the same time the State Party has undertaken and identified a solution for each of the issues we raised so therefore we think that the site can be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. No other opinions? Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Mr Chairperson, you suggested that some effort might be made in order to find a bridge to a point of agreement around this. Australia certainly can't support the proposition of inscription and of course our strong preference would be for a deferral because we don't in any way see a deferral as a downgrading. It's simply a reflection of the current state of the dossier as evaluated by IUCN and we do concur with that assessment.

But nonetheless, if there is a move towards referral again of the property, we think that it is very important that such a referral provides very clear guidance to the State Party about the sort of things that need to be addressed and from our perspective it would need to bring back a revised nomination in light of the significant boundary change proposed and that would include a revised comparative analysis. We would want to see a comprehensive update on the State Party's engagement with the Karen community in accordance with paragraph 123 of the Operational Guidelines and we would also suggest that the United Nations Office of the High Commission for Human Rights should be asked to review the dossier in relation to the point about engagement with the Karen community through paragraph 123 and that that advice from the Commission be provided to the Committee as part of the evaluation of the revised nomination and if an amendment in those broad terms is acceptable to the Committee then we would be willing to support a referral rather than a deferral of this nomination.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. Just one correction, if I may. We actually had requested further information but we didn't get a concrete answer to our question and it is crucial to our position so we are just wondering—it says that Indonesia, Brazil, China and perhaps Cuba should be added there as well, that it was a proposal from Cuba and we certainly don't want to usurp Cuba's place on the list. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. Norway concurs with the Australian delegation's intervention.

Chairperson:

Honorable Members of the Committee, we are just in front of the decision. We have two more applies, Cuba and Angola. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. No, it was for the clarification that Spain made. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Monsieur le Président, je voulais appuyer votre proposition. On a besoin de quelques consultations. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We must understand all the positions of the Advisory Bodies, the States Parties and from one point of view we have to give the chance to the State to prove the activities that have been launched especially in the point that the agreement between Thailand and Myanmar was agreed to just recently and the Members of the Committee didn't have the chance to get maps of the nominated territory so I think that we better appoint a working group for working out the decision and more delegates are coming to the decision of referral. I think that a referral will give the possibility to the State Party to go with more details inscription possibility. But it is my opinion so you can work it out during the working group until the end of the day. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

I thank you, Chairperson. I would just like to respond to Cuba's comment of saying that the Committee doesn't have any concrete information on the updated progress raised by Thailand. Just this morning we have been informed by the State Party that they sent IUCN emails and Committee Members the agreed map between Thailand and Myanmar that could be used for consideration by Committee Members, Chairperson. And I would also like to inform you, Chairperson, that the text displayed on the screen is not latest so we already sent a slight modification on the draft particularly on paragraphs 3 and 6 so paragraph 3 will start with, Takes note or Recognizes, we can go with either one of them.

Chairperson:

Let us follow the experience we had before that. So let us appoint the working group to work out the common decision and return to us at the end of the day. Who would be willing to be in the working group? Australia, Indonesia, Norway, Kuwait, Tunisia and Cuba. Six countries. Thank you very much. And we apply for your efforts to find a solution, which will be suitable and acceptable to all Committee Members. Thank you very much. Now we have announcements for the side events from Ms Rössler, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. As you know, we start today with the Operational Guidelines group from 2-3 p.m. in Room A7. Then you have from 1-3 p.m. a meeting of the World Heritage Related Category 2 Centres and Institutes and the Regional Centre for World Heritage in Room A6. From 1-2:50 p.m. the World Heritage Interpretation and Reconciliation of Cultures by the Korean National Commission for UNESCO in Room A8. From 1-3 p.m. Sustainability: Youth and Innovation in Africa, the African World Heritage Fund in Room B1 and

from 1:10-2 p.m. 2020 the Great Wall between China and the United Kingdom by ICOMOS China, the Chinese Academy for Cultural Heritage Historic England in Room B3. Then we have an opening of an exhibition, a holy World Heritage site, Shining Again: Restoration of the Nativity Church in Bethlehem Palestine in the networking area which is the main lobby in front of Room A8. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much and have a nice break until 3 p.m. Please be on time to start correctly.

The meeting rose at 12.50 a.m.

FIFTH DAY – Friday 5 July 2019

TENTH MEETING

3.00 P.M. – 6.00 P.M.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

We have a quorum; we can start. Please, take your seats please. We stopped at the point of discussion on the draft decision on Thailand's Forest Complex. The decision was made for a working group to work together and provide some consensus. As far as I know, the process is still ongoing. They will go on with the discussion even after the afternoon session at 6 p.m. so we will move this matter to the discussion as soon as it will be proposed by the working group. I hope it will be tomorrow morning, the final. Now we proceed to file 43 COM 8B.6 and I now invite IUCN to present the nomination of the French Austral Lands and Seas, France. IUCN you have the floor.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and good afternoon. The evaluation of this nomination starts on page 29 in both the English and French versions of the IUCN evaluation report. The French Austral Lands and Seas nominated as *Les Terres et mers australes françaises* cover more than 67M hectares, a vast area exceeding the surface area of all of mainland France. If inscribed, this property will become the largest World Heritage property on earth.

The serial nomination encompasses extremely isolated volcanic islands located in two biogeographic zones, the Crozet Archipelago, consisting of five main islands, and the glaciated and highly dissected Kerguelen, situated in the sub-Antarctic zone. The islands of Amsterdam and St Paul are in the cool-temperate zone.

The islands are of stunning natural beauty and include the emblematic Arch of Kerguelen, the dramatic glacial fjords and mountains and volcanic calderas. There are islands within the *Terres australes françaises* on which people have never set foot making them some of the last untouched wild places on the planet. Due to the extreme isolation of these islands, their position between the polar and subtropical convergence, and exceptionally low human impact, the sea is particularly rich in pelagic species, providing rich trophic resources for seabirds and mammals, supporting extraordinarily large numbers supporting for example the largest populations of King Penguins and Yellow-nosed Albatrosses in the world. Threatened and endemic species include Eaton's Pintail and the emblematic Amsterdam Albatross. In addition, the nominated area is home to the globally second largest population of Elephant Seal and the third largest population of Antarctic Fur Seal.

Despite historical attempts at colonization the islands are uninhabited. Fewer than 350 people visit the islands annual with some military staff, researchers and conservation personnel living in the bases or scattered cabins year around. Past damage caused by whale, penguin and seal hunting in the 19th and up to the beginning of the 20th century, as well as lobster fishing around Amsterdam, is now largely restored. Rodents, rabbits, cats, invertebrates, grass species as well as pathogens suspected to be the cause of decline for example of the Yellow-nosed Albatross are among the invasive species found in the nominated area.

Important progress has been made in reducing the impact of alien species including the total eradication of cows, wild and domestic sheep and chickens. Operations to eradicate and control rats, rabbits and cats have also been successfully undertaken on a number of islands and a very ambitious plan to eradicate cats and rodents form Amsterdam is under preparation.

These efforts by the State Party are highly creditable and need to be consolidated in future management. The entire property is legally well protected with one third designated under strict protection, categories Ia and Ib in IUCN terminology and strong protection elsewhere throughout the nominated area. The addition of reserve control over the entire Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) surrounding the reserve established in 2017 provides an effective buffer zone. Fishing within the Exclusive Economic Zone is subject to the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources with an annually adjusted quota ensuring sustainable harvesting levels. An excellent management plan covering the period from 2018 to 2027 provides clear overall guidance.

In conclusion, IUCN considers that the nomination meets integrity, protection and management requirements in addition to complying with the criteria. *Les Terres et mers australes françaises* with their pristine natural heritage, one of the last wilderness at that scale on the planet. The large size, pristine nature and remarkable congregations of wildlife make a compelling case for criterion (ix). In terms of criteria (ix) and (x) in addition to containing some of the highest concentrations and diversity of seabirds in the world and a very rich diversity of marine mammals the vast property also provides for the continuation of ecological and biological processes at an exceptionally large scale. The draft decision recommending inscription of the nominated property is set out on page 7 in both the English and French versions of working document 8B. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to apply to the Committee Members. I see Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Monsieur le Président, nous félicitons l'État français qui présente ce dossier de candidature impressionnant. Certains sites sont tellement exceptionnels qu'ils transcendent les frontières nationales et revêtent une importance commune pour les générations actuelles et futures de l'ensemble de l'humanité. Préservées de l'impact des activités humaines, les Terres et mers australes françaises sont une véritable vitrine de l'évolution biologique et constituent des modèles d'étude uniques pour le suivi des changements globaux. La Norvège supporte fortement la recommandation d'inscrire ce site exceptionnel sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia supports the nomination of this outstanding property, one of the world's largest marine protected areas covering an area nearly twice the size of the Great Barrier Reef region. In the Southern Ocean Australia and France are neighbors, fellow signatories of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources. The nominated property borders the Australian Exclusive Economic Zone. This zone surrounds Heard Island, a sub-Antarctic World Heritage site that also meets criteria (vii) and (ix). We are pleased that the French Austral Lands and Seas World Heritage site is also nominated under criterion (x) because of its exceptional habitats, which are vital for the conservation of seabirds and marine mammals. Australia looks forward to continuing working with France to conserve the exceptional natural values of the Southern Ocean.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. Guatemala would like to support the proposal to inscribe French Austral Lands and Seas on the List as this is a site that has an amazing wealth of biodiversity. Indeed all of this bears testimony to the value as an outstanding site in terms of biodiversity and indeed this is one of the biggest marine protected areas in the world. It's a wonderful example of the biodiversity of the southern hemisphere and the environmental processes of its particular area. We have wonderful concentrations of bird colonies here and marine wildlife. Guatemala concludes that the nominated property does fulfil the criteria of Outstanding Universal Value and integrity and it's for these reasons that we wish to include this in the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je crois que, avec ce dossier que nous sommes en train de traiter, la Convention et son application depuis son entrée en vigueur arrive à un point culminant, puisque, aujourd'hui, l'étendue très large de ce site et la diversité de la vie, au sens biologique, qu'elle recouvre est une très bonne nouvelle pour sa protection et pour une protection très élargie. Alors le constat par les instances consultatives de l'existence de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle nous réconforte dans l'idée que la Convention, avec l'engagement de l'État partie, va permettre une protection de l'ensemble des espèces vivant dans cette vaste étendue. Nous félicitons l'État partie d'avoir présenté un dossier de cette qualité et nous nous félicitons de sa potentielle inscription.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. Mr Chairperson, while supporting the draft decision I would like to know that unless there is a Member who is not in support of the draft decision I move that we adopt the draft decision. I so move. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I was about to do that. I don't see any other options to the proposed draft and if there are no other opinions I would like now to invite you to adopt decision 43 COM 8B.6 before Rapporteur...

Rapporteur:

We have no amendments.

Chairperson:

No amendments. I decided to ask at the last minute. Thank you very much. No amendments. We adopt this document in whole [*applause*]. My congratulations. I would like to congratulate France on behalf of the entire Committee for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List and invite the State Party to deliver their speech. Please, you are welcome.

La Délégation de la France (Observateur)

Mme Ségolène Royal :

Monsieur le Ministre de la culture d'Azerbaïdjan, Président du Comité, Mesdames et Messieurs les représentants des organisations consultatives, et notamment l'UICN, merci infiniment du fond du cœur de la décision que vous venez de prendre. Je suis très honorée, très heureuse de recevoir au nom de la France la décision du Centre du patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO d'inscrire les Terres et mers australes françaises sur la prestigieuse Liste du patrimoine mondial. Ces terres et mers, comme cela vient d'être dit dans le passionnant rapport que nous venons d'entendre sont situées au sud de l'océan Indien et au plus près de l'Antarctique, couvrent un espace de plus de 670 000 km² et constituent le plus vaste et l'un des derniers lieux de naturalité au monde. Sanctuaire remarquable de biodiversité, elles hébergent une des plus fortes concentrations d'oiseaux, 50 millions d'oiseaux, et de mammifères marins de la planète.

À travers ce classement, ce sont les efforts de plus d'un demi-siècle de recherche scientifiques sur les grands enjeux environnementaux, écosystèmes, changements climatiques, biodiversité, qui sont aujourd'hui mis à l'honneur. C'est aussi un encouragement à relever les immenses défis écologiques de préservation de ce site remarquable dont la France a la responsabilité. Pendant la COP21, que j'ai présidée, je m'étais engagée en décembre 2015, dans le cadre de l'Agenda de l'action, à créer dans cet exceptionnel territoire une aire marine protégée sous forme de réserve naturelle, création que j'ai signée en décembre 2016, puis à la proposer pour inscription au patrimoine mondial. C'est aujourd'hui une réalité. Je salue l'action très efficace menée par la collectivité des Terres australes et antarctiques françaises fortement engagée dans cette protection.

Cette précieuse inscription engage la France sur le long terme et nous motive pour approfondir les remarquables coopérations scientifiques internationales, et je voudrais assurer que, en application de cette inscription, la France s'engage à faire de cette sublime oasis au cœur de l'océan Austral un territoire sentinelle de la biodiversité des changements globaux, notamment en suivant les recommandations de l'UICN et du Comité du patrimoine mondial : lutte contre les espèces invasives, gestion exemplaire des pêcheries et mise en place des actions de conservation. Oui, la France sera à la hauteur des engagements qu'elle prend ici devant la communauté internationale et devant les générations futures pour maintenir l'intégrité du bien et garantir son authenticité au service de l'humanité. Je vous remercie chaleureusement.
[Applaudissements]

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup, Madame Ségolène Royal, pour votre intervention. Now we move to another site to be discussed. This is draft decision 43 COM 8B.8. I now invite IUCN to present the nomination Vatnajökull National Park--dynamic nature of fire and ice, Iceland. IUCN you have the floor.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. IUCN's evaluation of this property is on page 41 in both the French and English versions of the IUCN report. The nomination of Vatnajökull National Park--dynamic nature of fire and ice, encompasses approximately 1.5M hectares, approximately 14% of Iceland's national territory, and more than 85% of the nominated property is classified as wilderness under national legislation. Vatnajökull is the largest glacier in Europe and one of the largest in the world. It is a young glacier formed approximately 2,500 years and is highly sensitive to climatic conditions and is therefore an outstanding natural laboratory for studying the effects of global warming trends on glacial extent.

The nominated property is an iconic volcanic terrain and includes the entire range of currently active mid-ocean rift features, including large rift systems with historically important eruptions and includes the world's largest and best expressed subglacial volcanic landforms. Since the rift also includes a major mantle plume, there is the development of large central-vent

volcanoes that include the largest, Bárðarbunga, over the plume itself, and the most famous, Askja, which is free of snow much of the year. The nominated property also includes the roots of volcanic systems: the reservoirs of magma that were transported through the feeder systems to the volcanoes. These shallow level magma intrusions are very rare around the world, and the nominated property contains more than five such intrusions. From a volcanic perspective, the nominated property certainly contains the best-exposed products of historic magmatism, all the way down to the subvolcanic magma chambers, that represents a divergent plate margin setting. There is little to no vegetation on these outstanding examples rendering the values immediately visible.

The vast majority of the nominated property has a high level of integrity due to its remoteness. Vatnajökull National Park has had increased tourism since its designation, but most of this has been concentrated in a relatively small number of easily accessible tourism hotspots on the southern and northern fringes of the park. Managing tourism is being addressed by Icelandic authorities but will remain a challenge for the Park and it is a matter of urgency to implement as intended visitor facilities and tourism management plans. Climate change will clearly play a key role in the future of the nominated property, and is already evident in the ongoing and rapid retreat of Vatnajökull's many outlet glaciers, potentially leading to the complete loss of the Vatnajökull ice cap and hence the interaction of fire and ice. However, as noted in the nomination, this process may take centuries and provides an important natural laboratory for studying the glaciovolcanic and ecological dynamics in response to climate change.

There is strong evidence of community engagement in, and support for this World Heritage nomination. Vatnajökull National Park has been managed under a comprehensive management plan for 10 years with a high level of local input and decision-making coupled with legal protections against overdevelopment. There is also a clear framework for monitoring the state of conservation including indicators covering geology, geological hazards, biota and tourism. Around 97% of the nominated property is protected by the Act on Vatnajökull National Park. There is no buffer zone proposed, however, given the vast size of the nominated property, the resilient nature of the OUV and the existing protection of the surroundings, IUCN agrees that a buffer zone is not essential at this point in time.

The nominated property covers a very large area and the proposed boundaries include all of the values that support OUV. However, there are concerns regarding the proposed boundaries north of the Herðubreiðarlindir Nature Reserve, in particular, the Jökulsá á Fjöllum River corridor connecting the northern portion of the nominated property to the main Vatnajökull portion is only partly protected by law and there is not continuous state ownership or management authorities over this region. Given ongoing community consultations and to avoid an inappropriate serial configuration IUCN is of the view that the northern portion should not yet be included in the nomination, and to avoid an inappropriate serial configuration of the nominated property, at the present time only the southern portion up to and including the Herðubreiðarlindir Nature Reserve could be recommended for inscription. The globally significant values of Vatnajökull National Park relate to the coexistence and active interaction of a divergent tectonic plate boundary, a mantle plume and a large ice cap. The nominated property contains the world's best-exposed mid-ocean ridge volcanic system that is not under water. The outstanding values represented are dynamic and currently active processes.

In conclusion, IUCN considers that criterion (viii) is met and the integrity, protection and management of the nominated property meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines while noting the reservation in relation to the northern part of the nominated property which do not yet meet fully the protection requirements. The draft decision recommending inscription up to and including Herðubreiðarlindir Nature Reserve but not including the Jökulsá á Fjöllum River corridor and the northern Dettifoss--Ásbyrgi part of Vatnajökull National Park is set out on page 9 in both the English and French versions of working document 8B. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments or proposals? I don't think there is any apply for intervention. So Rapporteur do we have any other amendment?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have no proposed amendments with this decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Can we proceed with approval? I see no objections and no other proposals so I therefore declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.8 adopted as amended. *[Applause]* Let me congratulate Iceland on behalf of the entire Committee for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. Iceland, you have the floor for an intervention. Please, welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Iceland:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and thank you Members of the World Heritage Committee, Director of the World Heritage Centre, members of IUCN and ICOMOS, excellences, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Icelandic government I have the honor and great pleasure to thank the World Heritage Committee for this historic decision for Iceland by accepting our nomination of Vatnajökull National Park covering approximately 14% of our country for inscription on the World Heritage List as a natural property. I would also like to use this opportunity to thank IUCN expert panel, especially to two evaluators that visited Iceland for the onsite evaluation.

In our minds, this area has always been a fascinating and special, breathtakingly beautiful, of course, but also dangerous with a long history of eruptions threatening and seriously affecting the lives of not only those who live in close proximity to the glacier but also populations living quite far away causing loss of harvest and famine around the world. Parts of the National Park have been protected since the early days of nature protection in Iceland in the 1960s and 1970s. But preparations leading to the Vatnajökull National Park started in 1999. This decision recognizing the Outstanding Universal Value of the area thus coincides with the 20-years long history of the establishment of the Park.

As suggested by the IUCN Advisory Body, the inscription does not cover the whole of the nominated area as the northern part along the glacier river Jökulsá á Fjöllum and the area around Dettifoss--Ásbyrgi have been referred due to lack of continuity, wholeness and consultation with some of the landowners. We fully understand and respect the conclusion and will continue our work and consultations with landowners and local communities. On this occasion I would suffice it to say that my government has already acted on many of the recommendations by the Committee, recommendations a) and b) and they are constantly working for improved and added facilities, staff and administrative support for the Park and to stop off-road driving. A recent off-road driving incident involving a foreign tourist, a trendsetter if you like, became through social media internationally recognized and condemned and I think this is actually a problem that should be of universal concern as the trendsetter in question did not show any sign of remorse or understanding of the harm he had done.

Mr Chairperson, Iceland stands fully committed to protect and improve the World Heritage site, Vatnajökull National Park and to ensure that the integrity and Outstanding Universal Value will be maintained for the world and future generations to enjoy. Thank you, again, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Once more, our congratulations *[applause]*. We have now finished the examination of natural nominations and will continue with the examination of mixed sites.

Chairperson:

The two mixed nominations will be presented by the two Advisory Bodies. I now invite ICOMOS and IUCN to present the significant boundary modification proposed by Albania of the Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid region, North Macedonia. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr Balsamo you have the floor for some clarification.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. Just to remind the Committee that we received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation for this nomination and this factual error notification is on page 12 of the English version of INF.8B.4 and on page 13 of the same document in its French version. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I would like to ask ICOMOS and IUCN to present the modification. Please, welcome.

IUCN:

IUCN's evaluation of this property starts on page 77 in both the English and French versions of the IUCN Evaluation Report. This nomination is an extension of the natural and cultural heritage of the Ohrid region in North Macedonia areas of the lake and its watershed, which was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 and extended in 1980, which is when cultural criteria were added to the justification for inscription. The extension into Albania was nominated under natural criterion (vi) in line with the already inscribed property as well as under cultural criteria, which as just noticed, has been evaluated by ICOMOS and will be presented by ICOMOS in a moment. IUCN recalls that the Committee had selected the extension as a pilot upstream project and the extension process has thus been the beneficiary of extensive support.

The proposed extension is exclusively located in the territory of the State of Albania. The existing property has an area of close to 84,000 hectares with no buffer zone. The extension covers an area of over 11,000 hectares with a buffer zone of some 16,000 hectares. The distinctive nature conservation values of Lake Ohrid are already established via the longstanding inscription of the existing property. The values include the Lake's history going back to pre-glacial times and its uninterrupted evolution in geographic isolation. Most of the area and the extension area is state-owned water body representing approximately one-third of the total surface of the Lake. The area nominated for extension includes the Lin Peninsula, a small, mainly privately owned terrestrial area in the extreme northern section of the nomination, included for its cultural attributes.

Lake Ohrid provides a unique refuge for numerous endemic and relict freshwater species of flora and fauna. Its nutrient poor waters are a particularity of an ecosystem supporting over 200 endemic species including 17 endemic species of fish. The avian fauna associated with the Lake further adds to the conservation significance.

The property has suffered from inappropriate development and neglect. Until recently planning has frequently been damaging or ineffective such as in the case of uncontrolled tourism infrastructure development. Water quality is the most significant nature conservation concern with untreated sewage and agricultural run-off contributing to increasing contamination and eutrophication, in other words, excessive levels of nutrients in the Lake. Both the highly endemic biodiversity and natural beauty of the Lake are particularly vulnerable to deterioration of water quality. Water quality monitoring is limited on the Albania side and the monitoring laboratory visited by evaluation mission has been closed due to budget cuts.

The current administration has taken recent steps to remediate some of the damage done. However, IUCN notes that a range of issues of significant concern still remains such as tourism pressure, illegal and inappropriate legal developments, habitat destruction, over fishing and logging as well as the water contamination noted earlier. IUCN notes that the existing property is also considered under Item 7B on the Committee's agenda including with a recommendation for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The entire extension and its buffer zone are within the protected landscape with formal adequate legal protection in place. The protected landscape has a sound management plan. However, there is a need to consolidate coordination and cooperation across the many involved institutions dealing with cultural and natural heritage both within Albanian and with the neighboring State Party of North Macedonia.

The complexity of Lake Ohrid's shared natural and cultural heritage requires innovative governance and management models in the broader transboundary Lake Ohrid region. Integrated management of natural and cultural heritage through a joint coordinating body and joint management planning are urgently needed to conserve the outstanding values of this property.

In conclusion, IUCN considers that the nominated extension meets integrity and protection requirements while management requirements are not met and may be addressed via the state of conservation process of the existing inscribed property. IUCN recommends the Committee approve the extension into Albania in relation to natural criterion (vi) thereby granting World Heritage status to Lake Ohrid in its entirety. I will now, with your permission, Mr Chairperson, pass the floor to ICOMOS to present the evaluation of cultural value and to conclude with a joint draft decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. Lake Ohrid straddles the border between the Republic of Albania and North Macedonia. What is now being nominated is a major extension on the Albanian side, which encompasses the east part of the Lake together with small parts of the coast. The existing property was extended in 1980 under cultural criteria to reflect its outstanding religious architecture from the 7th to the 19th centuries and urban structures from the 18th to 19th centuries. The proposed extension includes part of the Lake, the small Lin Peninsula to the northwest and an area around the Drlon Springs in the south.

The proposed enlarged property would encompass the whole of the Lake but the margins on the Albanian side would almost all be in the buffer zone. The Lin Peninsula and the small area of coast that links it to North Macedonia are one of the few remaining intact coastal areas. The main threat to these is the proposed railway from North Macedonia, part of a pan-European corridor currently planned to pass alongside the Lake to the north of the peninsula. On the high point of the peninsula are the remains of a Christian church founded in the late 6th century. Excavations in the 1970s suggested it was destroyed by fire in the medieval period. Its triconch plan provides a clear link to the early 6th century development churches on the Macedonia side of the Lake. Several floors survive covered with mosaics. Recent studies of these by both Macedonian and Albanian scholars show similarities in style and techniques with the early medieval mosaics in basilicas in North Macedonia which may suggests they all came from an Ohrid atelier operating during the early Christian period. Around the church is this half-built new church and an atrium with corbelled tombs that are currently at the moment unprotected.

On the west side of the peninsula is a small settlement within places small garden plots running down to the Lake. The villages are popular with tourists and the gentrification of houses for holiday use has begun to have an impact though the character is still reasonably strong. Currently there is no controlled conservation of the village. New development on the outskirts has though been in part halted though the rebuilding of abandoned houses has continued and stronger controls are definitely needed. The remains of three prehistoric pile-dwellings have been discovered in the Lake, three in the vicinity of Lin and two further south. Although there is some active conservation of these resources have precluded the conservation of perishable archaeological finds.

At the south end of the Lake a small area has been nominated enclosing the Drilon Springs. These were popular tourist destinations in the 19th century. Further nearby springs to the east near the village of Tushemisht seen here in the lower images have not been nominated. Both springs are part of a \$5M project to develop luxury facilities along the lakeshore. In the extensive buffer zone villages suffer from uncoordinated and in some places illegal development of the lakeshore and such degradation of cultural heritage through uncontrolled development results in loss of landscape character and is clearly acknowledge in the nomination dossier management plan.

The management issues are considerable. Although the nominated terrestrial area is small the buffer zone is essential to protect the lake setting and this is highly vulnerable and for both there is a need to integrate approaches and culture and across international boundaries. Currently, adequate mechanisms are just not in place to begin to address these challenges.

This slide highlights the new road just completed along the edge of the Lake and an example of the many buildings that have proliferated in recent years. The nomination dossier highlights the negative impact of this rapid development and sees the danger could lead to the area becoming typical generic coastal resort. ICOMOS considers that the Lin Peninsula does have the potential to complement what is known from excavation of early byzantine churches on the Macedonia side of the Lake dating from the 6th century in relation to criterion (i). For criterion (iii) the similarities to the Lin Church to Christian basilicas of the same period on the Macedonian side suggests they have a strong link.

For criterion (iv) the Lin Church can be seen to support an understanding of the important basilicas of the early Christian period. But integrity and authenticity are both vulnerable for the reasons already set out. Legal protection and management currently in place are inadequate to address the major challenges. The idea of collaborative working between ministries and departments dealing with culture and nature appears hardly to have begun and discussions have yet to start with the State Party of North Macedonia to form a formal transboundary coordinating mechanism. In conclusion, the fragile remains of the Lin Church, village and peninsula are under potential threat from the erosion of archaeological and architectural details and a proposed railway. The Drilon Springs are to be transformed by a major tourist development while the landscape of the buffer zone is under actual threat as well as further potential threats from lack of development control.

In view of these serious and specific and acknowledged threats which endanger the contribution of the cultural attributes being nominated to the Outstanding Universal Value of the existing property and the need for urgent measures to counter these, ICOMOS considers that the proposed extension should be approved and at the same time be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. ICOMOS has provided further recommendations that need urgent consideration and has also suggested a mission to the property to discuss the identification of corrective measures. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I apply to the Members of the Committee. Are there any amendments, comments? I see Hungary. Please. You are welcome.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We welcome the approval of the extension of this extraordinary property, which as we have heard provides refuge for numerous endemic and relict freshwater species of flora and fauna dating from the tertiary period. We are very happy that starting this session of our Committee the entirety of Lake Ohrid will finally be covered by the protection the World Heritage status provides. However, we acknowledge what we have heard during the presentations and what we have read in the evaluation that there is a range of issues of significant concern that remain such as tourism pressures, over fishing, logging and water contamination among others. We have submitted amendments to the draft decision, as we believe that time should be given to the two States Parties to work jointly on a transnational approach to address these very real threats the property faces and as such it should not be inscribed at this time on the List of World Heritage in Danger. We believe that the Committee should return to examine this property again next year to see the progress the two States Parties achieve on the understanding that the Committee will be considering in the case of confirmation of potential or ascertained danger to its Outstanding Universal Value the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway actually supports the original draft decision proposing the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In our attempt to understand the complexity of this area, we have had discussions with the two States Parties in question and we would like to commend them on their willingness to dialogue and for clarifications as well as to encourage them to continue on this constructive path. We think that their ability to collaborate with different stakeholders will be essential taking into consideration the grave situation that the property has been facing for quite a long time.

Therefore, in the future we expect to see the following: two States Parties that collaborate on all levels and that represent the World Heritage property together regardless of the challenges taking into consideration the severe decay and uncontrolled development of the property; we also expect to see the two States Parties that have done and continue to do their utmost to ensure that the OUV is not further weakened; finally we would like to encourage Albania and North Macedonia to take up their task in such a manner that they will play a leading role as an example of best practice in the future. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. First of all, China wishes to concur with the Hungarian position on this matter. China welcomes the dialogue that the two States Parties are willing to engage in with each other. We see the value of this beautiful property. China is always hesitant as the record may show in encouraging the use of enlisting a property in Danger. It is with this mind that China supports the Hungarian amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just to be consistent with our previous decisions and also to continue in the spirit of last year's meeting in Manama, I think that Kuwait also supports the draft amendments submitted by Hungary to have it listed without the in Danger List. I think we can encourage the two States Parties to continue their dialogue and move forward and as we see in the draft amendment there will be a report by February 2020 to assess the situation. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. We are thankful for the detailed reports that were received. Here we have one of the positive mechanisms of the Convention. Lake Ohrid was inscribed in 1979 as a natural site and then one year later as a cultural site as well. The Tikal National Park in Guatemala in 1989 followed a similar process. And here we are a few decades down the track looking at the various aspects of this Lake for its endemic and relict freshwater species importance and also one of the oldest European human settlements so having it on the World Heritage List means that it is an ongoing challenge and Guatemala is pleased to see that there is resistance to the degradation of this exceptional site. We also understand that both States Parties will be facing increased challenges if it is listed but we know that they are going to take this duty very seriously.

At the same time, we would like to urge both States Parties to continue implementing the recommendations issued, so as to bolster its management of the site and safeguard it when it comes to water quality, tourism management, fishing and the other elements listed.

For all of the above, we can support the proposed amendment put forward by Hungary, China, Kuwait and others. I think this way we can offer a little more time to the States Parties so that they can work towards remedying these aspects before looking at a Danger listing. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. When evaluating the state of conservation of the site by North Macedonia, the Committee demonstrated that there was significant around the view that although there are relevant concerns that still need to be addressed it would be premature to include the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. We believe that this should also be the case now for this boundary extension to include the Albanian part of Lake Ohrid. The State Party must be given the opportunity to undertake the measures that are requested by the Advisory Bodies before Danger listing is considered. We congratulate Albania for its proposal for boundary extension and lend it our support, as we believe that it is a testimony to the mutual understanding and international cooperation between the two neighbouring countries. We also support the Hungarian amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Azerbaijan joins Hungary and China in supporting the inscription of this site to the List and we encourage the State Party to engage in constructive dialogue with the State Party concerned and also with the Advisory Bodies for better preservation and conservation of this site. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je crois que nous sommes devant un cas extrêmement positif, parce qu'il y a une extension à la fois de l'espace de ce site et une extension des souverainetés politiques qui vont en prendre la charge après notre décision. Je crois que cela augure d'une meilleure coopération internationale, d'une plus grande efficacité, en tout état de cause une addition de volontés et de moyens. Cela est suffisamment pertinent et cela crée une dynamique que nous voyons positive. C'est pour cela que nous rejoignons la demande d'amendement pour que ce site soit inscrit mais ne soit pas inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have some amendment to the draft decision. I would like to ask the Rapporteur to inform us about this.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As flagged, we have a proposed set of amendments proposed by Hungary, China and Tunisia. The first three paragraphs, which include the statement about Outstanding Universal Value are unchanged or not proposed for change. The first change occurs in paragraph 4. It's a very comprehensive statement about Outstanding Universal Value. So this would now read, Notes with concern the threats facing the cultural and natural attributes as well as the setting in the Albanian side of the property and encourages the States Parties to develop, as a matter of urgency, a joint transnational approach to address these threats to values, integrity and to the serious protection and management issues facing Lake Ohrid.

Paragraph 5 would read, Also requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020, with a view to considering, in case of the confirmation of potential or ascertained danger to its Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. And I believe that is the end of the proposed amendments.

Chairperson:

Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you. I have just a minor change--if we go back to paragraph 4 where it says, a joint transnational approach, it should be a joint transboundary approach. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. ICOMOS, please. You wanted to comment.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. Could I just say that in the original draft decision a mission was recommended to look at the necessary measures to be taken. For sites in North Macedonia the necessary measures could be developed from the 2017 mission. We have no similar document for Albania so ICOMOS would like to ask whether in light of the changes made to the draft decision a mission to Albania, the site of the new property could be considered?

Chairperson:

Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have a few comments. First of all, I do apologize because now I have realized that we have forgotten that actually the paragraph with the request to submit the state of conservation report should actually replace paragraph 8 because now we would have in this decision two requests for the state of conservation reports. That's the first. The second, well, we have heard the concern of ICOMOS and I believe that we could from our side leave it, putting back the request for the reactive monitoring mission but obviously without—I'm a bit hesitant and I might ask the Secretariat to help me out, about the corrective measures because isn't corrective measures linked to the Danger listing as a term? I would like to clarify that before we put back that request. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Ms Rössler, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I confirm that that was in relation to the original request to put the site on the Danger List so in this case you would not require that and you can just sent a normal reactive monitoring mission to the property.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Now we have to approve the last version of the draft with the changes. Please, Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

I just wanted to clarify that we are now moving what is now paragraph 6. You wanted to replace paragraph 8 with that paragraph.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Yes, because I think it would be very strange if we have two different requests with two different dates. If I understand correctly we are going to move to the state of conservation report of this property in the next step and I believe we are going to have amendments also to the draft decision so this would be the suggestion as you have said. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Other suggestions?

Rapporteur:

I think we are just getting this quite right now. What we might do is just go back up to paragraph 4. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remain un-amended and just check that that is now sounding sensible. Paragraph 4, Notes with concern the threats facing the cultural and natural attributes, etc. with a change to transboundary approach. Paragraph 5 is requesting a reactive monitoring

mission but no reference to corrective measures, as it's not on the Danger List. Paragraph 6 then is requesting to submit an updated report. I thought we were moving that paragraph. Yes. Lovely. Then next paragraph, all the measures. This one remains in then, okay, this last paragraph is about requesting the State Party to submit the reports and I think that logic is now okay.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Okay, Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and I apologize if we can just scroll back up to the reactive monitoring mission, because a reactive monitoring mission always has to have a purpose so I would like to ask not to delete the whole sentence but to say to the property, to discuss maybe the measures to address the recommendations below. And then if I understand correctly we are going to have paragraph 7 that details the recommendations that are to be discussed. Yes, I think it makes more sense now. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Rapporteur, can we approve it like that?

Rapporteur:

I think our former Rapporteur has hit nail on the head, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So I propose to approve the text in whole without going paragraph-by-paragraph. It's clear. So I declare decision 43 COM 8B.9 adopted as amended. Approved [*applause*]. I would like to give the floor to the State Party, Albania, please.

The Observer Delegation of Albania:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Let me thank dearly Hungary, China and Tunisia but as well Kuwait, Guatemala, Brazil and Azerbaijan but also of course all the Members of the Committee for their understanding, their support and their trust. We also would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for the close cooperation on this and other issues as well as the Advisory Bodies for their work. We are happy and proud to add another pearl to the World Heritage List, a superb and extraordinary natural resource and cultural asset of particular importance. We are particularly happy that the Committee fully shares with us the determination to put in place specific, tailor-made, effective planning and implementation processes at all levels to deal with the vulnerabilities and threats. It is our intention to make this an example of transboundary cooperation within importance and success together with North Macedonia through a coordinated and joint management body we will further build on the current joint efforts and develop a cross-sectoral cooperation and transboundary conservation in order to achieve a successful, longterm management of Lake Ohrid and its region to ensure that both the natural and cultural values of the whole property are conserved in a full and integrated manner. Finally, let me express our gratitude Minister to you and your government for hospitality and excellent organization of this meeting. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to apply to North Macedonia. Please, you are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of North Macedonia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Republic of North Macedonia strongly supports the extension of the protected property to include the territory within the Republic of Albania and I would like to use this opportunity to congratulate our neighbours for this extension. We firmly believe that this extension will be a significant and positive step towards ensuring the better protection of natural and cultural heritage in the Ohrid region. We commend the work done by our Albania friends in preparation for the extension and we thank the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for their support through the upstream process that strengthens the capacities in both States for transboundary governance. We look forward to the next joint government session between North Macedonia and Albania to be held in the property where we will continue to deepen our cooperation. With regard to the joint management parameters of the site extending the boundaries to include Albania on the 40th anniversary of the Ohrid region's inscription on the World Heritage List would correct a longstanding anomaly and ensure improved protection, promotion and affirmation of the natural and cultural heritage of the Ohrid region for the future. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now as far as you remember Members of the Committee, we decided to return to the question that we didn't close due to the necessity of discussing the Albania file. So now we are at this item, please return to Item 7B.36. Now as agreed I invite you to adopt that draft decision 43 COM 7B.36 concerning the property. Before doing that I would like to ask again the Rapporteur whether there are any amendments.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As you may recall we did have amendments proposed by Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China and Hungary. And I'll just quickly remind the Committee of these proposed amendments. The first four paragraphs are not proposed for amendments. There is a minor amendment in paragraph 5 so the start of that paragraph would read, Notes that partial progress had been made and so on.

Paragraph 3, again rather minor, Notes that the State Party is not regularly informing the World Heritage Centre of projects and planning activities being developed within the boundaries of the property in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines. Paragraph 7 is also proposed for amendment. Notes with concern that the State Party has not yet addressed the recommendations on the Railway corridor VIII, and so on. Then a new paragraph 8 is proposed. Notes with satisfaction that the Party's action on the longterm projects including the waste water management system and re-directing of River Sateska, and furthermore welcomes the government's adoption of Law on Management of the Natural and Cultural Heritage in the Ohrid Region, as well as the government decision taken in June 2019 tasking all relevant domestic institutions to implement the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre.

Then former paragraphs 8 and 9 are both proposed for complete deletion. The next paragraph is unchanged other than the numbering. Former paragraph 11 is then proposed for complete deletion and then the final paragraph would read, Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020 with a view to considering, in case of the confirmation of potential or ascertained danger to its Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Actually, I have a sort of technical question because obviously when we prepared these amendments Lake Ohrid was the World Heritage site of only one State Party but it has now become the World Heritage site of two States Parties. So my question would be, would it be appropriate to add the State Party of North Macedonia in the first paragraph so it's clear which one we are talking about and then in the very last one where we are talking about the need for the state of conservation should it be changed to States Parties. I'm just asking the Secretariat if I'm on the right path or if we can leave the decision as it is. Thank you.

Chairperson:

I think that we can leave this decision as is because by all means the other decision approved before reflects the same requirements that apply to both sides--if you don't mind. Do we need some comment from the legal adviser or is it okay. Okay, it's fine. Thank you.

ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. ICOMOS recalls that during the discussion on the extension most Committee Members supported the extension but acknowledged the considerable threats that were facing the property. We are wondering whether there is any way that those threats can somehow be reflected in this draft decision. For instance, part of what was originally under paragraph 8...

Chairperson:

I'm sorry but as far as I understand it is already late because we approved the previous one and it is not there. So I think the document already reflects this. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Decision 43 COM 7B.36 adopted. *[Applause]*

Chairperson:

Now we move to another part of the world. I now invite ICOMOS and IUCN to present the nomination of Paraty--Culture and Biodiversity from Brazil. Welcome.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. IUCN's evaluation of Paraty--Culture and Biodiversity is on page 87 in both the English and French versions of the IUCN Evaluation Report. Paraty was nominated under cultural criteria (ii), (iv) and (v) and as a cultural landscape in 2009. That nomination was deferred by the Committee to allow the State Party to revise the properties boundaries and consider re-nominating Paraty as a mixed property.

The nominated property is a mixed serial site located in the Serro do Mar region of Brazil, along the southern tip of the State of Rio de Janeiro, and the northern coast of the State of São Paulo. It includes five components: the Serra da Bocaina National Park; Ilha Grande State Park; Praia do Sul Biological Reserve; the Environmental Protection Area of Cairuçu and the Paraty Historic Centre. Following the field mission the State Party advised on boundary adjustments to the nomination including a decision to propose the Environmental Protection Area of Cairuçu, which incorporates the nominated Juatinga Ecological Reserve. The nominated property now covers a total of just over 200,000 hectares with a buffer zone of almost 260,000 hectares.

The nominated property corresponds to a centre of endemism in the Atlantic Forest biodiversity hotspots, one of the five most threatened biodiversity hotspots on the planet. Paraty Ilha Grande includes a unique diversity of landscapes from sea level to about 2000m in elevation. As a result species diversity and endemism are extremely high. More than 500 endemic species of vascular plants have been recorded. The nominated property includes two endemic bird areas supporting 124 endemic bird species, 57% of the total endemic bird species within the hotspot and 450 bird species overall or approximately 45% of all the Atlantic Forests' bird species. The nominated property also includes a remarkable key biodiversity areas related to terrestrial vertebrates, rare freshwater fish and rare plants. Paraty Ilha Grande is also home to an impressive array of rare and charismatic species including such as Jaguar, White-lipped Peccary and several primate species such as Tufted Capuchin, Brown Howler Monkey and Southern Muriqui.

The expansion of component 4 to include all of the 16,000-hectare Environmental Protected Area of Cairuçu means that the proposed property now includes several traditional indigenous communities, quilombos, and caiçaras. Their traditional ways of life based on respectful relationship with the natural environment are a key element of the claim to Outstanding Universal Value of the mixed property. IUCN notes that the nominated property will need to accommodate participation of these communities in management decision-making. The original 1.4Mkm² of the Atlantic Forest region has been reduced to less than 10% of its original extent.

The nominated property has experienced pressure from tourism and real estate development since the opening in the 1970s of the BR-101 highway that connects Rio de Janeiro with São Paulo. The Almirante Álvaro Alberto Nuclear Centre (CNAEA) on BR-101 is one of the largest developments in the region and the nearby Petrobrás Port Terminal (TEBIG) has resulted in dense maritime traffic putting pressure on the marine ecosystem.

Most of the components of the nominated property have the highest level of protection under Brazilian law. Nonetheless, integration of the five components under the cultural and natural values and traditional uses of the complex will require a management plan that integrates management decisions at municipal, state and federal levels. The integrity of natural values in the nominated property is demonstrated by the presence of species that require large areas of intact habitat such as Jaguar, White-lipped Peccary and several primate species. While the combined size of the five components and the buffer zones are adequate to ensure integrity, connectivity between them must be enhanced to maintain the functionality of the site.

IUCN considers that the nominated property meets criterion (ix) as the site demonstrates a remarkably high biodiversity. In terms of criterion (vii) IUCN acknowledges the impressiveness of this land and seascape however, points out that most of the coastline and all of the marine areas are excluded from the proposed boundaries and are included only in the buffer zone. Thus, the proposed property does not present the complete picture described in the justification. In addition, the visual integrity is limited by past forest laws and degradation and the presence of large-scale developments such as the Almirante Álvaro Alberto Nuclear Centre and the Petrobrás Port Terminal, which are considered to detract from the naturalness and aesthetic of the nominated property. IUCN considers that on balance the nominated property has not made a convincing case to meet this criterion when compared to similar properties in the Atlantic Forest.

The draft decision recommending inscription of this nominated property on the basis of natural criterion (x) and the cultural criterion (v) is set out on page 15 in both the English and French versions of working document 8B. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. From a cultural heritage perspective Paraty--Culture and Biodiversity testifies to the occupation of the area by indigenous inhabitants from the 16th century onwards by European settlers and enslaved Africans. The property houses traditional quilombola, Guarani and caiçara communities that maintain the ways of life and production systems of their ancestors as well as most of their relationships, rites and festivals. The fifth component includes the historic centre of Paraty, one of the best-preserved colonial coastal towns in Brazil. It was the terminus point of the Gold Route along which gold was brought to Paraty for shipping to Europe. The constant flows of the tides penetrate into the town, transforming the stone paved streets into a network of conduits.

During the 17th century, Paraty was transformed into an important warehousing and exportation port, favored by its isolation and the numerous inlets and hidden harbours. The historic centre houses four squares, the main one of which constituted the colonial civic centre with its concentration of government buildings and churches. A defense system was designed and constructed to protect the rich port and town and ensure the safe transport of gold along the Gold Route from Minas Gerais to the harbor. Tupi-Guarani language communities have retained close relationships with and deep knowledge of the different forest ecosystems around this trade.

ICOMOS considers that the property meets criterion (v) as an outstanding testimony of human interaction with the environment. ICOMOS further considers that the conditions of integrity and authenticity have been met and that the boundaries and conservation approaches are appropriate. However, we note that protection and management mechanisms offer room for further improvement. Therefore, ICOMOS recommends in addition to inscribing the property under criterion (v) and criterion (x) to complete and elaborate a property management plan, strengthen visitor and risk management provisions and carefully analyze new use propositions of the airfield as well as strengthen participation of the local communities. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any comments, any amendments, any additions to the proposed version? Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would like to make a reference because a few years ago the Calakmul Biosphere Reserve and in 2018 Tehuacán also became a mixed property and both of these sites are in Mexico. Also last year Chiribiquete in Colombia was accepted as a mixed property. Today we hope that Brazil property will be inscribed as a mixed property and indeed I would just like to say that these inscriptions show the valuable mixed heritage that exists in Latin America a region that we believe is still underrepresented given its diversity from both a biological and cultural point of view. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China wishes to use this opportunity to congratulate the State Party of Brazil for presenting such a beautiful and great property for both cultural and natural inscription. We are delighted that the Brazilian government has been working very closely with the Advisory Bodies and we welcome the positive comments by the Advisory Bodies both ICOMOS and IUCN so we support wholeheartedly this result.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have a draft proposal with minor changes to the original text. Please, Rapporteur, can you can we have it on the screen?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We will just pop it in the screen but there are very simple changes from Spain to reflect the name of the property, which is Paraty and Ilha Grande so the second paragraph would just read, inscribes Paraty and Ilha Grande. Also, which we won't need to see but you can see the name in a moment on the screen—there we are. And this will also be reflected, of course throughout the statement of Outstanding Universal Values so that's been changed a few times along with putting the correct name and capitalization of the Ministry, but other than that there are no changes to the proposed decision. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Just briefly we wanted to comment about the communities in the property. We fully support the inscription and we want to particularly note that this site goes some way in fulfilling a significant gap in the World Heritage List in the representation of the interactions of peoples in their environment. We see that the inscription also provides an important opportunity to learn more about the communities of Paraty and how they understand their environment, their resources, the forest, the sea and the knowledge and practices that have sustained them in the past and present and we hope that the listing of this property will provide greater opportunities for the communities of Paraty to maintain and build their sustainable livelihood. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous avons à traiter d'un très beau site, qui marie parfaitement culture et biodiversité. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier les organes consultatifs pour leur rapport, qui montre l'extrême richesse de ce site, mais également l'État partie de nous avoir présenté un si beau dossier. Cela vient à un moment important de l'évolution de nos travaux pour marquer l'inscription d'un site extrêmement important, un site mixte. La Tunisie apporte son soutien à cette inscription.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Mr Chairperson, I will be very brief. Just to congratulate the State Party with this very successful nomination and the work has been done since 2009. It shows how the State Party was dedicated in constructive dialogue with the Advisory Bodies for the protection of this area. I congratulate them again for this inscription. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So if there are no other proposals, I declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.10 adopted as amended [*applause*]. On behalf of the Committee, please allow me

to express our heartfelt congratulations to Brazil for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. The floor is given to the State Party. Brazil, you are welcome.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Brazil is honored and full of joy with this inscription of its first mixed site on the World Heritage List. I would like to express our most sincere gratitude to all Members of this Committee, to the Secretariat and to the Advisory Bodies for qualifying Paraty and Ilha Grande as a site of Outstanding Universal Value. I would like to announce the presence at this meeting of our Special Secretary of Culture of Brazil, of the Mayors of Paraty and Ilha Grande as well as the President of our National Historic and Artistic Heritage Institute (IPHAN) who worked on this dossier for more than 10 years. I will now pass the floor to our Secretary of Culture, Mr Henrique Medeiros Pires.

Mr Henrique Medeiros Pires:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Good afternoon to one and all. Thanks to all the work done from the very top down we have been able to get recognition of the important and the duty to conserve this mixed natural and cultural site of Paraty and Ilha Grande. We are sure that this will only enrich the cultural and natural heritage of our country. For years now, we have been able to work on ensuring the adequate recognition of the site with all of its cultural and natural attributes. This is part of the strategic approach to sustainable development process. Since 2019, IPHAN in Brazil has been working on Paraty as an exceptional mixed site. It has an inestimable value, both in terms of what it can teach us, and the influence it can have and the NGOs, associations and civil society organizations have been working to defend the biodiversity of Paraty and Ilha Grande and other regions. Brazil has been delighted to be able to announce this fantastic result and we are indebted to the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and to UNESCO and we want to offer them our special thanks for all of this support and encouragement in inscribing this site and in recognizing its OUV. With your permission now we would like to hand over to the Paraty representatives who are here with me. Thank you very much. *[Applause]*

Paraty representative:

Thank you very much. We invite all the Members of the Committee to visit the paradise of Paraty and Ilha Grande. Thank you very much!

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Once more we congratulate you with this inscription and we are moving to the other discussion.

Now we have finished the examination of the mixed nominations and we move to the cultural sites. According to the list we start with Burkina Faso, Ancient ferrous metallurgy sites. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr Balsamo you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination. This factual error also has an impact on the proposed statement of OUV and the factual error notification will be found on page 46 of the English version of document INF.8B.4 and on page 51 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. ICOMOS, you are welcome. Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation on this property can be found on page 45 in the English version and page 49 in the French

version. Next, please. This is a serial nomination including five component parts: Tiwêga, Yamané, Kindibo, Békuy, Douroula. These include some fifteen furnaces still standing, several furnace bases, assemblages of slag, mines and some traces of dwellings all spanning 2500 years from the 8th century BCE to after the 15th century. Tiwêga consists of three still-standing induced draft furnaces that are 2.6m high with conical shapes and slag fragments. Yamané includes two induced draft furnaces and several bases of other furnace types. The components also comprise scattered slag, mines and anthropogenic mounds.

Archaeological research dates the site between the 13th and 14th centuries. Kindibo includes three still-standing induced draft furnaces, built out of successive circles. They are believed to date from the 10th-11th centuries up to post-15th century. Extraction mines, access pits, and a dwelling site with mounds covered by potsherds complete the component. Békuy is different from the other components in terms of its highly structured spatial organization, and the quantity of slag heaps found there. Underground and semi-underground natural air-draft type furnaces are built with slag blocks bound with clay. Several dozen backfilled pits complete the property with an iron ore mine found at the edge of the buffer zone. The site of Douroula includes the remains of a semi-underground furnace, dated to the 8th century, which is the oldest discovered in Burkina Faso up to now. It takes the form of a conical bowl in the ground, with walls made of laterite earth. Fields of slag, an ore quarry and anthropogenic mounds have also been found there.

The serial property has been nominated under criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi) because it bears emblematic testimony to ancient ferrous metallurgy in Burkina Faso covering the old technical systems related to this technology. They also illustrate different morphological types of furnace, the different working modes of induced draft furnaces and the diversity of materials used in their construction as well as epochs of construction. The State Party has fully harnessed the evaluation process and through additional comparative studies has demonstrated that In the context of the long iron sequence in Africa, the presence of furnaces still standing in Burkina Faso bears witness to socio-technical knowhow based on skill in furnace construction as well as on method processing which is still practiced and blacksmiths are very much revered and respected in the contemporary social structure in the villages.

The state of conservation of the property cause concerns, due to termite infestation of some of these furnaces as well as some factors affecting the properties including agricultural activities in the vicinity of the archaeological remains. Additional information gives an account of specific conservation measures undertaken with the involvement of the local communities but conservation remains a challenge for the property, as it requires a steady flow of financial and human resources. Due to conservation issues, both integrity and authenticity are vulnerable although a selection of the sites has been fully justified.

The boundaries are appropriate for the property and the buffer zone has been established through a participatory process of the local population. The combined legal and customary protections present advantages to the property as it involves local populations and enhances their awareness. On the other hand the management needs to be developed to incorporate risk preparedness and action plans with clear priorities and adequate resources.

ICOMOS therefore recommends that Ancient ferrous metallurgy sites, Burkina Faso is inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi). ICOMOS has also provided an additional set of recommendations to be implemented concerning strengthening protection, conservation, research and management. ICOMOS further recommends that the State Party submit a report on the implementation of the recommendations above and finally suggests that the name of the property be slightly modified to become Ancient ferrous metallurgy of Burkina Faso. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have the draft decision. Are there any comments? Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. L'Angola aimerait féliciter l'État partie du Burkina Faso pour l'excellent dossier qu'ils ont soumis pour inscription, et également féliciter l'ICOMOS pour le travail d'évaluation logique et rationnel qui a été fait sur ce dossier important. Donc nous sommes devant un site historique qui marque justement des civilisations africaines pour ce qui concerne les techniques de traitement du fer. J'ai eu le privilège, personnellement, le mois dernier, au mois de juin, de visiter un de ces sites, à Kaya, donc je suis devant ce que j'ai vécu sur le terrain, qui montre jusqu'à quel point les populations africaines ont du génie pour pouvoir traiter certains matériaux qui contribuaient évidemment à l'économie locale, et comment ce site justement essaie d'aider les populations locales à développer toute une série de produits dérivés de ce minerai de fer. Donc nous sommes devant un site, non pas seulement enrichit la Liste du patrimoine mondial mais également va aider les populations locales à améliorer leurs conditions de vie. Nous félicitons donc une fois de plus l'État partie du Burkina Faso et l'encourageons à continuer à travailler avec l'ICOMOS, notamment sur les recommandations qui ont été faites d'améliorer le cadre de gestion et les défis de conservation que certains biens présentent donc nous pensons que cette collaboration va certainement aider et assister l'État partie dans le maintien de la valeur universelle de ce site exceptionnel. Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Merci à vous. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Mr Chairperson, my delegation takes pride in the inscription of Ancient ferrous metallurgy sites of Burkina Faso on the World Heritage List and on behalf of the Africa Group V(a) region, congratulations is due to the State Party for coming this far. Anyone who visits this awesome landscape departs somewhat differently upon realizing the centuries old magnificence of how the ancient civilizations of this part of Africa registered tremendous levels of technical, scientific, artistic and crafts sophistication in extracting ferrous ores from the earth and how the craftspeople processed them into numerous metallic products despite the low level of technological advancement of those times. The craftspeople used simple technology to make artefacts of tremendous power and cleverness and since the 13th century to date the furnaces through which the ores were processed resulted into the various ancient ferrous metallurgy sites of Burkina Faso, which are still intact. In protecting the OUV of the site, the delegation of Uganda joins ICOMOS in requesting the State Party of Burkina Faso to embrace the complementary recommendations added to decision 43 COM 8B.11 in favour of sustainable management of this landscape alongside joining the World Heritage List. I congratulate Burkina Faso again and I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Very briefly, this delegation would like to commend the State Party of Burkina Faso for the efforts they have undertaken to ensure the OUV of this property. Indeed, we commend the Advisory Body for their technical support to the State Party. Therefore, we support the inscription of this property under criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi). Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie voudrait tout d'abord remercier les organes consultatifs de nous avoir présenté un rapport extrêmement détaillé sur ce dossier, et nous voudrions aussi remercier l'État partie du remarquable travail qui a été fait. Je crois que c'est une inscription, vers laquelle nous nous acheminons, de quelque chose d'extrêmement important par rapport à l'ensemble des sites que le continent africain a jusque-là inscrit. C'est un bien en série ; c'est un bien qui s'attache à beaucoup d'éléments de la culture africaine, sur la métallurgie ancienne bien entendu, mais au-delà, et cela a été remarquablement souligné par le Centre du patrimoine mondial dans sa présentation, sur l'extrême qualité de la préservation de l'ensemble des éléments, puisqu'on parle là de fours qui n'ont pas été démontés depuis leur installation. Et il y a aussi une reconnaissance de la richesse technique et des traditions de ces populations, et notamment la communauté des forgerons. C'est un très beau dossier et nous voudrions vraiment féliciter l'État partie d'avoir présenté un dossier de cette qualité. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Zimbabwe would like to add its voice to other States Parties in congratulating the State Party of Burkina Faso for the deserved inscription of its property, the Ancient ferrous metallurgy sites to the World Heritage List. Mr Chairperson, this achievement bears testimony of the State Party's ability to preserve and present the well-protected iron ore smelting furnaces which are directly associated with their living traditions of all iron technology of West African communities dating back to over thousands of years ago. We have no doubt in the State Party's future commitment and ability to safeguard into perpetuity of the property's Outstanding Universal Value. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. As far as I know the last speaker is Spain and Norway.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson for this privilege, the privilege of being the last delegation to take the floor. Quite honestly we are delighted here in our delegation because this is an African property that is being inscribed on the List and we are always hoping to see a more geographically balanced List. So congratulations to Burkina Faso. It's an underrepresented category of site, a historic site so we are delighted to see it happen but we do understand that this is going to raise some challenges so congratulations Burkina Faso, congratulations Africa.

Chairperson:

Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We just wanted to say that we wholeheartedly support the inscription. Félicitations au Burkina Faso. Merci.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Azerbaijan joins the previous speakers in congratulating the State Party for this inscription. It is the only one from Africa this year and we really commend the State Party for its efforts for the preservation of this site. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you. It's always a great pleasure to congratulate somebody so in this case we want to join all the others to congratulate Burkina Faso for this site and we are delighted that one more site is added in Africa. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I am happy to have such a positive atmosphere in the hall. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We are very delighted to join the chorus of congratulations for Burkina Faso. There is so much more to do in terms of achieving better representation of Africa on the World Heritage List and this is a most welcome addition.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Senegal, I can see the representative of Senegal. Please, the last speaker.

La Délégation du Sénégal (Observateur):

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais juste féliciter chaleureusement le Burkina Faso pour cette inscription, car les sites de métallurgie anciennes de réduction du fer sont les témoignages de ce savoir-faire technologique que les pays africains, les civilisations africaines ont maîtrisé à une époque très, très ancienne. C'est important de le préciser et de dire en même temps que la plupart des pays de l'Afrique de l'Ouest partagent, si vous voulez, cette réalité. C'est le moment d'encourager d'ailleurs les États parties qui partagent cette continuité historique, qui ont également des hauts fourneaux, de travailler sur une extension et de nous donner un peu ce qu'on pourrait appeler la route du fer en Afrique de l'Ouest. Elle existe. Que ce soit au Sénégal, au Mali, au Burkina Faso, au Niger, nous avons cette extension qui devrait être faite, donc que ces pays travaillent dans ce sens. Je vous remercie

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Senegal. Hungary. I hope no objections.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I know this is one too much, but I would like to express our congratulations to Burkina Faso for this very successful nomination first of all, because the Ancient ferrous metallurgy sites are an extraordinarily unique thing in this region and secondly, because in this region Burkina Faso and the nearby countries--many sites are in danger and we do hope that it can be kept in very good position also later and thirdly, because this

metallurgical activity went through the boundaries up to the Mediterranean and so it is more important than we could imagine. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Honorable Members of the Committee, as far as I know there are no amendments or draft proposals so I therefore declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.11 adopted as amended [*applause*]. Let me congratulate Burkina Faso on behalf of the entire Committee for the inscription of this property to the World Heritage List. Burkina Faso you have two minutes for a statement. Please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Mesdames et Messieurs, chers amis de la culture, Monsieur le Président de la session, je voudrais tout d'abord, au nom du Gouvernement du Burkina Faso, de la délégation de mon pays, au mien propre et même aussi à celui de mon collègue de la culture qui n'a pas pu être là, exprimer mes vives félicitations et ma gratitude à l'endroit des plus hautes autorités de la République d'Azerbaïdjan pour l'organisation parfaite de cette 43^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, que vous présidez de main de maître.

Je voudrais ensuite saluer Mme la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO et toute son équipe, et précisément Mme la Directrice du Centre du patrimoine mondial, le Fonds du patrimoine mondial et les experts du Comité du patrimoine mondial, pour tout le soutien multiforme dont mon pays a bénéficié pour aboutir aujourd'hui à l'inscription des Sites de métallurgie ancienne du fer au patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO.

Troisième du genre au compte de mon pays, après celle des Ruines de Loropéni et du Complexe W-Arly-Pendjari, une inscription sur cette prestigieuse Liste est un honneur et une source de fierté, non seulement pour le peuple burkinabé, mais aussi pour l'Afrique tout entière, parce qu'aujourd'hui nous célébrons l'Afrique qui participe à l'industrie mondiale, qui participe à la créativité et à la technologie. Notre pays est connu pour sa diversité et son dynamisme culturel. Nous vous invitons, par-delà ce site culturel, à fréquenter l'artisanat africain, le cinéma africain. Mais cette victoire d'aujourd'hui, à un moment où notre pays fait l'objet d'attaques terroristes, est une énergie qui galvanise nos troupes. C'est pourquoi le Burkina Faso est conscient que l'Afrique a très peu de biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ; l'Afrique présente un visage peu reluisant sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril. Onze États africains n'ont pas encore de bien inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et nous espérons que ces pays travaillent à cela.

Pour cette nouvelle inscription portant sur une tradition qui existe depuis trois millénaires, le Burkina Faso est disposé à renforcer la coopération autour de la métallurgie ancienne du fer, comme il l'a stipulé au niveau de l'objectif 4 du plan de gestion de sa proposition de nomination. C'est le lieu pour ma délégation et moi, tout en manifestant une satisfaction légitime, de nous sentir tout aussi interpellés sur la grande responsabilité qui est confiée à mon pays, car le tout n'est pas d'inscrire un bien, mais il s'agit de le conserver, de le protéger.

Je ne saurais terminer mon propos sans prendre l'engagement, avec les experts du groupe Afrique, de toute l'Afrique, de travailler avec les autres gouvernements et États parties à l'occasion de la sauvegarde de notre patrimoine africain. Nous voudrions ensuite féliciter et remercier la grande équipe des experts et le groupe Afrique, mais aussi dire que c'est un travail de synergie gouvernementale et de solidarité qui a porté ses fruits aujourd'hui. Je voudrais qu'on puisse féliciter tous les experts qui nous ont accompagnés. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Once more we cordially congratulate Burkina Faso for the inscription. And I would like to make one announcement that according to the apply of several States the discussion of their files will be postponed for tomorrow. Now we proceed to Item 10.

Chairperson:

I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Babylon, Iraq, Item 8B.13 presented by Mr Balsamo. Please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination and this factual error notification will have also some impact on the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It is to be found on page 78 in both the English and French versions of document INF.8B.4. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I am sorry, may I ask for the continuation of celebrations out of this room, please? Burkina Faso, please, please take a seat. Thank you very much. Thank you. ICOMOS, please. You are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The nominated property includes the archaeological remains contained in both the inner and the outer city as well as selected agricultural areas surrounding excavated ruins of the ancient Neo-Babylonian capital, Babylon. The property was first deferred in 1983, in order to prepare a safeguarding plan, clarify restoration aims and define the boundaries. Several previous initiatives of UNESCO supported its protection and in particular two special sessions at assessing the condition of this site of Babylon in 2005 and the establishment an ICC (International Coordination Committee for Safeguarding of the Cultural Heritage of Iraq) subcommittee in 2007.

The nominated property has an area of 1054 hectares and a buffer zone of 154 hectares. As the capital of the Neo-Babylonian Empire (626-539 BCE), it is an exceptional testimony of this culture at its height. Babylon is one of the largest and oldest settlements in Mesopotamia, which provides testimony to the seat of successive powerful empires under such famous rulers as Hammurabi and Nebuchadnezzar. The city has brought forward architectural and urban references widely acknowledged such as the Ishtar Gate, the Ishtar Temple, the Nabu shakhare Temple and many, many others. Only 18% of the archaeological city has been excavated and ICOMOS commends the very cautious policies for future excavations adopted by the State Party. Above the archaeological evidence one finds reconstructions created during the Revival of Babylon Project in the 1980s, sometimes of a larger scale but largely based on the archaeological walls of the historic remains underneath. The Summer Palace here illustrates the methods and scale of these reconstructions.

The property first of all contains post-neo-Babylonian structures including archaeological evidence from later periods, here the Greek amphitheater or architectural remains of the Islamic era. Unfortunately, a number of architectural structures were also added above the urban archeological evidence in the 20th century including the palace of Saddam Hussein, the police headquarters, the antiquities administration, a touristic village and structures established during the site's military use as Camp Babylon in the early 21st century which both covers significant areas at the centre of the property. Surface damage occurred in the context of vehicular movements during the site's military utilization. Most of these alterations occurred above the archeological evidence, which can be seen in this overlay of 1930 archeological survey with the contemporary aerial photograph.

ICOMOS in its evaluation process considered that the 20th and 21st century aboveground alterations do not support Outstanding Universal Value and should not be conceived as part of the property. It therefore, in its dialogue with the State Party recommended the development of a three-dimensional boundary definition, which was very positively responded to by the State Party. The property now contains within it aboveground buffer zones while the below surface archeological remains remain included in the property area.

ICOMOS further notes that despite continuous efforts of the State Party and the provision of considerable financial support by the Iraqi government the property is in a precarious condition with several structures at the verge of collapse.

ICOMOS considers that the property meets criteria (iii) and (vi) but that the qualifying conditions of both integrity and authenticity are at stake in terms of intactness and material evidence given the extremely vulnerable condition of the site.

The state of conservation of Babylon raises serious concerns with many structures in urgent need of conservation and several at the verge of collapse and ICOMOS considers that this critical state of conservation constitutes a clear threat to the integrity of the property in accordance with paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines. ICOMOS therefore recommends inscribing Babylon simultaneously on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. The latter recommendation is by no means intended penalize the State Party for its many efforts to conserve the property and the significant funding it has made available in this regard.

The recommendation to inscribe Babylon on the List of World Heritage in Danger tends to draw international attention towards its very critical state and to call upon international technical cooperation towards developing the best possible strategies and methodologies for its international protection in line with Article 7 of the World Heritage Convention. Aspects of such international cooperation could also include the additional recommendations made by ICOMOS in particular the preparation of a comprehensive conservation plan for the property. Further recommendations including a reactive monitoring mission suggested to assist in developing the desired state of conservation can be found in the draft decision before you. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Do we have any comments, any interventions concerned with this file? Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je crois qu'avec ce site nous touchons quelque chose d'extrêmement important et cela est apparu déjà dans les rapports faits par les organes consultatifs et également dans la présentation par le Centre, qu'ils en soient remerciés. Nous parlons d'un site où notre civilisation dans sa globalité a vu le jour. C'est le berceau de la civilisation et l'un des plus grands et probablement des plus anciens lieux de peuplement en Mésopotamie. Chacun de nous a dans son imaginaire ce que Babylone représente ou, en tout état de cause, une représentation de Babylone.

Je crois que, de la présentation qu'on vient d'écouter, du rapport qui nous a été soumis et de l'ensemble de nos connaissances sur cette région et de son histoire, il est évident que l'inscription de Babylone sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial vient combler une absence d'ailleurs remarquable et remarquée dans cette liste. Dans l'esprit de ceux qui ont fait cette convention, c'est ce genre, ce type de sites qui a été envisagé au départ. Donc c'est extrêmement important que nous complétions cette liste dans la direction de sa crédibilité, sa représentativité et son équilibre.

Les points qui ont été soulignés et la vérification qui nous a été présentée des critères (iii) et (vi) sont extrêmement importants. On y souligne le témoignage le plus exceptionnel de cette culture à son apogée. Bien évidemment, quand on parle de critère (vi), chacun de nous a à l'esprit depuis son enfance ce que la tour de Babel et ce que les jardins suspendus constituent dans notre imaginaire. Tous ces éléments montrent que c'est vraiment un moment important dans l'histoire de cette liste que nous vivons ce soir.

Tout cela plaide en faveur de son inscription, ce que les organes consultatifs confortent aussi. Tout au plus, nous avons vu, et nous y sommes extrêmement sensibles, une proposition de l'inscrire tout en le faisant figurer en même temps sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril. Je ne vous cache pas que les critères et les éléments qui ont été présentés sont absolument importants, sont à prendre en considération, sauf que je crois que c'est important de souligner ce qui est proposé dans cette direction. Essentiellement : élaborer et finaliser un plan de conservation ; renforcer le plan de gestion qui est existant ; encourager la coopération internationale. Nous croyons que ce sont des éléments extrêmement importants et nécessaires à la conservation de ce site et sa meilleure tenue.

C'est pour ça que je vous propose, Monsieur le Président, qu'on donne la parole à l'État partie pour qu'il nous dise sa disposition à faire face à ces points, sans passer par la Liste en péril, parce que je crois qu'il y a un signal important à l'adresse de toutes ces populations que cette inscription est un moment fort ; elle induira l'énergie suffisante pour la bonne protection, sans passer par la Liste en péril. Merci beaucoup de votre attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the Advisory Body and the State Party for finally after 35 years that chapter of the dossier has been closed in a partially positive way. What is the World Heritage List without Babel? And how to tell the history of humanity without going back to the earliest of all chapters, Babel. One would assume that during the early years, during the time of the fore fathers and mothers, of this Convention that such fundamental start of human history would have been a global priority to ensure its listing. Any shortcoming in achieving the pillars in which the Outstanding Universal Value that Babel depends on is a shortcoming of the international community. Resilient Iraq continues to provide lessons to all of us with regard to the importance of heritage to the State, to Iraqi society, to the local people who are taking care of Iraqi heritage and the site managers if you would meet them you can touch deeply rooted the sense of responsibility that they inherited over generations that which makes the very sense of their sense of pride.

We call on the Committee Members again--I really call on the Committee Members to consider a symbolic gesture of solidarity with Babel, with Iraq and heritage at large, to celebrate a list of heritage that includes Babel. It should have been a long, long time ago—a really much overdue moment to be inscribed, but not on the in Danger list. And I don't think we need attention or reasons for Babel to secure funds to get the necessity to be done in the site. As I know, the local government and the national government of Iraq have allocated a substantial budget to overcome all the concerns of the Advisory Body so again, I urge all the Committee Members to inscribe the site but not on the Danger list. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. Whereas it is now common knowledge as contained in sections 2 and 4 of draft decision 43 COM 8B.13, that Babylon, Iraq is now poised for simultaneous inscription respectively on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The delegation of Uganda takes full cognizance of the effort of the State Party of Iraq and provides encouragement that the second part of this inscription is set to generate hitherto unforeseen advantages poised to ignite unique intermediate and longterm benefit transfers to Babylon. Accordingly, Mr Chairperson, simultaneous inscription of this site comes in a post-Gulf War era signifying exceptional resilience and commitment of the Iraqi government towards the mobilization of considerable funding for conservation, scholar exposition, visitor comfort and concurrent protection of its OUV highest possible standards. The Uganda delegation commends the Iraqi government for this feat amid this projected urgency of even more fervent resource-led reduction and mitigation of threats highlighted in the statement of integrity of the property.

In this connection, Mr Chairperson, as the government of Iraq seems uncomfortable about the concurrent inscription of Babylon on the List of World Heritage in Danger for supposedly denoting a penalty for inheriting a severe situation and prejudice against already ongoing corrective measures it is beyond doubt that this second part of the inscription will in fact attract more effective resource-driven attention and care both locally and internationally and further galvanize a more robust timeless and active driven conservation management planning regime as an immeasurable benefit for Babylon. I submit Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Mr Chairperson, it should be noted that in the 1980s, Babylon suffered from the inappropriate construction of its main monuments and from landscape alteration. New damages were inflicted to the property between 2003 and 2005 when it was used as a military base by the foreign forces. Fortunately for the past decade the Babylon has been the focus of urgent conservation work and longterm management and conservation planning undertaken by the State Party in collaboration with the World Monuments Fund. Clearly, the State Party needs more time to secure their fragile integrity and authenticity of Babylon. This endeavour should take place with additional international assistance and cooperation especially from ICOMOS and UNESCO, a step the State Party appears fully open to. Tanzania, therefore is of the view that in such circumstances and at this stage there appears to be no justification for inscribing simultaneously the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Therefore we support the amendments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would like to thank ICOMOS for their thorough presentation which clearly outlines the efforts made by the State Party of Iraq in demonstrating the clear OUV of the property in this previously deferred nomination file. The Danger listing mechanism is seen by Bahrain as an opportunity to highlight the need for international cooperation and financial and technical support. The government of Iraq has pledged sufficient funding over the next five years and sustains ongoing international cooperation with the World Monuments Fund. We therefore doubt that the Danger listing proposition could bring these benefits in the case of Babylon. We request that ICOMOS clarifies and elaborates on the proposition on Danger listing and how that will benefit the State Party.

We would also like to ask the State Party of Iraq to outline to the Committee its existing and projected plan to ensure the desired state of conservation of the property in line with the Advisory Bodies' advice and guidelines. Bahrain reiterates its commitment to the support of all Arab States in the implementation of the Convention to the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage and we look forward to continuing our cooperation with Iraq on this matter. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like to express our great satisfaction with the proposal of the inscription of Babylon as an archaeological and symbolic site, testimony to one of the most important civilizations of the ancient world, which left the whole world a remarkable cultural and scientific legacy. As to the recommendation to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, we would like to call the attention of this Committee to the negative message that we would be passing to potential tourists to the region who would perhaps associate listing in Danger to threats of violence tourist attacks. We therefore do not favour the immediate inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger especially considering that the integrity of most of the site is not affected considering that 82% of the site is still to be excavated. Thank you very much Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Indonesia would like to praise the Republic of Iraq for its well-prepared nomination for the inscription of the Babylon archeological site on the World Heritage List. The site is the most exceptional testimony of a great empire once reigning in Mesopotamia and the Middle East, which have been renowned worldwide for its cultural achievements as one of the most important milestones in the history of world civilization. Indonesia recognizes the state of conservation of the property, which suffers from severe damage caused by nonstandard reconstruction and a long-lasting conflict in the past. However, Indonesia believes the strong commitment of the State Party to take all the necessary measures to protect, conserve and manage the property. The Advisory Body reports that the State Party has committed to provide a considerable fund to ensure the conservation study and presentation of the property to international standards. Furthermore, the well-prepared management plan shows both federal and provincial government commitment with enforcement of local and international communities to protect, study, manage and monitor the state of conservation of the property.

Indonesia would support the amendment proposed by the delegation of Tunisia and others to delete paragraph 4 of the draft decision and not to inscribe Babylon on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. My delegation just like those who have come before me is impressed by the integrity and authenticity of this site, which is undoubtable. Therefore it needs to be included in our opinion on the World Heritage List. However, we also

believe that the Member State needs to be given time to continue to resolve the issues on the site so that it can turn the very complicated situation that exists today around. That is why we advocate including this property on the World Heritage List but not on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Clear. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson, for giving us the floor. Babylon is one of the most famous culture heritage sites in the world. We heard about this unique cultural site of the Hanging Gardens of Babylon in childhood and we were reminded of it later in the 1970s with the beautiful song Rivers of Babylon. It is not necessary to talk about how Babylon is valuable for all humanity. Thank you very much to ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for working hard and for fruitful work and special thanks to the State Party for the preservation of this site for all of us and for future generations despite security challenges. The site has been under discussion since 1983 and finally it will be inscribed on the World Heritage List. We fully agree with the ICOMOS statement that the nominated property of Babylon is an exceptional testimony of the Babylonian and Neo-Babylonian empires, which are not currently represented on the World Heritage List. Babylon has also been a powerful symbol, or metaphor, not only in the religious texts of the three monotheistic religions but also as a symbol of reference in the arts and literature at large. We agree with ICOMOS' kind request to the State Party to revise the boundary zones and especially the boundary of the buffer zone. Our delegation supports the amendment for inscription of the nominated property on the World Heritage List. The State Party has really done a great job necessary to give the opportunity to continue their successful work. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China welcomes the decision of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to inscribe Babylon on the World Heritage List. It is a great part of ancient civilization. It should be well protected and we appreciate the tremendous efforts of the State Party to achieve that despite the disruption of war and other activities. The State Party wants no money from international support, therefore we feel the State Party should be given time to continue their efforts in this direction and we very much hope, also, that the distinguished delegation of Iraq be given the opportunity to speak to clarify some of their positions on this matter. China joins the others in sponsoring the amendment to the draft decision to enlist Babylon on the World Heritage List but not enlist it on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. We would like to congratulate the State Party for its efforts. It's been 35 years since the file was first examined. And thank you for the detailed analysis provided by ICOMOS for shedding light and giving us light at the end of the tunnel that gives us hope. Indeed Babylon is a testimony of the ancient world and it is something from a cultural and historic point of view extremely important for the whole world as well in terms of the architecture, the urban aspects of past civilizations and artistic aspects of creativity and astronomy as well. This incredible site is also important from the aspects of

fine art and art. How many works of art came out of Babylon we may ask ourselves. Therefore when it comes to Outstanding Universal Value that is clear, it has been clearly stated in criterion (ii) and we also recognize the efforts that have been made to set up a management plan so that the site can be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

We take into account the current situation regarding the state of conservation of the property however we have also spoken about similar cases on this Committee and Guatemala is therefore in favor in inscribing this site on the World Heritage List but we also we support the amendment by Tunisia and other countries to not inscribe it on the List of World Heritage in Danger. We are in favour of giving the State Party more time to correct the issues and we also are in favour of the amendment by Norway that give more clarity. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous voulons à notre tour féliciter la République d'Iraq pour cette proposition d'inscription et pour ces efforts qu'elle consent pour la conservation de Babylone. Ce bien de première importance a subi de nombreux outrages, mais il est à présent protégé par l'État partie qui, avec l'appui technique du World Monuments Fund, a mis en place un système de gestion du bien. Il mène également un programme de conservation d'urgence et permet à ses professionnels de se mettre à niveau. L'Iraq dédie un budget conséquent à ces efforts, alors même que ce pays a été frappé par des conflits successifs et est en phase de reconstruction. Sans doute que beaucoup reste encore à faire pour permettre à Babylone d'atteindre un état de conservation optimal, mais il ne fait pas de doute que l'Iraq est fermement engagé dans cette démarche et a les moyens de la mener à bien dans un délai raisonnable. Aussi, mon pays estime non justifiée la proposition de l'inscrire simultanément sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril. Nous appuyons donc de ce fait l'amendement pour son inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. We have been privileged enough to have visited Babylon and therefore we would like to congratulate the State Party on the efforts that have been made so far. In terms of the tangible and intangible aspects of this site Babylon is a civilization born out of the desert and it reminds us that once it was possible for all of the monotheistic religions to coexist peacefully. Babylon was able to rise from the sands and therefore we have added on to the amendment presented by other Members States and we also add our voice to the point made by Norway. We believe that a property like this needs to be included on the World Heritage List. Not only is this an example of a site that fulfils the criteria but it's also a very important example of the survival of our human civilization given all the wars and conflicts that this site has been through. I believe that we need to do everything possible to avoid inscribing this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would like to congratulate Iraq and of course we support inscription on Babylon on the World Heritage List but after what we have heard from our

distinguished delegates from Kuwait, Bahrain and others we are not in favour of simultaneous inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please. The last one.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Babylon is the keystone in the history of our heritage and urban life in the world and we would like to support the amendment proposed by Tunisia, Bahrain, Kuwait and other countries.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now as far as I can see most of the speakers were supporting the new draft decision provided for our consideration. So may I ask the Rapporteur to proceed? Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. As discussed we have received amendments from various countries for this property. The first three will remain the same and after the statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Paragraph 4 would be deleted as would paragraph 5 in its entirety.

And then paragraph 4 has two suggestions so from Tunisia and the other countries it would read, Recommends that the State Party give urgent consideration to the following and then it would remain as it was. Norway suggesting an amendment, which is to invite—sorry, consideration of the following, inviting a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Advisory mission to the property as soon as possible to joint establish an immediate action plan and roadmap for the development of a detailed conservation and emergency stabilization strategy for the property on the basis of such a phased and costed action—maybe that should say strategy—immediate efforts would then be made with the assistance of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to find partners, technical support and donors to support this large-scale international conservation project. And then we can keep going down. This is unchanged.

Paragraph 5, Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2020 a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020. Those are the entirety of the amendments we have received. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all Norway would like to congratulate the distinguished State Part of Iraq with this very successful nomination and we wholeheartedly support the recommended inscription of this important cultural heritage of Babylon. We believe that most people in the world have great association with the name and history of Babylon. We also register that there is a motion in the room and as a principle we would prefer to keep the original text but given the situation we as shown on the screen like the addition to the draft amendment as a new paragraph 4 a). Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just a matter of procedure, before we discuss the two different draft amendments a lot of the Committee Members asked the State Party to reply to certain specific questions so hopefully after we listen to the State Party comment on specific questions we can then discuss the draft amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

You are correct. So if you don't mind I will give the floor to Hungary and then to the State Party before the approval of the decision.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I congratulate the State Party of course and many thanks to the Advisory Body for these proposals to be inscribed for the site because it is really important for humankind. Hungary supports the amendments given the possibility to not inscribe it at once on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Hungary, however, would like to give short additions to paragraph a) the new paragraph a). We prefer such a wording here that as soon as possible but until the end of this year so 2019 before at the end of the paragraph there is a compulsory task to give the SOC until the end of February so it would be better to emphasize this Advisory mission should take place before the end of 2019. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now I would like to apply to the State Party, the honorable delegation of Iraq to answer the questions, which were posed by the Committee Members. Please.

The Observer Delegation of Iraq:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We fully share the concerns as regards the state of conservation of Babylon as demonstrated by our transparency about the issue in the nomination dossier. But we also contend that describing Babylon as a property in Danger would penalize Iraq for inheriting a severe situation and incorrectly signal that we are not already engaged in taking corrective measures. I will give the floor to his Excellency, Minister of Culture, Dr Abdulameer Al-Dafar Al-Hamdani to continue the message.

Minster of Culture, Iraq:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all would like to express Iraq's deep thanks and appreciation to the efforts that have been made by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. The Republic of Iraq understands the concerns regarding the conservation status of Babylon that had been made in the 1980s. But Iraq is eager to conduct a corrective conservation and set a comprehensive conservation plan and management plan based on the Outstanding Universal Value in cooperation with the international community and with ICOMOS. For that the Iraqi government has granted \$250M for the coming five years to conduct urgent conservation for the city of Babylon and we, of course, welcome the mission of ICOMOS to visit Babylon in 2020 to assist our commitments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, honorable Minister. Tunisia has the floor.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais remercier l'État partie qui confirme ce que nous avons dit dans la présentation, à savoir sa disposition à coopérer avec le Centre et avec les instances consultatives pour établir les meilleures conditions pour que ce site inscrit au

patrimoine bénéficie de la meilleure protection et conservation possible. Ça, c'est le premier point.

Le deuxième est qu'il y a un financement disponible pour cela, donc nous n'allons pas perdre du temps à chercher à lever des fonds, ce qui est extrêmement sensible par rapport à la question du temps de mise en place de tous ces mécanismes, et la deuxième chose est que, sur le plan du principe, l'État partie est prêt à recevoir, et donc il n'y a pas lieu je crois d'aller consigner cela dans notre décision puisque cela a été admis par l'État partie devant nous. Je voudrais donc à la fois appuyer le projet d'amendement tel qu'on l'a présenté et, deuxièmement, féliciter l'État partie pour l'esprit de coopération et l'esprit de s'insérer dans les conditions de notre réflexion commune aujourd'hui. Il y a lieu, je crois, comme on reconnaît l'élément historique dans sa grandeur et dans sa beauté, d'ajouter à cela la confiance que l'on doit avoir à l'endroit de l'État partie.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I think looking at the draft amendment submitted by Norway there is a lot of redundancy in a majority of things we cover in the next paragraph, former a) and now b) regarding the comprehensive conservation plan and all the other points so I don't think there is a need to add or to have it again so I suggest to not have it.

Chairperson:

Thank you. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. Just very briefly we have now the addition from the distinguished of Hungary to put a deadline actually by the end of 2019, to have the joint mission. But just now the Iraqi Minister mentioned that they are willing to invite the joint mission in 2020. I was just wondering if the Hungary delegation wishes to insist on this deadline. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Hungary?

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you. I proposed this date because just at the end, the last paragraph of this proposed decision there is a date, February 2020 and it means that at least for me that it would be very good to be able to prepare this report and submit it to the Committee to be able to examine it at the 44th session of the Committee. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. There was one concrete question which was addressed to ICOMOS--considering the benefits of a possible Danger listing which has been a little overcome by the discussion in the meantime but nevertheless ICOMOS appreciates the considerable amount of resources that have been made available by the State Party for the conservation of Babylon and ICOMOS believes that now regardless of whether this site is listed on the List of World Heritage in Danger or not, what is really important is that international cooperation and assistance is provided to establish the correct priorities for the utilization of

these resources in developing an immediate urgent stabilization plan and a longterm comprehensive conservation plan and ICOMOS would like to assure its willingness to contribute in this process and in this context the joint mission that was proposed by the State Party of Norway is very welcome at the earlier opportunity to assist the State Party in the context that is perceived as extremely urgent from our point of view. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je crois que l'intention de la proposition norvégienne est tout ce qu'il y a de plus louable et salubre, mais avec ce que nous venons d'entendre de la part du ministre iraquien, qui a dit ouvertement, devant toute la communauté internationale, sa disposition à recevoir une délégation, je m'adresse à nos amis de la délégation norvégienne, seraient-ils à l'aise avec une proposition où on enlèverait leur proposition et on la remplacerait par – si vous pouvez prendre ce que je vais vous dicter – « Le Comité salue la disposition de l'État partie à recevoir dans le plus bref délai une mission du Centre et de l'ICOMOS » ? Est-ce que cette partie-là pourrait remplacer la proposition norvégienne ? Je m'adresse à nos amis de la Norvège, qu'est-ce qu'ils pensent de ma proposition ?

Chairperson:

Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We absolutely accept the suggestion from Tunisia.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So I think our Rapporteur has some ideas how to figure it out. So you are welcome.

Rapporteur:

Actually, Mr Chairperson, if that paragraph is amended to be mostly deleted my value is gone. Thank you.

Chairperson:

I think we can proceed with the approval of the document. So are there any objections against the added paragraphs? Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Chairperson, it's just that the Tunisian amendment that you've just added doesn't make that much sense in the syntax from the primary sentence at the top of paragraph 4. Perhaps it should be a separate paragraph.

Chairperson:

Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Because the Committee is welcoming a new something, technically it will need to be a new paragraph but it would just read as our distinguished delegate from Tunisia suggested that the

Committee welcomes the willingness of the State Party to host this mission and I must apologize but I didn't hear what Australia's suggestion was.

Chairperson:

So we accept it like that. ICOMOS.

ICOMOS:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Given that the mission has now been divided from the content of what the mission was supposed to achieve in the previous paragraph it would indeed be very helpful if a few words could be added to specify what the objective of this mission would be. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Rapporteur, please. Angola.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je suis tout à fait avec l'ICOMOS de dire les raisons de cette mission.

Chairperson:

Thank you.

Rapporteur:

I think my understanding was to jointly develop a phased and costed action plan for the conservation of the property. That was from Norway's original proposal. Welcomes the willingness of the State Party to host as soon as possible a World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS Advisory mission to jointly develop and phased and costed action plan for the conservation of the property.

Chairperson:

No other versions? Tunisia, I see again...

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie est tout à fait d'accord avec la proposition à la fois de l'ICOMOS et de Mme le Rapporteur. C'est tout à fait louable de préciser, et la précision nous convient parfaitement. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Sorry it has just been pointed out that rather than jointly develop it may be to assist the State Party to develop because obviously if they are there they are assisting. To develop a phased and costed...if that's amenable.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Thank you for such a dedicated discussion on this item which really reflects the interest of the whole world with the name connected to Babylon. I would like to propose to approve this decision in whole because we have already agreed on the amendments and the changes in the text. You don't mind? I don't see any objections. I therefore declare draft

decision 43 COM 8B.13 adopted as amended. Approved [*applause*]. On behalf of the Committee Members, please allow me to express our heartfelt congratulations for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. I would like to give the floor for the intervention to the State Party. Honorable Minister, the floor is yours.

The Observer Delegation of Iraq:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Excellences, ladies and gentlemen, allow me first to express how grateful we are to the government of Azerbaijan for its hospitality and outstanding organization of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. Babylon is one of the most ancient cities in the world and was at once the largest one in antiquity. Volumes and volumes have been written about its immense legacy to the world. It is also a property that has suffered long neglect and even serious damage. The Government of Iraq has now taken upon itself to redress the situation of this exceptional archeological property. We are extremely pleased to see these efforts recognized and the inscription of Babylon on the World Heritage List was long overdue and will give a boost to future conservation work. We will take into consideration all the recommendations of the inscription decision to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is conserved. I now give the floor to his Excellency Minister of Culture, Dr Abdulameer Al-Dafar Al-Hamdani for his speech. Thank you very much. [*Applause*]

Minister of Culture (Iraq):

Thank you all, thanks to the government of Azerbaijan, thanks to UNESCO, thanks to ICOMOS, thanks to the World Heritage Centre, thanks to the 21 countries on the Committee. For us inscribing Babylon is a reward to the Iraq people who just defeated ISIS on behalf of the international community. I invite you all to visit Babylon, to visit the cradle of civilization. Thank you so much. [*Applause*]

Chairperson:

Honorable delegates, Members of the Committee as far as we can see we don't have the chance to start discussion on the next item now. So we will move all other discussions for tomorrow and before finalizing the session I would like to ask Ms Rössler to give some information.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. So tonight we have two events with indigenous peoples, one on Indigenous Languages for the Conservation of World Heritage organized by the World Heritage Centre and Parks Canada, Room B2 which is followed by the Indigenous Engagement in World Heritage Processes, the International Indigenous Peoples Forum for World Heritage in B2. Then we have Building Leadership for Climate Adaption, World Heritage Centre in Room A6 and then we also have the "Thai Night" with presentations on the use of IT in the conservation of cultural heritage sites. That's it, Mr Chairperson. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Please note that we still have the open item on Thailand. The working group is supposed to meet today after this closing. We hope that the decision will be proposed in the morning. If not we will request the time for considering—we will appoint the other time for considering. Tomorrow the Bureau will meet at 9:30 a.m. and the session will resume its work at the morning session at 10 a.m. Have a nice evening. Thank you very much.

The meeting rose at 5.53 p.m.

SIXTH DAY – Saturday 6 July 2019

ELEVENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev

Chairperson:

We have two minutes to start our morning session, please. Good morning. We are ready to start our morning session. Please, honorable delegates take your seats and we will start. Good morning to everyone. We did quite a good job yesterday. We successfully inscribed seven nominations and I think that we can go on to further questions. As you remember, yesterday some delegations requested to move their discussion to today but it is already occurred that now we can proceed according to the list proposed to everyone. We will start this morning with the discussion with the site from Bahrain.

Chairperson:

I would now like to invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Dilmun Burial Mounds. Please, ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The English version of the ICOMOS evaluation for this property is found on page 57 and the French version is found on page 202. This is a serial nomination of 21 components comprising thousands of burial mounds, which are characterized by their architectural design, their interior arrangement including the use of alcoves, and their different types indicating the emergence of social hierarchies in Dilmun society.

Located in the western part of the island of Bahrain, the Dilmun Burial Mounds were built during Early Dilmun Period over a period of 450 years, approximately between 2050 to 1750 BCE. Dilmun Burial Mounds are categorized in five typological groups including Early Type Mounds, Late Type Mounds, Chieftain Type Mounds, Royal Type Mounds and Mounds with subsidiary burials. Early and Late Type Mounds are tumuli placed in close proximity forming dense cemeteries. They are on average 2-3m in height and 6-11m in diameter. The burial chambers may be L-, T-, H-shaped. Royal Mounds are also contemporaneous to the Late Type Mounds but larger reaching between 13-26m in diameter and often consist of two-story burial chambers. Royal Mounds have the same architectural features as the Chieftain Mounds but differ in size as the latter can display up to 50m in diameter. The link between the terminology and the existence of a natural monarchic dynasty has not been confirmed so far by research although in 2017 two of the last kings have been identified in relation to two mounds.

Ring mounds are special type mounds with an outer ring wall while mounds with subsidiary burial chambers consist of essential burial chambers and other subsidiary ones. The best examples of this type are found in Janabiyah and Madinat Hamad. Some evidence would indicate that these mounds were originally constructed as stone towers, possibly cylindrical. Examples of standing walls support this hypothesis although later evidence suggests that the original shape might have been a terraced building or a ziggurat. The series has been nominated as it bears witness to the flourishing of the early Dilmun civilization around the second millennium BCE. It illustrates global It illustrates globally-unique characteristics with regards to amount, density and scale of the burial mounds but also in terms of construction details. The series also provides archaeological data on the unique funerary constructions and unique information about the development of social complexity, land use, and life and death of the Early Dilmun people.

The state of conservation of the mounds is overall stable, although those already excavated need intervention to be decided on a case-by-case assessment. The main effective factors to the property are development pressures due to lack of land and a growing population. The additional information provided in February 2019 clarified the documentation and data storage and methodology and informed the conservation strategies under development for all burial mounds covering also information technology, documentation and new archeological license issue procedures. Following the reception of this additional information, the comparative analysis now justifies consideration of the property for the World Heritage List as well as the selection of the component parts among the 14,000–14,500 surviving burial mounds.

Integrity and authenticity requirements were met particularly when considering the two additional sites that are scheduled for being included in the property by 2022 as proposed by the State Party. Criteria (iii) and (iv) have been justified. Legal protection is adequate as well as the management system. Dilmun Burial Mounds Unit has begun to operate. A unified study and documentation of the current state of conservation of each element of the property is needed as a priority. Documentation management needs and risk management are also to be addressed.

ICOMOS therefore recommends that the Dilmun Burial Mounds, Bahrain, be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv). ICOMOS has also provided some recommendations for consideration by the State Party concerning conditions, documentation, monitoring and particularly the extension plan of the site, to include Umm Jidr and Wadi as-Sail mound fields in the future. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have listened to the proposal of ICOMOS. Now the floor is going to Tunisia. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais tout d'abord, au nom de la délégation tunisienne, remercier le Centre et les instances consultatives de leur rapport, qui rejoint l'idée qu'on se fait de ce dossier qui est extrêmement important, et je voudrais à ce titre remercier le Bahreïn de nous avoir fourni un dossier de cette qualité. Ce qui est important, je crois, c'est que ce dossier vient opportunément étoffer une période sur la Liste, une période assez peu présente en fait sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, et je crois que c'est extrêmement important parce que cela corrobore la finalité qu'on a rappelée hier, à savoir la représentativité de cette liste. Je voudrais encore une fois féliciter l'État partie de ce dossier de qualité et dire combien on était heureux par rapport à la communauté des archéologues tunisiens qui avaient participé pendant de longues périodes aux fouilles de ce site. Merci encore.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all I would like to thank the Centre and the Advisory Body for the great submitted to the Committee. I would also like to thank the State Party of Bahrain for the great thing they have done. This is their third site that will be listed yet this small island has been hosting civilization for several thousands of years and this is an exact example to see how the small nations, a small place can be the heart of several civilizations over the centuries and the outcome of all these civilizations—definitely we saw it last year in Manama when they hosted this Committee meeting, how those people, how this nation big in heart yet small in lands but they have so much to offer and especially this Dilmun Burial Mounds, it has been so effected in that region, even in Kuwait we see part of this civilization in Kuwait. Once

again, congratulations for the great dossier and thank you to Bahrain and the government of Bahrain and the people of Bahrain.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We wanted to offer our thanks for this report and commend the State Party for having drafted such an excellent nomination, very well prepared and that is really responding to a period that was not very represented on this List. By being able to inscribe this and represent this period, well we are adding a variety of representation to our List. It has been a privilege to have been able to visit this site and to have an empiric chance to be able to talk more about this so that is especially why we think that it was a very good report. We would like to encourage the State Party to continue emphasizing sites such as this and encourage them as well to make sure that the state of conservation which is quite challenging in a way that they could maintain that and its credit on this List. We are quite satisfied with this nomination because it also shows how clear what one of the objectives of this Committee is so thank you very much for this excellent report and our commendation to them once again.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Spain. China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China wishes to join the previous speakers to congratulate the State Party of Bahrain for the inscription of this enormously important property. The period of Dilmun is one of the oldest ancient civilizations in the Middle East, and it fills a void in this regard. Therefore, we congratulate the State Party for their efforts in preserving this property and also showing it to the world. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask Committee Members are there any other opinions or objections to the proposed draft decision? I don't see any. May I ask the Rapporteur are there any additional amendments?

Rapporteur:

We've received no amendments on this draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

In this case, I would like to propose to adopt this document in whole; I declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.12 adopted as amended [*applause*]. On behalf of the Committee Members, I would like to congratulate the State Party of Bahrain for the inscription of this site. Please, you are welcome to take the floor.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. On behalf of the State Party of Bahrain, I would like thank everyone that was involved in the preparation and evaluation of this exceptional serial nomination and commend the World Heritage Centre on its continuous support and

outstanding coordination efforts, as well as ICOMOS for their intensive and constructive work during the evaluation process. I would also like to convey the appreciation of H.E. Shaikha Mai Bint Mohammed Al-Khalifa, President of the Bahrain Authority for Cultural Antiquities, to the Committee for this decision.

This is a very valuable designation to the exceptional testimony of the Dilmun Burial Mounds site components. As you all know from the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee, which took place in Bahrain, our country is a small island but our heritage is rich and extends over five thousand years. It is our pride to preserve and promote the diverse strata of cultural heritage we are privileged to accommodate. The Dilmun Burial Mounds site is the third World Heritage site in Bahrain and I hope some of you already had the chance to visit the components of the Dilmun Burial sites during the Committee's meeting last year. If not, I warmly invite you Bahrain to witness our heritage and experience our hospitality.

As a final note, Bahrain is thankful to have this recognition and is very much aware of the responsibility it brings along. Following the spirit of the World Heritage Convention we are keen on keeping our commitment and fulfilling our responsibilities to the international community and future generations. Thank you, Mr Chairperson. *[Applause]*

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to give you some very interesting information. With this inscription, there are now 1100 properties on the World Heritage List. *[Applause]*

Now we move to another question. Item 43 COM 8B.14 and I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Budj Bim Cultural Landscape from Australia. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr Balsamo you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of Budj Bim Cultural Landscape. This notification has a lot of impact on the proposed statement of OUV and has been agreed between the State Party and ICOMOS and has been integrated in our version. The factual error notification is on page 20 in the English version in document INF.8B.4 and on page 24 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I now invite ICOMOS to make the intervention.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Budj Bim Cultural Landscape is situated within the traditional country of the Gunditjmarra aboriginal people in southeastern Australia. It is a serial nomination of three sites, which is also nominated as a cultural landscape. The property comprises the Budj Bim volcano and Budj Bim lava flows, which extend over 50km west and southwards. The area of the three components totals 9935 hectares. The three serial components comprise four different landscape types recognized by their traditional owners in English translation as Forest Country, River Forest Country, Sea Country and Stone Country. The lava flows of Budj Bim, which connect the three property components, provide the basis of a complex aquaculture network developed by the Gunditjmarra.

Over a period of at least 6,600 years, the Gunditjmarra created, manipulated and modified these local hydrological regimes and ecological systems. The highly productive aquaculture system provided a six-millennia long economic and social base for the Gunditjmarra society. The system is composed of constructed channels, weirs and dams used to contain flood waters and create holding and growing ponds for eels aimed at confining the fish to a restricted area

allowing for them to be kept as live storage for consumption over longer periods. All of the Budj Bim Cultural Landscape is aborigine owned and/or managed and has managed to respect the customary and legal rights and obligation of the Gunditjmara traditional owners.

The Budj Bim Cultural Landscape is the result of a creational process narrated by the Gunditjmara as a “deep time” story. For the Gunditjmara “deep time” refers to the idea that they have always been there. The interrelationship is evidence in the aquaculture system itself and in the interrelated geological, hydrological and economic systems. From an archeological perspective “deep time” here refers to a period of at least 30,000 years that aboriginal people have lived in the Budj Bim Cultural Landscape. The continuity of the cultural and environmental system is documented through present-day Gunditjmara cultural knowledge, practices, and material culture.

ICOMOS considers that the property demonstrates criteria (iii) and (v). It has a high degree of authenticity and the condition of integrity is satisfactory. While the site boundaries and conservation efforts are fully appropriate protection at highest national level were unclear at the moment of inscription by the World Heritage Committee. ICOMOS recommends to also reflect this new legal status through recognition on the national heritage list. ICOMOS hence recommends the inscription of the Budj Bim Cultural Landscape under criteria (iii) and (v).

ICOMOS further recommends to continue surveys and cultural heritage features located outside the property boundaries to harmonize the site’s new legal status through recognition on the national heritage list and to finalize the property’s specific strategy management framework including indicators for monitoring.

Please note that the factual errors indicated by the State Party impacted the draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value and a revised draft statement of OUV has been prepared by ICOMOS in consultation with the State Party. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to apply to the Committee Members. I can see Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Hungary would like to thank the State Party for the excellent nomination file as well as to the Advisory Body for the comprehensive assessment provided. It has now been quite a long time ago when the World Heritage community realized that having Outstanding Universal Value in a property is only the starting point for the longterm preservation of our shared heritage and an equally crucial issue, especially for the future of World Heritage sites is proper management that is extremely difficult in the case of cultural landscapes where probably the larger number of stakeholders should be involved in the planning and day-to-day implementation of the agreed measures. Now we have an example of a perfectly managed site on our table with an excellent and effective management system in place, demonstrating among others but first of all the full engagement of aboriginal people at all management levels. In case of a particular decision of the distinguished World Heritage Committee, Hungary would be delighted to welcome Budj Bim in the family of Cultural Landscapes as well as in the entire World Heritage family as its 1,101 member. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all I would like to thank the Centre and the Advisory Body for this great addition to the List, the 1,101 hopefully. I would like to also thank the State Party of Australia—they have been working so hard and all the different dossiers from all different countries. It's time for them to really enjoy the moment for their inscription. Once again, a great addition to the List I think and it's great recognition for the people of Australia and congratulations.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China is very pleased to join our colleagues in congratulating the State Party of Australia and we also commend the wonderful work of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for giving advice on this particular property. This property represents an important testimony of the aborigine's traditional culture and civilization demonstrating their unique understanding of nature and their view on sustainable development. We congratulate the State Party of Australia for this nomination. Thank you. And we support the conclusion.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. The Spanish delegation is very pleased with this nomination. It is one that has really got it all. It's been drafted wonderfully. We see very well the documentation about the relationship between tangible and intangible heritage. It fills a gap in the List on the issue of diversity, and there is respect for human rights because we can't forget this is managed by the community itself, which also respects common law. So its very well presented, very well justified. It's a wonderful nomination so our congratulations to Australia for this fantastic file.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. Norway warmly welcomes this exemplary nomination file from the distinguished colleagues from Australia showing us that there is an unbroken line of 6,600 years of interaction between humankind and nature. We also take interest of the legal protection of this really taking into account the provisions of the Operational Guidelines paragraph 104 and it would be interesting to learn more from the State Party at some point on how this actually works as that is exemplary as well so we wish to congratulate with a very well prepared nomination file and we welcome this on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. My delegation also joins the previous speakers in congratulating the State Party for this excellent nomination. The Budj Bim Cultural Landscape contains one of the world's oldest and most extensive aquaculture systems. It bears the exceptional

testimony to the cultural traditions, knowledge, practices and ingenuity of the indigenous population. Their aquaculture practice has been shown to reach back at least 6,600 years and continues to be used today. In that sense we congratulate the State Party and also ICOMOS for this exceptional work. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I apply to the Committee Members whether there are any other opinions or objections to the proposed draft? I don't see any. Did we receive anything additional?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. There were no amendments to this draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. It is clear, I would like to approve the document in whole and therefore I declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.14 adopted as amended [*applause*]. Our congratulations on behalf of the Committee Members to the honorable State Party for the inscription of this site and I give the floor to the State Party. Australia, you are welcome.

The Delegation of Australia:

Wow, what an experience, Mr Chairperson. Here we are surrounded by Gunditjmara Traditional Owners. In the deep time, indigenous people have inhabited Australia a day is but a flicker in history. But today burns bright and will be remembered as we inscribe Australia's first World Heritage property exclusively through its indigenous cultural values. It is a symbol of and a step towards the healing of our history. The Budj Bim Cultural Landscape is the ingenious creation of the Gunditjmara people. This is their nomination. I present Denis Rose, Gunditjmara Traditional Owner to speak on behalf of the Gunditjmara people.

Mr Denis Rose:

Thank you. I'd like to thank the Committee and the Centre—for us to get to this stage it's been a long journey. I'd like to acknowledge our Gunditjmara ancestors who led the way for us. We know they are still here with us and their ingenuity still shows in the aquaculture system that are still operational to this day. We've certainly with the aquaculture systems; we have a lot of support over the years from the government, NGOs and other educational institutions, for example. We have had a lot of support. We have always acknowledged that we can't do all the jobs ourselves. We don't have the expertise or the resources to do them so we have had to rely heavily on our partners but most importantly it's the people behind me that lead the way. We have a lot of young people here. We were talking about management before and a few of our Budj Bim rangers, I know that looking after this country and sharing this country is in safe and great hands with our community. Thank you, Uncle Ken, thank you, Meg and thank you, Maya.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much and we once more would like to congratulate the Australian delegation for this inscription and we are now ready to proceed to another file. Please, thank you very much. Can you proceed to the places? We now move to Item 15. It is the nomination from China, Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City, China. I would like to give the floor to Mr Balsamo to give comments, and then to ICOMOS to present the file, please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the nomination of the Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City, and it's to be found on page 58

in the English version of document INF.8B4 and on page 63 in the French version of the same document. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, the floor is yours.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The nominated property includes the archaeological remains of Liangzhu City, which was once the centre of power and belief of an early regional state in the lower reaches of the Yangtze River in late Neolithic China. Located in the eastern foothills of the Tianmu Mountains in a plain crisscrossed by a network of rivers, the nominated property consists of four component parts: Yaoshan Site, High-dam at the Mouth of the Valley, Low-dam on the Plain and City Site.

The Area of Yaoshan Site is located on top of the hill outside the city and is the location where hundreds of objects including jade artefacts have been excavated. It contains the Yaoshan Altar (a sacrificial site) and the Yaoshan cemetery, with two rows of tombs. The Area of High-dam at the Mouth of the Valley consists of six artificial dam sites and a series of natural ridges and peaks directly associated with them. The dams are believed to have been built around 3100-2850 BCE and were continuously in use until about 2600 BCE. The area of the Low-dam on the Plain is located to the north and west of the City Site, and consists of four artificial dams which form a water storage system with a length of approximately 2.4km while the causeway in front of the mountains is composed of composite dams extending over 5km. the area of the City Site is composed of the Palace area, Inner City, Outer City and a series of socially graded cemeteries. According to the latest analysis of carbon-14 dating, Liangzhu City was built and occupied around 3300-2300 BCE and abandoned by around 2100 BCE.

Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City reveal an early regional state with rice cultivating agriculture as its economic base and the excavated objects represented by a series of jade artefacts symbolize a unified belief system. The property represents a remarkable contribution made by the Yangtze River basin to the origins of Chinese civilization. ICOMOS considers that the property demonstrates criteria (iii) and (iv) and meets the qualifying conditions of authenticity and integrity. While the boundaries are adequate, ICOMOS considers that the protection management and conservation are acceptable however, these offer further opportunities for future improvement.

ICOMOS therefore recommends that the Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City, China be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv) with the additional recommendations to complete listing of all component sites as national protection priority sites to complete the management plan including cautiously regulating visitor numbers and access strategies to update monitoring indicators and to develop HIAs for any current and future development proposals. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I now apply to honorable Members of the Committee for your comments? Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Mr Chairperson, the Ugandan delegation thanks both the Centre and ICOMOS for the concise report and recommendation of the nomination for inscription of the Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City. We further congratulate the State Party of the People's Republic of China on this successful nomination for inscription of this site. Uganda supports the draft decision. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Australia sincerely congratulates China on this nomination. The property certainly bears exceptional testimony to an early urban society and one based on rice cultivation. The nomination was beautifully presented especially in the description of the archeological evidence and we note in particular the extraordinary preservation of organic remains especially those of the water system on the picture now and even down to the charred rice in the storage areas. The rich array of artefacts is truly astounding, especially the jade. This is an extremely important archeological site in a global sense. It makes an important contribution to balancing the regional representation of the Neolithic period of human history on the World Heritage List and we very warmly welcome it. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway congratulates China for this paramount contribution to the World Heritage List.

[Chinese spoken]

[English spoken] Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City gives us insight into the origins of Chinese civilization. The four components of the site together stand as an impressive testimony of this early civilization with its city planning and societal structure, evidence of a religious system and traces from the civilization's economic base in rice cultivation. Mr Chairperson, Norway is confident that China will manage this new World Heritage site that is in their care wisely. We wish them great success with regard to handling the issues they may face be it from tourism or new development projects. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania goes along with the previous speakers to commend the Advisory Bodies and all those who were involved in the preparation and evaluation of this special property on this planet. Tanzania congratulates China and its people on this successful wonderful nomination. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Azerbaijan sincerely congratulates China for this successful nomination. It represents the remarkable contributions made by the Yangtze River basin to the origins of Chinese civilization. It is a typical approach in China to highlight the socially graded order and power in urban planning. It reflects urban and architectural features created by the people in a wetlands environment. It is a supreme achievement of a prehistoric rice-cultivating civilization of China and East Asia over 5,000 years ago. We would like to commend the State Party and ICOMOS for this exemplary work. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Saint Kitts and Nevis commends the State Party of China for the submission of this nomination of this outstanding site and fully supports its inscription on the List of World Heritage sites around the world. We are confident that China will manage the site well for the people of China and for the entire world. Congratulations, China and thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie se joint à tous les orateurs précédents pour féliciter la Chine d'avoir présenté un dossier de cette grande qualité. Pour ne pas me répéter, je rejoins mes prédécesseurs dans ce qu'ils apprécient de l'aspect important sur le plan culturel, mais je voudrais souligner qu'à nos yeux ce dossier revêt aussi pour les centres d'intérêt de l'UNESCO un autre élément, additionnel, celui d'apporter un élément important dans notre connaissance scientifique et historique sur le mode de vie, le mode d'organisation de ces sociétés du néolithique. Je crois que c'est précieux autant sur le plan culturel que du point de vue du progrès de notre connaissance scientifique de cette période reculée. Merci encore une fois à la Chine de nous avoir donné cette occasion.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Ma délégation fait écho également pour féliciter l'État partie de la Chine pour ce bien et pour tout le travail mené pour le proposer sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Le site de Liangzhu est une contribution, comme l'ont déjà exprimé bien d'autres, très remarquable aux origines des peuples de la Chine, et également pour l'histoire de cette partie du monde. C'est pourquoi le Burkina Faso remercie le Centre et l'ICOMOS qui ont accompagné l'État partie dans la préparation de ce dossier et sa proposition pour son inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. De ce fait, nous appuyons également cette proposition d'inscription. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Zimbabwe would like to commend the State Party of the People's Republic of China for nominating the Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City on the World Heritage List. The property testifies to the presence of a regional state from the 3rd century BCE. We note the level of detail in the nomination with this Neolithic property that has undergone research since 1936. We therefore congratulate the State Party and concur with the Advisory Body and World Heritage Centre's decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. A very brief intervention--just to congratulate China for its presentation of this wonderful site that dates from 3,300 years BCE. We believe the site offers to this Committee a remarkable example of Outstanding Universal Value so once again I would like to extend to China our strong congratulations. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask the honorable Members of the Committee whether there are other opinions or proposals concerning this file. I don't see any. May I ask the Rapporteur whether there are additions?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have received no amendments for this proposed decision.

Chairperson:

Since I don't see any other versions I would like to propose to adopt this document in whole. No objections. Therefore I declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.15 adopted [*applause*]. On behalf of the Committee Members let me congratulate the Chinese delegation with this inscription and you are welcome, the floor is yours.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. We wish to extend our heartfelt appreciation and thanks to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, the entire Committee and the international and domestic experts for their precious support, advice and help during the nomination process. We are proud that after 25 years of preparation our efforts have finally led to the successful inscription of this exceptionally important property that is the most concrete testimony of five thousand years of Chinese civilization. We are keenly aware that the inscription also entails an enormous responsibility for conserving this heritage of humanity. Now I would like to invite Mr Liu Yuzhu, administrator of the National Administration of Cultural Heritage and also Mr Zhou Jiangyong, Secretary of the CPC Hangzhou Committee to take the floor. Thank you.

Mr Liu Yuzhu:

Thank you, Chairperson. Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City are a major discovery of the 21st century and bears testimony to 5,000 years of Chinese civilization. On behalf of the Chinese government, I would like to sincerely thank the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies for their work and I would like to thank ICOMOS for its thorough evaluation and also the organizers of this meeting. Since China became a State Party to this Convention, its representation on the List is becoming more diverse. This is a wonderful example of a crossroads between civilizations and China will continue to push its archeological and management practices in excavations in order to better preserve our cultural heritage, which belongs to all humanity. Finally, allow me to give the floor to Mr Zhou Jiangyong.

Mr Zhou Jiangyong:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Archaeological Ruins of Liangzhu City are a brilliant paragon of early urban civilization in the history of humankind as a concrete testimony to the 5,000-year history of Chinese civilization. It's not only the cultural gem of the Chinese nation but also the cultural heritage of humankind as early as the 13th century Hangzhou was acclaimed in the travel notes of Marco Polo as the most beautiful and magnificent city on earth. Today apart from the three World Heritage sites and you will also find a number of world-renowned enterprises in Hangzhou including Ali Baba. The city is making an all-out effort to become a digitized international city. Thank you for your support.

Chairperson:

Once more, we would like to congratulate the Chinese delegation and the government of China with the inscription of this exceptional site to the World Heritage List. Thank you very much and we proceed to the next Item.

The next Item is 8B.16. This is connected with Jaipur City, Rajasthan, India. But first I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr Balsamo. You have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of Jaipur City, Rajasthan and it is to be found on page 69 in both the English and French versions of document INF.8B.4. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. ICOMOS, please, present the file. You are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found on page 122 of the English version and page 114 in the French version of document 43 COM.INF.8B.1.

The historic walled city of Jaipur, located in northwestern India's Rajasthan State, was founded in 1727 under the patronage of Sawai Jai Singh II. Unlike other medieval cities in the region, which were typically located on hilly terrain and evolved organically, Jaipur was situated on a flat plain and deliberately planned. A walled city, it was developed in a single phase with a grid-iron plan inspired by traditional architecture, but reflecting an interchange of ancient Hindu, Mughal and contemporary Western ideas. Its ordered, grid-like structure features broad streets crossing at right angles. The main markets, shops, residences and temples on the main streets were constructed by the state, thus ensuring uniform facades.

I will now have a few images to give you an understanding of the property. Here is an example of one of the city gates with wall on either side, another city gate, bazaar buildings, part of one of the open spaces, other buildings including a old *haveli*, the interior of an old *haveli*. Very fine architecture, the city palace and the town hall.

ICOMOS considers the comparative analysis justifies consideration of the nominated property for the World Heritage List with regard to an important interchange of ancient Hindu, Mughal and contemporary Western ideas related to town planning and architecture and as an outstanding architectural ensemble. However, it provides no meaningful supporting analysis regarding the values of arts and crafts that are central to the claims made under criterion (vi) and in this instance the comparative analysis is not adequate.

The property is nominated by the State Party on the basis of cultural criteria (ii), (v) and (vi). ICOMOS considers that the property has the potential to meet criterion (ii) and while not proposed by the State Party it also has the potential to meet criterion (iv). However, criteria (v) and (vi) have not been demonstrated. In the case of criterion (v) the property is not a traditional human settlement as required by the criterion but is rather an innovative planned city for its time. The attributes identified by the State Party reflect only part of the urban form of the city, in particular excluding the inner areas of the *chowkris* and the old *havelis*. ICOMOS considers that the attributes reflecting the full historic urban form and architecture of the city should be considered for nomination, including these additional features.

In this context, ICOMOS considers that the requirements of integrity and authenticity have not been met at this stage. There are substantial integrity issues related to the impacts of

development, the poor condition of many parts of the city wall, in areas of some of the *chowkris* and some of the old *havelis* and the encroachment of open spaces. In the case of authenticity, the material's substance and techniques need to be confirmed through additional documentation.

ICOMOS considers that the protection, conservation and management are not adequate, and that the property is threatened. Conservation measures are not adequate to address the whole of this large property with its many attributes. The monitoring system is broadly satisfactory but another level of detailed implementation is required. There are serious vulnerabilities in the protection of attributes, the previous management system had significant problems and the new enhanced management system does not extend to all attributes, is untested, and there is no established overall interpretation and presentation policy or program for the nominated property. ICOMOS therefore recommends that the nomination be deferred in order to allow the State Party to address a range of matters.

These include developing a clear plan to enhance the state of conservation of the property with regard to development impacts and conservation measures and to commence implementation of the plan; completing the detailed heritage inventory for the nominated property covering all attributes; improving the legal protection to overcome the danger to the property and ensure it is adequate and effective for all attributes; extending the management system to cover all attributes in the property, and demonstrating the enhanced management system is effective, well coordinated and has adequate supporting administrative tools and power; undertaking Heritage Impact Assessments for any current or planned projects which may affect the proposed Outstanding Universal Value; developing a detailed monitoring program, including more detailed indicators and lastly, establishing an overall interpretation and presentation policy and program for the nominated property.

The draft decision can be found on page 26 of the working document WHC/19/43Com.8B. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I have the opinion of the Committee Members? I know that I have the request from the State Party. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Before I take the floor just to clarify, shouldn't the State Party be given the floor first?

Chairperson:

According to the Rules of Procedure, we can give the floor to the State Party to make an intervention first. Usually we start with the Committee Members first but if the Committee Members don't mind I can give—no objections? State Party, please.

The Observer Delegation of India:

Thank you, Chairperson. We would like to thank you for allowing this intervention. We appreciate ICOMOS' evaluation; we welcome its acceptance that Jaipur City meets the requirements for nomination of criteria (ii) and (iv). The non-acceptance of criteria (vi) is a matter of concern. This as was pointed out by ICOMOS is an 18th century planned living historic city that has for centuries sustained trade, commerce, arts and crafts and their practitioners. It is not a fortified city but built in times of peace and guarded by surrounding forts.

On integrity which was raised, the city wall and all of the nine, and I repeat, nine of the original gates are the most intact and best preserved and conserved among the historic cities in India.

Despite development pressures, the city wall, the inner *chowkris* squares and *havelis* of Jaipur City provide coherent evidence to convey the totality of the OUV. We welcome the acknowledgment of authenticity by ICOMOS on all accounts barring one and that count is of material substance and techniques. ICOMOS' contestation that they do not have adequate documentation is not borne out by the documentation that has been provided and the record of major conservation works in the city including all 12 bazaars, specifying the materials such as lime and stone and wash, this is the Pink City of India which are included not only in the dossier but in additional information as well.

We welcome the additional attributes proposed by ICOMOS. They are already a part of the property and we have made a commitment to inventory, manage and monitor all of them including the inner squares. There is recognition globally and in India of the pioneering urban conservation projects. Let me remind you that it is UNESCO that bestowed the Creative City of Crafts and Folk Art on Jaipur. All of the six points suggested by ICOMOS have been met. They are part of the documentation that is available.

Jaipur, honorable Chairperson, is a thriving, pulsating, prosperous city. It is much more than an assortment of a few physical attributes. It's a living historic city in its urban totality. Thank you, Chairperson. Thank you for this opportunity. We hope that sets the record right.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. At the outset, Brazil would like to praise the State Party for presenting this nomination and ICOMOS for its detailed report. There has been a constant call for dialogue between Advisory Bodies and States Parties and in the present case I would like to commend ICOMOS for its openness for exchange of information with India and have received comprehensive additional informational material in advanced stages of the evaluation process. The reading of the nomination accompanied by additional information dated October 2018 and February 2019, totalling more than 2,000 pages leaves no doubt about the technical and financial commitment of the Jaipur administration for the inscription of this property. A walled city, idealized plans developed and deployed in the second decade of the 18th century as a trade hub in the Rajasthan Desert. These are very rich documents in content and graphic quality.

We have carefully analysed the documents presented, and in our understanding the additional information provided submitted by the State Party delves deeper into the nomination dossier and fully responds to the issues raised by ICOMOS and gives an account of the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List.

Concerning the property's OUV in terms of the criteria it seems to us indisputable that it is a unique and original city, an exemplary development in town planning and architecture that demonstrates an amalgamation, an important exchange of ideas in the late Indian-medieval period, thus meeting criterion (ii). It is an outstanding example of a late medieval trade town in South Asia, which was later emulated elsewhere, justifying therefore criterion (iv). Jaipur is also deeply and intangibly associated with longstanding living traditions in the form of crafts that have a global recognition and, in our view, meets criterion (vi). How's my time? Maybe we can go back to criterion (vi) when we discuss the draft decision.

In terms of integrity, Mr Chairperson, additional information that was provided has proven that the city wall, *chowkris* and *havelis* of Jaipur though facing development pressures provide coherent evidence to convey the totality of the property's OUV and in our view the surviving

buildings in the property bear sufficient testimony to form a whole in line with Annex 3 of the Operational Guidelines on historic towns.

Brazil also considers that the nominated property meets the requirements of authenticity with regard to qualities such as form and design, use and function, location and setting, intangible heritage and spirit and feeling. The State Party also provided us with compelling explanation on material substance and techniques though we can side with ICOMOS that perhaps additional research would be welcome for future conservation and management strategy. In light of this Brazil has submitted a draft amendment proposing the inscription of Jaipur on the World Heritage List and, Mr Chairperson, with regards to conservation and legal protection and management, Brazil considers that the measures put in place are not ideal but sufficient for inscription on the World Heritage List at this stage. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving Norway the floor. Jaipur, the pink city of Rajasthan is a splendid city, indeed. There should be no doubt that the city is worth a place on the World Heritage List. And so was also stated by ICOMOS in their evaluation we agree with the State Party in that. ICOMOS has found that Jaipur meets two criteria, namely (ii) and (iv) and hence fully satisfies the requirements to become a World Heritage property. Therefore, our opinion is that there should be no necessity to spend efforts on another expert mission, which is implicated in the process following a deferral. The crucial point is however to reach agreement on the justification for the OUV because from the time of inscription onwards the criteria chosen constitutes the platform for all follow-up work.

There is consensus on criterion (ii). Norway finds ICOMOS' argument for replacing criterion (v) with criterion (iv) very underhanded. Criterion (iv) will encapsulate the values more precisely because as an entity the city represents a type of architectural ensemble that is related to a certain period of time rather than a traditional settlement. Also, criterion (iv) corresponds better to criterion (ii) in this case when focusing on architecture and town planning. Norway looks forward to welcoming Jaipur on the World Heritage List on the basis of a shared justification. We encourage the State Party to proceed reviewing its nomination in that direction. This city deserves the best, meaning no confusion at all about what its OUV represents.

In conclusion, Norway co-presents an amendment for a referral. We would however, like to hear if the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have any comments on our suggestion. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Bahrain appreciates India's nomination of this important urban site to the World Heritage List. As the evaluation of ICOMOS confirms and I quote, the comparative analysis justifies consideration of the nominated property for the World Heritage List and the nominated property has the potential to meet criteria (ii) and (iv). This property will eventually be inscribed on the World Heritage List. We take note of the conservation issues outlined and we reiterate the need that these are addressed as soon as possible to ensure that authenticity and integrity of the site is maintained. It is our understanding the State Party of India has already taken several positive steps in this direction and request that they are

given the chance to express their established and envisaged efforts to achieve this. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. When we asked to speak it was actually because we had some doubts about the actions carried out by the State Party concerning the state of conservation and the attributes of the site but the floor has already been given to the State Party and that means that our doubts have been resolved. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Indonesia would like to support the amendment proposed by Brazil to inscribe Jaipur City on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi). The historic city of Jaipur is one of the medieval cities in Rajasthan, India, which was inspired by Vastu Shastra, a traditional system of Hindu of architecture. The city demonstrates an important interchange of ancient Hindu, Mughal and contemporary Western ideas. In its report the Advisory Body approved that the nominated property is historically associated with a longstanding arts and crafts tradition that characterizes the city as a centre for artistic excellence throughout its history.

The Advisory Body report also suggest that the nominated property meets the requirement of authenticity in that it maintains most of its area-based traditional trade practices. In terms of integrity the Advisory Body notes that the city wall exists only in fragments, and long stretches no longer exist. It is also noted that the attributes identified by the State Party reflect only part of the urban form of the city. However, the State Party has provided our delegation with reliable information that shows that most parts of the city wall are still in existence and more than 400 attributes have been submitted. Up to now, the State Party is still conducting the inventory process to further identify the attributes.

We also recognize that the State Party has already put in place several policies as protective and corrective measures to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property including to declare a non-construction zone within the property to remove illegal construction, to initiate city wall conservation project, to stop encroachment and to formulate architectural guidelines. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The walled city of Jaipur City is a city where urban planning structures are based on the Western, Hindi and Mughal urban architectural tradition. It is a city where local traditions of trade, arts and crafts have successfully continued. The nominated property is an outstanding example of the late medieval trade town in South Asia, not to mention as a World Heritage site there are records that are located on the nominated property already. According to the ICOMOS evaluation, there is a comparative analysis that justifies consideration of the nominated property for the World Heritage List with regard to an important

interchange of ancient Hindu, Mughal and contemporary Western ideas related to town planning and architecture evidenced by the city, and as an outstanding architectural ensemble.

We fully agree with the ICOMOS consideration that the nominated property has the potential to represent an important interchange of human values, within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture. We can see that the nominated property walled city of Jaipur has demonstrated criterion (ii), (iv) and (vi) and should be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Jaipur was called the House of the 36 Industries, for being a historical trade centre principally supported by crafts and folk arts and received international recognition for such traditions that have been passed on through local festivals and fairs and has always been embedded in the city's cultural life. It also exhibits an outstanding example of city planning as a response to the topography of the sites and important to the human interchange of values.

While the nomination received a deferral, yet the report did not address the very nature of the information which would require in-depth assessment, a thorough study or even major reconsideration of the boundary but rather supplementary information and minor requirements most of which have been addressed by the State Party. Informational requirements such as the city walls which mostly exist and contribute to the wholeness of the site, the inner areas of *chowkris* and the old *havelis* in addition to the rest of the attributes have been included to reflect the attributes of the nominated area's full historic urban form, therefore meeting the integrity of the nomination. As for the authenticity, it has been accepted by the Advisory Body except that they cannot confirm the material substance and techniques and this has already been provided to the Advisory Body according to the State Party.

After hearing the analysis of the Advisory Body and the statement of the State Party and our distinguished colleague from Brazil, we stand with the amendment of the draft decision to welcome Jaipur on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Chairperson. First of all, Kyrgyzstan would like to thank ICOMOS and the Advisory Bodies for enhancing this nomination and suggesting criterion (iv). Kyrgyzstan would also like to support Brazil's amendment and suggest the inscription of the city of Jaipur on the World Heritage List taking into account that criterion under which the property is inscribed build the foundation for further work. Kyrgyzstan would like to propose that criterion (vi) should be kept because Jaipur has demonstrated its living traditions in the forms of very profound craftsmanship including the jewellery making out of lac, a resinous substance and many more crafts. Kyrgyzstan also appreciates the commitment of the government of Rajasthan as well as the government of India, which have proclaimed the city of Jaipur as a no-construction zone to conserve the heritage efforts of the city. That is why Kyrgyzstan would like to reiterate that we support the Brazilian amendment and we would welcome the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. The Zimbabwe delegation would like to support the proposal by Brazil to amend the draft decision 43 COM 8B.16 to inscribe Jaipur City on the World Heritage List. The Advisory Bodies have in their review noted that the nomination does satisfy two criteria as defined in the Operational Guidelines of the Convention. We note that the Advisory Bodies are concerned with the protective regime for the nominated property. We are of the opinion that the issues that have been raised by the Advisory Bodies to do with management and conservation of the property can be addressed while the property is already inscribed. We note that in conformity with paragraph 108 of the Operational Guidelines when the State Party produces a management plan which in our opinion forms the basis upon which management and conservation initiatives for all other elements of the property can be developed. Once more, Chairperson, we support the Brazilian amendment.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Hungary congratulates India for its huge work on the nomination dossier before and after its presentation and submission to UNESCO. Both prove that Jaipur is one of the most important sites in India first to be inscribed on to the World Heritage List. It serves for it in every respect. Hungary congratulates also ICOMOS for the comprehensive work in its evaluation. We can see controversy in the meeting of the World Heritage Committee. More States Parties support the inscription and some others would like to give a chance to the State Party to enhance the nomination, to enhance the property in conservation and management processes and so on and also there are differences regarding the criteria which serves as the basis for the evaluation of the site. Hungary believes that ICOMOS is right in saying and stating that two criteria, criteria (ii) and (iv) would be the best for the decision-making. But on the other hand, I could say that also there are some reasons to accept the opinion of India to take into account criterion (vi). We appreciate the activities made up to now in enhancing the site, the demolition of different illegal structures and some other but generally Hungary thinks and is of the opinion that more should be done to be worth to be nominated to the site so it is the reason that Hungary supports the decision to refer the nomination to the State Party.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. First of all, we wish to express our appreciation to ICOMOS for the evaluation. This historic city of Jaipur is known to the world for its architecture, planning, arts and crafts and well recognized for its best practice in the field of management and heritage protection. We note that the Advisory Body has recognized that the city has the potential for OUV under criteria (ii) and (iv). The State Party has provided the information on the basis for meeting the conditions of integrity and authenticity in the additional information submitted to the Advisory Body. The State Party is committed to the preservation of OUV and has taken action on all the six points contained in the ICOMOS recommendations. China therefore joins Brazil and supports the draft amendment and we wish India the greatest luck. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

The United Republic of Tanzania commends the State Party of India for presenting this interesting dossier of the historical wall of the city of Jaipur. Tanzania also congratulates ICOMOS for the comprehensive report related to the nomination of Jaipur. Chairperson, Jaipur is proposed to be inscribed under criteria (ii), (v) and (vi) and ICOMOS considers that the nominated property has the potential to present important exchange of human value within a cultural area of the world on development in town planning, architecture, hence has potential to justify criterion (ii). In addition, ICOMOS considers that the nominated property also has the potential to meet criterion (iv).

The delegation of Tanzania notes that ICOMOS recommends some measures to be taken by the State Party to enhance the integrity of the property. As for the authenticity, it considers that the nominated property meets the requirements with regard to overall form and design, use and function, location and setting, intangible heritage and spirit and feeling.

Chairperson, Tanzania agrees with ICOMOS that the development of new tools and plans to enhance the state of conservation of the property with regard to development impacts and the completion of a detailed heritage inventory of the nominated property to name a few, will enhance the management system of Jaipur. However, Tanzania strongly believes that by inscribing the city of Jaipur today the Committee will give strong support and visible encouragement to the State Party of India to take those measures and implement the recommendations proposed by ICOMOS for the successful management and protection of this site.

Chairperson, considering the above my delegation supports the Brazilian amendment to inscribe the city of Jaipur on the World Heritage List.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We've reviewed this file and the evaluation by ICOMOS about the meaning of the property to be found in Jaipur City, Rajasthan suggested proposed by the State of India. And based on the information and analysis this city includes significant architectural, cultural and town elements. From its very beginning it was protected by a complex of walls and now is being suggested as the boundaries of the property itself which shows a complete coherence between the tangible properties on the list and the cultural values that are directly tied to the creation thereof. We've also been able to see that Jaipur City in Rajasthan has architectural and urban spaces throughout history, which are shown to be integrally tied with other aspects of culture and tangible heritage of the people who live there. It is understood to be a configured space based on intercultural relations and the evaluation of the nomination file allows us to recognize the singular value of this historical city which is shared by ICOMOS which also shows potential according to criteria (ii) and (iv).

In the evaluation we see various opinions. We also hear the State Party give us updated information about the efforts that they have already undertaken. We believe that ICOMOS thinks it's necessary to strengthen the management system and the measures for protection conservation of the heritage while also recommending that they complete a detailed inventory

of the property that make up the site as well as other series of actions to respond to the concerns about protection for the site.

For all of these reasons, Guatemala believes that the improvement needed in terms of the management conservation system could be carried out by the State Party via dialogue and support by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Center taking into account the historical and cultural values of the property and the elements that have been identified and the characteristics of the ancient city itself which are presented before us, Guatemala supports inscription of Jaipur City, Rajasthan and also suggests the inclusion of all the recommendations that the Advisory Body has drafted to make sure that they are action measures to be taken in the immediate future. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson for the opportunity. Jaipur City is a complex mix of historical, retail, residential, leisure, cultural and office spaces configured in a rich backdrop of unique 18th century town planning traditions. Furthermore, Mr Chairperson, with separate and connected groups of buildings which constitute a masterpiece of classical Hindu Mughal architectural gem and already in position of World Heritage property such as Jantar Mantar Observatory, Jaipur City is a city of forts, palaces and prosperous historic bazaars.

Mr Chairperson, lack of time and space do not allow me to go into deeper details which have already been mentioned, my delegation wishes to echo this rich character that makes the OUV of Jaipur City resonate as products of spectacular exploitation of artistry, innovation, harmonious interplay of space and in closure topography, streetscapes, local climate, architectural styles and social-cultural conditions breathed from the local culture landscapes of the Indian subcontinent. Hence, Mr Chairperson, Uganda supports the amendment by Brazil for inscription of Jaipur City on the World Heritage List.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Like the other Committee Members who have spoken before us, Australia greatly appreciates the very large amount of research that has gone into this nomination and that this work illustrates the great significance of Jaipur as an important interchange of ancient cultures that resulted in an urban form and architecture of the city that is an outstanding architectural ensemble. We consider that there is potential for the site to demonstrate OUV under criteria (ii) and (iv) and with the honorable delegates Norway, Spain and Hungary we consider that the appropriate decision is to refer the nomination back to the State Party to further elaborate the attributes under these criteria and to better demonstrate how the property meets the requirements for authenticity and integrity. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier l'ICOMOS et le Centre pour le rapport présenté sur ce dossier. À écouter l'ensemble des intervenants, nous avons vu que,

quelle que soit leur position finale proposée, tout le monde est d'accord pour souligner à l'unanimité cette importance de la ville de Jaipur et le brassage, le fabuleux brassage civilisationnel qu'elle représente sur tant d'aspects. La délégation tunisienne qui a étudié ce dossier bien minutieusement partageait une bonne partie des craintes exprimées, en tous les cas des réserves exprimées par l'instance consultative, notamment sur les questions relatives à l'authenticité du bien. Mais la parole donnée à l'État partie et les explications qu'on a entendues, l'engagement ferme qu'on a souligné, lèvent une bonne partie de ces réserves à nos yeux et nous permet d'aller rejoindre l'ensemble des délégations qui appuient l'amendement présenté par le Brésil, notamment au vu des précisions données par l'État partie en matière de gestion et de conservation du bien. Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Ma délégation remercie l'ICOMOS pour l'important travail d'évaluation du dossier d'inscription de la ville de Jaipur. Ce travail relève certes des aspects non conformes en matière de conservation, mais aussi a le mérite de mettre en évidence des avis concordants de l'État partie et de l'ICOMOS. En ce qui concerne l'État partie de l'Inde, pour sa part, la conservation et la gestion de cette ville historique constitue une préoccupation majeure, lui qui a mis en évidence et qui a mis en œuvre un certain nombre d'initiatives et également pris en compte un certain nombre de recommandations de l'ICOMOS. Je voudrais par conséquent demander au Comité de considérer les efforts faits par l'État partie dans ce sens, et inviter le Comité à reconnaître, avec l'ICOMOS, le potentiel de valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Et je souscris au projet d'amendement introduit par le Brésil pour l'inscription du site à cette session. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. And Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Taking a great explanation of the site and all the discussions especially the presentation from the State Party of India about their commitment to develop this project, we support the amendment by Brazil.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous serons brefs. Nous avons suivi avec attention les explications de l'État partie, ainsi que les réserves exprimées par l'ICOMOS, notamment en ce qui concerne la question de l'authenticité. L'ICOMOS soulève des réserves en disant que des informations additionnelles doivent être fournies – donc, quand on dit additionnelles, c'est-à-dire que quelques informations ont été fournies – et notamment aussi certaines réserves par rapport aux questions de gestion et de protection. L'Angola aimerait proposer ce qui suit. Nous appuyons l'inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, tel que proposé par le Brésil, avec peut-être une condition, c'est-à-dire de demander à l'État partie de se rapprocher de l'ICOMOS et d'essayer d'établir un calendrier assez cohérent pour pouvoir accélérer la mise en œuvre des recommandations qui ont été émises. Donc voilà la position de l'Angola, nous soutenons l'inscription avec cette condition. Merci.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Saint Kitts and Nevis.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Saint Kitts and Nevis thanks the State Party of India for the submission of this interesting nomination file of Jaipur City, Rajasthan. We note that the walled city was founded in 1726 BCE and located on the plains unlike the other hilly counterparts of its time. The urban layout of the city as a mandala remains and the market shops, residences and temples located on the main streets are of recognized significance. Saint Kitts and Nevis recognizes the concerns raised by ICOMOS on the nominated property associated with the authenticity, integrity, protection and management especially with reference to the deterioration of the wall and other aspects of the site. The State Party has indicated its commitments to address these concerns and we encourage the State Party in collaboration with ICOMOS to deal urgently with the issues raised particularly those regarding plans for conservation of the property and legislative protection. Saint Kitts and Nevis however, support the amendment by Brazil. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to the World Heritage Centre.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. The delegation of Norway requested a comment from the Secretariat and also from ICOMOS about their proposed amendment to refer the examination of the nomination of Jaipur City. What we can say as the Secretariat from a procedural point of view, is that the proposed amendment procedurally follows and complies fully with paragraph 153 of the Operational Guidelines that gives the four options to the Committee to inscribe, refer, defer or not to inscribe properties on the List. The text of the amendment fully complies also with paragraph 159, the described procedure for referral. ICOMOS may have other considerations. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. Just a point of clarification before responding to the honorable delegate of Norway's request. Just to clarify that ICOMOS did receive a lot of information during the evaluation process and this information was very much appreciated and welcomed by ICOMOS in that period. But we understand that perhaps additional information has been provided to Committee Members during the current session and this is perhaps information that we have not had access to and do not have the opportunity to evaluate information after 28 February in accordance with the Rules. I might just say something briefly about criterion (vi), as that has been a topic for comment. Just to clarify that while arts and crafts are part of the historical legacy of Jaipur and the city has been recognized through the UNESCO Creative Cities Network, in ICOMOS' view the nomination dossier did not position the nominated property adequately among other properties that exhibit the same or similar attributes and values related to criterion (vi). Accordingly, the comparative analysis was not adequate on this aspect and I should just note that the inclusion of the UNESCO Creative Cities Network is very different to the World Heritage List and is not based on an assessment of Outstanding Universal Value.

So just to return to the issue of a possible referral—ICOMOS would see that as being a positive development in part because it would enable the State Party some further time to enable it to

undertake additional measures to respond on the ground to the recommendations made with regard to protection, conservation and management and we could then have a better sense of the effectiveness of those responses to issues relating to protection, conservation and management of the property. It would also enable the State Party in that period to enhance the understanding of the justification for criterion (vi), to enhance the comparative analysis with regard to the arts and crafts issue. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. I believe that it is quite clear, all Member States recognize the Outstanding Universal Value of this site and we all know this. However, we believe that perhaps we should go from deferral to referral because there were certain issues that are still to be resolved. Here we have an example of a case where we have a deferral where it has actually fulfilled certain criteria that were put forward by the Committee but there were certain legal and management aspects that need to be resolved. Spain would be delighted to inscribe this property next year because we are sure that India will be able to look at these legal issues and overcome these management issues but there is still a little bit of way to go before that becomes the case. So we believe that going from deferral to referral we are giving the State Party time to deal with the issues. The options that are open to us here are inscribe, deferral, referral or non-inscription. Spain believes that we should clearly pass from deferral to referral. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I think all delegations have expressed their opinions. I would now like to give the floor to the Rapporteur because we have two different submitted drafts. Please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Yes, we have two sets of amendments. One proposed by Norway, Australia, Spain and Hungary which is moving to a referral on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) and the other proposed by Brazil, Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, China, Guatemala, Indonesia, Saint Kitts and Nevis and the United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda and I know there are a few other delegations also added their support for this one. And that is for an inscription on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi). Paragraph 2 would be amended to read, Refers the nomination of Jaipur City, Rajasthan, India, on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) back to the State Party in order to give consideration to the following. And then former paragraph 2 would follow that with the subparagraphs a) to g) for the Norway and other countries' proposal. For the Brazil one it would read, Inscribes Jaipur City, Rajasthan, India, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi). Then the Brazil and others would therefore need to take note of the provisional statement about Outstanding Universal Value, which is been provided and follows.

Then former paragraph 2 would be amended by Brazil and group of countries to read, Strongly recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following: a) Develop the Special Area Heritage Plan under Jaipur Master Plan 2025 to enhance, etc. as you can see. Point b) remains unchanged. Point c) Improve the legal protection by introducing architectural control guidelines and other measures to overcome the potential dangers to the property and ensure it is adequate and effective for all attributes, including ensuring coordination between the various protective measures through the heritage committees proposed in the management framework. And then just scrolling, d), e), f) and g) are unchanged. Both sets of amendments would remove the requirement for the expert mission.

And then the final paragraph proposed by Brazil and others, Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2021 a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So can we come to the beginning of the text? Two approaches are different from each other from the point of view not only on the decision but from the approval of the criteria. Maybe we will clarify the criteria first. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. With regard to criterion (vi) I would like to say that one cannot fully understand the property without taking into account the tradition of crafts of Jaipur. The city housed a number of karkhanas—I don't know how to pronounce that but 11 out of 13 original ones continue to thrive, each with a specified street and market design for each craft and it still continues to date and in the additional information that was provided by ICOMOS, the comparative analysis was expanded based on the typologies and handicraft cities in four World Heritage sites, compared with India, China and Iran and it was concluded that the introduction of handicrafts and diversified techniques in Jaipur in the 18th century has led to the establishment of a distinct identity compared to other cities. In Jaipur traditional crafts are seen not only as an economic asset but have contributed more broadly to a process of construction and reconstruction of territorial identities in the city. In some, Mr Chairperson, these crafts that are of global recognition—they are tangibly manifested in the property. One can simply not understand fully the property without taking into account this dimension. Therefore, we would insist on having criterion (vi) taking into account whether we are referring or inscribing the property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there principle objections to such an approach from the Committee Members? I don't see any objections. Thank you very much. So now we have to proceed to the approval of the decision itself so most of the countries as far as I can see voted for the amendment proposed by Brazil. The number of the countries is 14. Five countries favor referral. So I don't want to put it to the other matters so the difference is quite strong. Can we then if there are no principle objections from the side of the countries that proposed the alternative draft, can we proceed to the approval of the matter? Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. Just for paragraph 2, it would read, Inscribes Jaipur City, Rajasthan, India, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi).

Chairperson:

No objections? Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. We are happy to go with the decision. We would just like to make or propose one further amendment to the final paragraph 5 in the amendment to inscribe. Given that there seems to be quite a significant number of things that the State Party has to do to satisfy the state of conservation, authenticity and integrity that we would like them to submit to the World Heritage by December 2020 rather than 2021.

Chairperson:

I think that is reasonable. ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. Just a suggestion that the Committee may wish to consider whether that final paragraph should indeed have a report submitted to the World Heritage Centre by the new revised date on the implementation of the abovementioned recommendations but for examination by the World Heritage Committee perhaps at its session in 2021 would be a worthwhile addition to consider.

Chairperson:

Okay, Australia, please. You don't mind?

The Delegation of Australia:

Mr Chairperson, we would certainly support that suggestion from ICOMOS.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Actually, we wanted to propose what was just suggested by ICOMOS. But since we are taking the floor, whichever way the Committee seems to wish to proceed we just want to say for the record that the Operational Guidelines set out the conditions for inscription on the World Heritage List and after some comments that we have heard we wish to remind all of us that simply meeting criteria is not enough to warrant inscription as it is clearly stated in paragraph 78 of the Operational Guidelines, To be deemed of Outstanding Universal Value, a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding. This shows that OUV has all of these criteria, which need to be met. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have seen now there is a movement towards inscription and we would not oppose it and we are in agreement with the delegates from Australia with their addition. And I would also like to point out that in our amendment we also had the list of recommendations from Brazil but we had an addition on point c) that we would like to have inserted. Improve the legal protection and there we would have including, if that is okay with the Committee.

Chairperson:

I don't see any objections. Thank you. Now we are approaching the stage of approval of the document in whole. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. On va au paragraphe 5 en fait. Donc, comme nous l'avons souligné, nous avons appuyé l'inscription. En regardant justement ce calendrier nous sommes tout à fait d'accord avec la proposition de l'Australie et de la Hongrie. Donc 2020, pour être beaucoup plus incisif sur la mise en œuvre des recommandations. Ensuite, s'agissant de l'amendement qui vient d'être proposé par la Norvège, il y a juste une question de formulation, qui n'est pas assez précise : « y compris en approuvant », ça ne marche pas ; peut-être « y compris des directives » si c'est clair comme ça, je pense. Voilà, si on peut enlever « en approuvant » ou « en promouvant ». Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. Then in the English then I think the suggestion would be to remove by introducing so it would read, improve the legal protection including, perhaps to include architectural control guidelines to overcome...And we remove introducing in both.

Chairperson:

Thank you. ICOMOS.

ICOMOS: Sorry, just to comment on the Rapporteur's intervention. I think by introducing narrows the intent of using the word including. Including is intended to highlight one aspect where legal protection would be enhanced but to use the words by introducing narrows it down to just that one aspect which I think would be not a beneficial outcome.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Yes, just like ICOMOS just said, it narrows it down and we wanted to broaden it so we would even if it's not the perfect sentence we want to keep the original if there are no other suggestions for keeping the meaning of what we wanted, including also.

Chairperson:

By including, yes?

The Delegation of Norway:

No. We want our original amendment, not the one rephrased. Improve the legal protection including by introducing architectural control guidelines, which means then you should do the architectural control guidelines and other measures. Okay? Is that clear?

Chairperson:

I understand. It's clear. The French version is okay for that?

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. It's okay. So now we proceed to the approval of the document in whole. Angola.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Il y a un problème là, ce n'est pas clair cette phrase : « y compris en y introduisant... ». Cette phrase n'est pas bien élaborée, il faut qu'on la rende plus claire. Qu'est-ce qu'on veut exactement ?

Chairperson:

Norway. We have to satisfy both languages, both versions. May I ask Angola to deliver the wording in French, as you think necessary.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

En fait, il faudrait peut-être que la Norvège nous explique ce qu'ils veulent exactement inclure dans cette phrase, et là on pourra peut-être aider.

Chairperson:

Norway, please, we need an explanation.

The Delegation of Norway:

I'll try once more to make it more understandable this time. I'm looking at the sentence in English. Improve the legal protection. I mean it could also read, include the legal protection by introducing architectural control guidelines and we have and other measures. With this other measures we should be fine. Including by introducing architectural measures and other measures. Does it make sense in French?

Chairperson:

Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

The simplest expression in English is to delete the word including and I think that then resolves the problem because it says improve legal protection by introducing architectural control guidelines. That's the first thing to be done and other measures to overcome so then we move past the architectural control guidelines on to other things that need to be done so I think this is the best way of expressing it in English.

Chairperson:

Now in French? Okay. Merci beaucoup. Now I hope we have finalized with the wording and we approach the approval of the decision in whole in a new version. Noting that the Committee Members voted and they accept the decision to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List with the following recommendations with the text that was just worked out by the common efforts of the World Heritage Committee Members. Thank you very much. Therefore, I declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.16 approved as amended [*applause*].

Chairperson:

I cordially congratulate the Indian delegation for the inscription of this site to the World Heritage List and give the floor to you for a two-minute intervention. Please.

The Observer Delegation of India:

Thank you, Chairperson and we thank the Members of the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The city of Jaipur today has been given the honor, privilege and responsibility of inscription on the World Heritage List. It is a proud moment for a proud land and a proud people, the men of women of Rajasthan. The credit is rightly theirs for having nurtured and protected this heritage for generations. They are conscious as we all are of the responsibility to protect and preserve to pass on to future generations this extraordinary, vibrant and living heritage.

To be inscribed on the List is not an award, it is not a prize; it's a shared commitment to be carried out, responsibly exercised in common cause and effort. We are all partners in this; all of us, Members of the Committee, the signatories to the Convention, all the world are in this endeavor. Even as we look back to look forward to a part in the future, we anticipate and await greater transparency, a sharing of perspectives and information and to changes in process that will allow this to happen. Who will evaluate the evaluators? We look forward to the removal of inconsistencies, to the gentle guidance to the highest standards of professionalism that would allow a truly great and a truly representative List but all of this in the future not too far in the future. This evening in the streets of Jaipur the elephants will rumble and trumpet in celebration. Thank you. [*Applause*]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Once more our congratulations to India and we are moving to the next item of our agenda, 43 COM 8B.17 concerned with Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto from Indonesia. Celebrations, please, outside. May I ask you to kindly proceed outside, please, Indian delegation, can you go to celebrate outside? Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to Mr Balsamo for some clarification and then to ICOMOS to present the file. Please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto and this is to be found on page 73 in the English version of INF.8B.4 and on page 74 in the French version of the same document. This notification also has impacts on the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value that are already integrated in our draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. ICOMOS, please. Welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson and good morning. The ICOMOS evaluation of the Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto, Indonesia can be found in document INF.8B.1 on page 133 of the English version and page 125 in the French version and the draft decision is 43 COM 8B.17.

A complex industrial and social system was established in the 19th century to extract processed and transport high-quality coal from a remote area of western Sumatra. Built by the Netherlands colonial government, mining continued under Indonesia ownership until 2002. This nomination has 12 components within three main areas spanning 155 kilometres from the remote mountains to the Indian Ocean port at Padang via a purpose-built railway system. The three areas demonstrate the full extent of the coal mining and transportation system including the housing and community facilities for the people that worked for the mining enterprise.

Area A includes the mining and coal processing sites. Deep-pit mining required considerable capital investment and technological ability and included open pit mines, tunnels, air compressor and ventilation system, river-water pumping station, coal-fired power plant, coal-processing facilities. The extraction of high-quality coal from the Ombilin Basin for more than a century is an exceptional example of a technologically advanced system established within the context of European colonization in Asia. Also in Area A is the company town of Sawahlunto. Many buildings with characteristic “Indies style” remain and are adapted to ongoing uses and community facilities. The needed labor and knowhow was considerable and a mining school established in 1916 has supported the longterm capacity of the mine. At its peak the population of the town was more than 7,000 people. All workers were housed in the town along with many community facilities.

Area B is the rail route constructed from 1887 between the mining areas and the port. Several bridges exhibit technological innovation. Area C is located at the port. A single component includes coal storage facilities. The State Party has provided additional evidence and research about the contributions of local cultural and landscape knowledge to the development of the mine. The many skilled and unskilled workers included local Minangkabau people, convict laborers and Javanese and Chinese contract workers. ICOMOS considers the local history to be a critical part of the significance of this system and has recommended continued research and interpretation of the social histories.

The comparative analysis demonstrates the significance the coal mining enterprise particularly in the context of colonial encounters between European and Southeast Asian peoples. The nominated property demonstrates criteria (ii) and (iv). The requirements for authenticity and integrity have been met. ICOMOS has made recommendations to reduce the vulnerability of some components and to comprehensively identify attributes in order to ensure the effectiveness of protection and management. Exchanges between ICOMOS and the State Party resulted in a minor adjustment in the boundary of one of the railway stations. The single buffer zone is sufficient to protect the property although it is comprised of a number of different legal mechanisms and could be further streamlined in the future.

The main factors affecting the property are uncontrolled small-scale domestic and commercial development particularly in Sawahlunto and deterioration of the physical fabric due to high humidity levels and vegetation growth. There is no mining within the property or its buffer zone and none will be permitted in the future. The legal protection was improved by the State Party during the evaluation and is now fully in place. The State Party has indicated the possibility for the property to be designated as a national strategic area following inscription, which could assist in further improving and clarifying the legal protection. The management system is adequate although it relies on excellent coordination between different government agencies, private owners and communities across a large area of the province.

To conclude, ICOMOS recommends that Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto, Indonesia be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) and has included a number of further recommendations in the draft decision to aid the longterm conservation of the property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, no one doubts that Indonesia has tremendous natural, cultural or mixed heritage but we applaud them for submitting the first industrial heritage in this meeting. This nomination shows an outstanding example of pioneering technological ensemble built by European engineers in the globally important period of industrialization in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The rail system devised to transport the coal from the remote and inaccessible region to the city. It demonstrates the exchange and fusion between European and local knowledge and practices within the context of global industrialization and colonization. Finally, the Ombilin training/education facilities formalised the transfer of knowledge within the colonial and postcolonial contexts, including coal mining within tropical climates. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We would like to commend Indonesia for this nomination, because not only is it very well structured in terms of the different components into which the three areas are divided into but moreover because in a world in which everything is moving so quickly, where new technologies are developing so quickly where it seems that our drive to reach the future leads us sometimes to forget why we've done things in the past and sometime we forget the past. When we see an example like this, which gives us the chance to really see the impact of changes on the productive social fabric that happened via European colonial history and that allowed for also a global industrialization in the last period of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century,

well this industrialization was thanks to the perfect technology that existed at that point even though it might seem a bit antiquated to us. But also we have to think about the contribution of the local communities and the intelligence of the engineers that were working on that as well and so to really think about history, where we are coming from and what all of us have contributed to the industrialized world is something that is very well reflected in this nomination besides the tangible value it has in and of itself. We would like to commend Indonesia and thank ICOMOS as well for the excellent report they have given us because it helps us to understand a lot of things from our past much better. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson and thank you to Indonesia for this comprehensive serial nomination and to ICOMOS for their excellent and professional evaluation. We have on the World Heritage List quite a number of large mining sites from Europe and South America so Australia was very interested to see a nomination of such a site from our close neighbour and one in a tropical environment that was established during the colonial period. The nominated series reflects a complete system from extraction and processing of coal to the housing for workers and transportation of the coal to the port. Such a large site especially in this tropical context poses many conservation hurdles but the State Party seems committed to and is implementing effective and collaborative management and conservation of the property. Like our colleagues from Spain, we were particularly interested in the history of the mining community that included people who came from other parts of Indonesia, from Europe, Japan and elsewhere, who together with the local community whose knowledge of the landscape and environment contributed to the mining operation built a successful community. We hope that the inscription of the property will bring an opportunity for further research and interpretation of the social life of the mine and wholeheartedly support its inscription.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. je voudrais tout d'abord exprimer nos remerciements pour la qualité du rapport présenté par l'organe consultatif, et la Tunisie voudrait saluer la qualité de ce dossier et féliciter l'État partie de présenter un dossier de très grande qualité qui, permettez-moi de faire une association avec le dossier qu'on a adopté et la résolution qu'on a prise hier concernant le dossier du Burkina Faso, voici comment la culture se fait, elle se fait par les hommes et les femmes qui travaillent tous les jours dans notre vie quotidienne. Hier c'était les forgerons ; aujourd'hui ce sont les mineurs. Le patrimoine de la mine de charbon que nous étudions aujourd'hui est un très bel exemple de la cruciale et dernière phase d'industrialisation mondiale. Cela a conforté d'ailleurs la proposition d'inscription sur la base de l'article (iv), mais également il faut souligner avec satisfaction la complétude de cet ensemble, de manière à démontrer un système pleinement intégré en vue d'une extraction optimale. Voici les deux éléments qui ont permis à la proposition d'inscription qu'elle soit basée sur les critères (iv) et (ii). La Tunisie appuie pleinement cette décision et félicite encore une fois l'État partie de nous offrir un si beau dossier.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China commends the State Party of Indonesia for this very important nomination and we appreciate ICOMOS for a very comprehensive and important evaluation. The Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto combines a contemporary advanced industrial technology with Indonesia's special climatic and geographic environment traditional practices and wisdom. Preservation of this unique industrial heritage will inspire exhibition, protection and management of the industrial heritage. China congratulates Indonesia on the inclusion of the Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto on the World Heritage List and hopes the conservation of the heritage property will serve as an example for best practices for international peers. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask honorable Committee Members are there any other opinions or objections to the draft proposed by ICOMOS? I don't see any. May I ask the Rapporteur if there are any draft amendments proposed?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have no draft amendments for this decision.

Chairperson:

I would like to propose to approve the proposed draft decision and I declare decision 43 COM 8B.17 adopted [*applause*]. On behalf of all the Members of the Committee, I would like to congratulate the Indonesia delegation for this achievement and inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. I give the floor to the delegation.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Mr Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, delegates, Committee Members, Advisory Bodies, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank the Committee for its decision to inscribe the Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto to the World Heritage List.

The property is Indonesia's first industrial heritage, which presents an outstanding example of pioneering technological development of the late 19th century. It is a fusion of European engineering knowledge and local environmental wisdom, traditional practices and cultural values in coal mining activities. The property has played an important role and made a contribution to the economic and social development of Sumatra Island and to the whole world. The establishment of a system of linkage of coal mining industry and train system provides a good example of rapid regional development of global economic growth. It also illustrates the impact of profound change in social relations of production imposed by colonial powers to their colonies. The cultural interaction between the East and West has transformed the remote area into a much more dynamic urban mining patterns comprising a more integrated, multiethnic and multi-religious community.

The successful nomination resulted from excellent collaboration between the central and local governments as well as a result of efforts among stakeholders namely research institutions, universities and experts. I am pleased to convey to you that the Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto is a truly significant Indonesian natural and cultural property that is important to the Indonesian people as well as others around the world. Before I end my remarks I would like to reiterate once again our deepest appreciation for your invaluable support for Ombilin Coal Mining Heritage of Sawahlunto on the World Heritage List of UNESCO. I thank you, Mr Chairperson [*applause*].

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Before moving to the next item I would like to give the floor to the representative of the NGO from Indonesia, WALHI, I think is the name.

Observer NGO (WALHI):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I speak on behalf of WALHI, Indonesia's largest environmental organization. We acknowledge the Indonesian Government's enthusiasm for recognizing our country's rich heritage. We also share this enthusiasm. Indonesia has over 1,300 ethnicities and cultures, many of which house indigenous knowledge and cultural heritage exemplify OUV as defined by World Heritage criteria for selection. Indonesia also has World Heritage sites, which also qualified as iconic World Heritage sites. Today, the Ombilin Coal Mine has been inscribed. The mining site is a symbol of the beginning of the destruction of nature and tropical rainforest in Indonesia. It is also the start of Indonesia becoming a major source of greenhouse gas emission due to coal energy. We understand that mining and coal sites have been inscribed as World Heritage sites in the past. We also understand that such commemorating and memorializing human conflict and tragedy is important and necessary. However, the recognizing and normalizing the human suffering and environmental fallout from coal, which the world is still dealing with, is not reflected in the inscription. Instead, the legacy of forced labor is sanitized. The ongoing environmental impacts and coal mining in the area are ignored.

We raise this issue not to dismiss the significance of the technological cultural but to contextualize it in our short human history. For instance, there are 13 mining licenses in Sawahlunto; local communities are still suffering. It fuels the question of how States Parties should prioritize the nomination of new sites. In the Indonesian context, there are ecosystems, some with critically endangered species in more urgent need of protection and conservation. In the future whether the World Heritage Committee should inscribe former coal sites is a key question which should be truly discussed. Should the World Heritage community inscribe such sites which sanitize our history and drive climate change? Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. We will take note. Now we are moving to another nomination from Japan, Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group: Mounded Tombs of Ancient Japan, draft decision 43 COM 8B.18. May I give the floor to Mr Balsamo to brief us?

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the nomination of Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group: Mounded Tombs of Ancient Japan and this is to be found on page 83 in both the English and French versions of document INF.8B.4. This notification also has impacts on proposed statement of OUV. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now the floor is going to ICOMOS to present the file. Please, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation of Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group: Mounded Tombs of Ancient Japan can be found in document INF.8B.1 on page 145 in the English version and page 139 in the French version. Kofun or old mound refers to a distinctive type of burial mound. These give Japan's Kofun period its name spanning the 3rd to 6th centuries. The Kofun are the richest tangible representation of the culture of this period, which was one of transition in East Asia. In Japan changes in power relations during the Kofun period resulted in the emergence of the Yamato kingly power.

The nominated Kofun are located on a plateau above the Osaka plain, an important political centre of the period. There are 45 components, containing 49 kofun in two main clusters that are separated by approximately 10km. The nominated kofun have been selected from 160,000 throughout Japan and represent the Middle Kofun Period. The kofun are understood to be the tombs of kings, their clans and affiliates reflecting social and political hierarchies. The largest kofun have a distinctive keyhole shape. Several of these are very large, close to 500m in length. A number are designated as *Ryobo* or imperial mausolea and are managed by the Japanese Imperial Household Agency. In addition to the large keyhole-shaped kofun there are also kofun in round, scalloped and square forms.

The kofun are complex earthen structures with steep sides paved with stones and surrounded by moats that are dry or filled with water. Originally, the mounds would have been exposed but over time they were covered in vegetation. Some moats have been filled in and stabilization works have occurred at some of the mounds. The mounds were decorated by clay figures known as *haniwa*. Cylinder-shaped *haniwa* arranged in rows were extensively used and there are also representations of various objects, houses, animals and people. There are a wide range of grave goods including weapons, armor and ornaments.

The nominated kofun occur within an area of high population. Approximately 80,000 people live within the buffer zones. Some of the nominated kofun have facilities for worship, including *torii* gates, lanterns, stone fences and washbasins. All kofun are considered to be places of reverence and respectful ambiance especially the *Ryobo*.

The comparative analysis demonstrates the significance of the selected kofun within the geo-cultural context of East Asia. The State Party has also established the rationale for the selection of the kofun of the Mozu and Furuichi groups. The serial property demonstrates criteria (iii) and (iv) and given the antiquity of the kofun and their state of conservation the requirements for authenticity and integrity are met despite some variations.

Exchanges between ICOMOS and the State Party resulted in a minor adjustment to the buffer zone of one component. While some components are located close to urban areas ICOMOS considers the boundaries to be adequate so long as the management system operates to protect their integrity. The main factors affecting the property are associated with the close proximity of urban development and it is necessary to control erosion and vegetation on the mounds and water quality in the moats. Development pressures managed by the local restrictions, legal restrictions and heritage impact assessment have been introduced and are critically important. The legal protection and management systems are therefore well established.

To conclude, ICOMOS recommends that Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group: Mounded Tombs of Ancient Japan be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv) and has included a number of further recommendations in the draft decision to aid the longterm conservation of the property. Please note that the text of recommendation b) has been revised to remove a factual error. A draft statement about Outstanding Universal Value has been provided. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all let me take this opportunity to thank the Advisory Body, ICOMOS for the great, great report and also I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre and the State Party for their continuous collaboration. Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group: Mounded Tombs of Ancient Japan is without question one of the most remarkable of all burial mounds

to have been built in antiquity. It shows a wide variation of shapes and sizes from the largest keyhole shape as we saw in the picture measuring almost 500m long where the other ones are as small as 20m. The complexity of the design of kofun such as the unique keyhole and scallop shapes, the stages of rituals as well as burials with numerous earthenware, *haniwa* placed among them and their excellent preservation unparalleled in the world. The ancient mound tombs in the Mozu-Furuichi area will exhibit considerable value for the World Heritage List. And let me add one more thing, to have and preserve for over 1,500 years in the most congested place as we've seen in the pictures is remarkable and we should thank the Japanese government. This is the first site listed in Osaka, surprisingly and let me mention one more thing, it's the hometown of our dear friend the Permanent Representative of Japan and UNESCO. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier l'ICOMOS pour le rapport qui a été présenté, mais également l'État partie de nous avoir offert un dossier de grande qualité. Il s'agit d'un témoignage exceptionnel sur la culture de la période Kofun, et bien entendu que la Tunisie rejoint le rapport et la proposition de décision en la vérification des critères (iii) et (iv). Je crois qu'il y a aussi lieu de souligner la grande qualité et le très haut niveau de l'encadrement juridique et de la protection juridique mis en place par les autorités japonaises pour protéger ce site, et l'ensemble des sites qui lui ressemblent d'ailleurs. Il y a lieu de les féliciter et, bien entendu, d'appuyer la décision d'inscription.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Zimbabwe would like to commend the State Party of Japan for presenting Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group, which are the most exceptional mounded tombs in the world. By virtue of their outstanding range of size and variety of shapes the cluster of mounded tombs represent the socio-political structure of the unique civilization. We note with admiration that these monuments, kofun, were preserved for over 1,600 years with distinctive meanings, which share the life and spiritual value as a friend of citizens. In the development classes in the 1950s one of the components, Itasuke kofun, was protected by the civil safeguarding campaign and this action became the first case of a citizen-led safeguarding movement in Japan. It is also noteworthy that kofun has been successfully preserved to this date thanks to the efforts of the citizens initiative. Once again congratulations to Japan. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Australia would like to congratulate Japan on the nomination of the remarkable mounded tombs. This was a very detailed, comprehensive and beautifully presented nomination and it was a pleasure to read. We were fascinated by the distinctive geometric forms of the kofun. The state of conservation and integrity of the tombs is impressive given their antiquity and location in an urban setting as is their sacred status and the respect they are afforded in particular the *Ryobo* the tombs of the ancestors of the Imperial Family. We very much look forward to seeing the results of further documentation of the intangible values of the tomb and

we encourage Japan to strengthen the involvement of local communities in the management of this property. Again, congratulations to Japan.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. My delegation also congratulates the State Party with this beautiful heritage and successful nomination. The Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group represents and provides an exceptional testimony to the culture of the Kofun Period of Japan's ancient history. It also demonstrates an outstanding type of ancient East Asian burial mound construction with its tangible attributes such as the clay sculptures, moats and geometric terraced mounds reinforced by stone. We would like to commend the State Party and ICOMOS for its work. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. Just like the other delegations the Spanish delegation is very impressed by the excellent work carried out by the technical team in Japan. We therefore ask the Japanese authorities how long have they actually been working on this file? Because time is of course of the essence and we can see that this something that has been prepared over 10 years and now we are seeing the fruit of that. As other delegations have said, as Australia has said, we are impressed with the system of protection put in place and we can see in the photo here that this is a site right in the middle of a major urban area. It's absolutely incredible to have this level of conservation. And as Zimbabwe said, since the 50s when the city had major urban pressure put on it this was a site that was protected by the civil society organizations. This also shows the local community sees this site as fundamental and now we are seeing the fruit of all of this. So congratulations to Japan and congratulations to all of us for accepting this on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Honorable Members of the Committee, we have had several interventions and more are coming. Are there any objections or other opinions about the proposal given by ICOMOS? If there is no additional information—please, I can give the floor to those who insist but we decided to follow a little bit. Thank you very much. So we now have full support for the proposed draft. May I ask the Rapporteur if there are any amendments or additions?

Rapporteur:

We've received no amendments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Therefore, after listening to all the comments and information of ICOMOS I would like to declare decision 43 COM 8B.18 adopted as amended [*applause*]. We cordially congratulate the delegation of Japan for the inscription of this exceptional site on the World Heritage List and I would like to give the floor to the delegation of Japan. Please, you are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Japan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Distinguished Members of the Committee, excellences, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Government of Japan I would like to express my deepest appreciation to all the Member States of the Committee and ICOMOS for deciding on the inscription of the Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group: Mounded Tombs of Ancient Japan. The property is on an exceptional testimony to the Kofun Period's culture in the late 4th and 5th centuries in which the socio-political structure of the time was demonstrated by the shape and size of kofun built as a collective entity. I wish to share this historic felicity with everybody concerned, in particular people of the Osaka region who have long cherished and maintained the inscribed properties and are committed to preserving and protecting them in the future. Now I invite Mr Yoshimura, Governor of the Osaka Prefecture to say a few words. Governor, please.

Mr Yoshimura:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I am Hirofumi Yoshimura, Governor of Osaka. I am greatly pleased that our precious historic heritage, Mozu-Furuichi Kofun Group in Osaka has just been inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List. The property has been preserved by local residents for 1,600 years and handed down to this day. It is not only a priceless heritage for Japan's history but also an important treasure to convey many people's efforts for protecting the kofun to people today. We will continue to make every effort together with local government to hand over this heritage to the next generation and to offer a deep impression to visitors who come to see the sites. Last but not least, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to those who have supported us through the nomination process and to everyone today. Thank you very much. *[Applause]*

Chairperson:

We once more congratulate Japan for their inscription.

Now we proceed to another nomination, 43 COM 8B.19 from Lao People's Democratic Republic: Megalithic Jar Sites in Xiengkhuang–Plain of Jars. First I will give the floor to Mr Balsamo.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination and it is found on page 90 of the English version of document INF.8B.4 and on page 140 of the same document in French. This notification also has impacts on the proposed statement of OUV. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you are welcome to make your presentation.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation of Megalithic Jar Sites in Xiengkhuang–Plain of Jars, Lao People's Democratic Republic can be found in document INF.8B.1 on page 156 in the English version and page 178 in the French version. More than 2,100 tubular-shaped megalithic stone jars used for funerary practices in the Iron Age give the Plain of Jars its name.

This is a serial property of 15 components occurring across an area spanning 80km west to east and 40km from north to south. The 15 components include several major clusters as well as smaller sizes and there are 10 buffer zones. The nominated components contain 1,325 of the large carved stone jars. The jars range in size from one to three meters, are well crafted and would have required technological skill to produce and move from the quarries to sites where they are now found.

Aside from the jars, the nominated components contain many stone discs thought to be lids for the jars, secondary burials, grave markers, quarries, manufacturing sites, grave goods and other archeological materials and features. In most cases, the quarries are near the jar locations. Located on hill slopes and spurs surrounding the central plateau, the jars and associated elements are the most prominent and intriguing evidence of the Iron Age civilization that made and used them. The sites are dated from between 500 BCE and 500 AD (and possibly up to as late as 800 AD).

The Plain of Jars is located at an historical crossroads between two major cultural systems of Iron Age Southeast Asia. Because the area is one that facilitated movement through the region enabling trade and cultural exchange the distribution of the jar sites is thought to be potentially associated with overland routes and demonstrate social hierarchies. The 15 components demonstrate the range of site types including topographic and locational context contexts, stone types, density and sizes of jars and other archaeological evidence. The selected components also ensure the protection of the substantial archaeological potential of these sites. The State Party has acknowledged the need for continuing archeological research and documentation. While megalithic sites are found in many countries in Southeast Asia, the comparative analysis establishes the distinctiveness of the Plain of Jars. Information provided by the State Party has also justified the selection of the 15 components.

The integrity and authenticity of the property are demonstrated despite damages that have occurred in the past including bombing during the Second Indochina War in the 1960s and 70s, looting, minor developments and grazing. The State Party is to be commended for the work undertaken to remove sources of potential damage including unexploded ordnance in the nominated components. ICOMOS considers that criterion (iii) has been demonstrated and that the Plain of Jars exhibits an exceptional testimony to the civilization that made the jars. Little is known about these people and their specific cultural traditions; however, research collaborations are ongoing and can be expected to yield greater future insights. No major concerns have been identified for the boundaries and buffer zones to the nominated components although several recommendations have been suggested in order to strengthen their integrity. There are few continuing threats and the protection is adequate. ICOMOS has recommended that a conservation plan be established. The present standard of interpretation is limited. The State Party is actively addressing this and a tourism management plan is to be developed.

A considerable amount of work has been done by the State Party to establish the components of the management system. The village based management arrangements and community engagement are strengths of this nomination. ICOMOS has recommended that a management plan be developed to guide the coordination and consistency of approaches across the property.

To conclude, ICOMOS recommends that the Megalithic Jar Sites in Xiengkhuang–Plain of Jars, Lao People's Democratic Republic be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii). A draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been provided and ICOMOS has also made a number of further recommendations. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any interventions from Committee Members? China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China congratulates Lao People's Democratic Republic and we also commend the comprehensive review by ICOMOS. The 1,325 jars in the Megalithic Jar Sites in Xiengkhuang–Plain of Jars in the Lao People's Democratic Republic manifest the impressive achievements of the ancient civilization in Southeast Asia. The traditions to use a huge number

of megalithic stone jars for funerary practice have similarities with the ancient Chinese terracotta figures, the Terracotta Warriors. There are rich materials for later generations to study the customs, history, culture and belief system of the time. We also note another distinct feature of the project, which is the active involvement and monitoring by the local community, which greatly enhances the public engagement in heritage conservation serving as an important basis for effective conservation of heritage and sustainable development of the area where this is located. China congratulates Laos on the inclusion of the heritage of Plain of Jars on the World Heritage List and wishes the State Party to enter a new stage in heritage and conservation management. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

La Tunisie voudrait remercier tout d'abord les instances consultatives de nous avoir fourni un rapport précieux puisqu'il nous permet de prendre conscience de la beauté de ce dossier et des éléments qui le composent. Je voudrais, à l'occasion, féliciter les autorités laotiennes pour leur travail et le remarquable dossier qui nous a été présenté. Ces milliers de jarres qui nous ramènent à ces pierres mégalithiques, c'est extrêmement important et précieux à ajouter à notre Liste. Je crois qu'il y a, sur le plan de la procédure aussi, une belle leçon qui est donnée à travers ce dossier. Il suffit parfois d'un seul critère bien démontré et bien édifié pour qu'on obtienne une inscription. Je crois que cela est important aussi à retenir. Je renouvelle mes félicitations à l'État partie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any other opinions or objections to this draft decision proposed by ICOMOS? I don't see any. May I ask the Rapporteur about amendment?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have no amendments proposed. Thank you.

Chairperson:

If that is the case I would like to propose the procedure of adoption. qsl don't see any objections. Thank you very much. I therefore declare decision 43 COM 8B.19 adopted as amended [*applause*]. We congratulate the Lao delegation for the inscription to the List and you are welcome to make a speech. Please.

The Observer Delegation of Lao People's Democratic Republic:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson, excellence, Madam Ms Rössler, Director of the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO, all Members of the World Heritage Committee, excellences, ladies and gentlemen, it is my great honor to be here among so many distinguished delegates representing States Parties from around the world at this very important meeting. On behalf of the Government of Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lao multiethnic people, particularly the provincial authority and the people of Xiengkhuang Province, I, Minister of Information, Culture, and Tourism of Lao PDR, Chairman of the National Committee for World Heritage of Laos and Mr Bountone Chanthaphone, Governor of Xiengkhuang Province, present here, would like to sincerely express our highest appreciation and acknowledgement to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and its Committee Members and all of your distinguished delegates here for your valuable consideration and support in inscribing the Megalithic Jar Sites in Xiengkhuang Province of Laos on the UNESCO World Heritage List at this remarkable 43rd session here in this very beautiful Caspian historic city of Baku, World Heritage site of the Republic of Azerbaijan. On this auspicious occasion I would like to express my sincerest

gratitude to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, World Heritage Committee, Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS experts for their precious contribution and support to the protection of this archeological site as a common heritage of humanity without whose expertise and hard work this inscription could not have been possible. May I take this opportunity to express my special thanks to the government of Azerbaijan for the very warm welcome and excellent hospitality. On this auspicious occasion, let me wish all of you great happiness, good health and success in your noble task. And may I invite all of you, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen to visit our country, visit of Plain of Jars. Thank you very much. [*Applause*]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We once more congratulate the delegation for the inscription.

As we are approaching lunchtime, I think that there is no sense to start another item. I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler for some announcements and then we will proceed.

Ms Rössler:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. As you know, we have from 2-3 p.m. the working group on the revisions of the Operational Guidelines which takes place in Room A7, then there is a meeting at 1 p.m. Building Peace through Heritage with Life Beyond Tourism Movement in Room B2, then from 1:10-2 p.m. World Heritage Nomination Project in Africa by the World Heritage Centre, ICCROM, Tsinghua University, the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO and the African World Heritage Fund. That's in Room B3 and there is also a meeting of the members of the organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) in Room A6. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we are breaking for lunch and we start back at 3 p.m. with the nomination of Myanmar. Please be on time. Thank you very much. Have a nice time.

The meeting rose at 12.55 a.m.

SIXTH DAY – Saturday 6 July 2019

TWELFTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 6.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)
later: H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil)
later: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Honorable delegates, please proceed to your working places--we have to start another nomination, please. We have a quorum; we can start. We start our afternoon session with the examination of draft decision 43 COM 8B.20 connected to the inscription of Bagan from Myanmar. Can I ask ICOMOS to start the presentation, please?

ICOMOS:

Good afternoon. Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The ICOMOS report for the evaluation of Bagan in Myanmar can be found in document INF.8B.1 on page 166 in the English version and 150 in the French version.

This is a revised nomination. Bagan archaeological area was nominated to the World Heritage List in 1995. In 1997, ICOMOS recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party to address issues related to the boundaries, management, conservation approaches, archaeological investigations, management arrangements and planned developments. Bagan is located on a bend in the Ayeyarwady River in the central dry zone of Myanmar. The property has eight components with a single encircling buffer zone. Bagan is a sacred landscape, which features an exceptional array of Buddhist art and architecture, demonstrating centuries of the cultural tradition of Buddhist merit-making.

The nominated area provides evidence of the Bagan civilization between the 11th and 13th centuries, a period when redistributional Buddhism became a mechanism of political control. Bagan was a substantial city located in a relatively resource-poor region, and was dependent on a strong flow of goods through political and religious exchanges. The traditions of merit making resulted in a rapid increase in temple construction, peaking in the 13th century. Intangible attributes of the property are reflected in Buddhist worship and merit-making activities, pilgrimage, traditional cultural practices and farming. The serial property of eight components consists of 3,595 recorded monuments including stupas, temples, monasteries and other structures for Buddhist spiritual practice, extensive archaeological resources, inscriptions, murals, cloth paintings and sculptures.

The property is a vast, complex and layered landscape of elements of different historical periods, styles and scales. The property also incorporates parts of seven villages and two towns and is a complex living community. The landscape is largely intact despite some individually intrusive elements and varying states of conservation. Earthquakes damaged a number of stupas and temples in 1975 and 2016. The State Party and its partners have made commendable progress in recovering from the damages of this latest disaster and disaster risk management arrangements are now in place for Bagan.

The way in which the nomination of Bagan has been presented by the State Party, reflecting both its historical significance and continuing cultural practices is compelling. Criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi) are demonstrated.

Although potentially vulnerable, the property meets the requirements for integrity. Management of future pressures including the sustainability of tourism are important. The quality of life of Bagan's people is central to sustaining its values. While authenticity has been impacted by earthquake damage, natural deterioration and some intrusive developments, the property is nevertheless notable for the extensive presence of original historic fabric, archaeological resources, murals, sculptures combined with the ongoing traditions of Buddhist worship and merit-making. ICOMOS notes that the State Party has made commendable progress in reversing some of the inappropriate conservation interventions of the past.

During the course of the evaluation, exchanges between ICOMOS and the State Party have resulted in minor adjustments to the boundaries and buffer zones of several components. The main factors affecting the property are urbanization, future tourism growth, inappropriate development particular of hotels and other tourism infrastructure, natural deterioration and earthquake damage. These have been factored into the management system by the State Party and ICOMOS has included a number of recommendations for continuing effort in the draft decision.

The State Party has recently amended its heritage law, an essential step for ensuring adequate legal protection for Bagan. The integrated management framework is comprehensive and soundly conceived but has yet to be fully implemented. The further use and elaboration of heritage impact assessments, strategy for the siting and design of future hotel developments and sustainable tourism planning are priorities in the view of ICOMOS.

To conclude, ICOMOS recommends that the Bagan in Myanmar be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi) and has included a number of further recommendations in the draft decision to aid the long-term conservation of the property. A draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value is included. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Yes, please we have Uganda, then China, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Mr Chairperson, the Ugandan delegation has carefully reviewed the ICOMOS narrative and appreciates the strong evidence and justification for the nomination of Bagan of the State Party of Myanmar on the World Heritage List. In this regard, the Ugandan delegation is pleased to support the draft decision to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List and congratulates the State Party of Myanmar. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China congratulates the State Party of Myanmar for this nomination. We also appreciate the very important and comprehensive review by ICOMOS and the nomination by the World Heritage Centre. Bagan is an outstanding sacred cultural landscape, featuring an exceptional array of Buddhist art and architecture demonstrating centuries of Buddhist traditions and culture of the Bagan period. Chinese heritage experts have been privileged to participate in the conservation of this important heritage. China wishes to congratulate Myanmar on its inclusion on the World Heritage List and is aware of the difficulties and pressure in the protection and management of this heritage property. China is willing to continue to work with Myanmar and contribute to the protection of this important heritage of humankind. China supports the draft amendments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. It's a property where everyone in the Committee can feel very privileged in being able to participate in the listing of Bagan. Personally, I'm familiar with the site. I was there a few years ago and the only problem was that I couldn't actually see the UNESCO logo. I was looking for and couldn't imagine that it wasn't already on the List of World Heritage. You can see that it is a place they have been working on for many, many years and as was mentioned since 1996 that work has really been carried out with a big push over the last five years and this can be seen perfectly in the nomination file. Our experts had a lovely time looking at the cartography, which is exceptional both from a quantitative as well as a qualitative point of view. We aren't used to working with something of such high quality and especially for a place that is so large. To be able to see the cartography that was really a true privilege. We are in absolute agreement with listing the site and we are actually surprised it wasn't already inscribed. Thank you very much, Myanmar for this presentation and for the great effort you have been making because it's a property that is incredible and you have a great challenge ahead as well especially the management plan and it would be very good news that that is taken really seriously and that Bagan becomes a paradigm of well-managed properties. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Indonesia would like to take this opportunity to support the recommendation of the Advisory Body to inscribe Bagan on the List of World Heritage. We commend Myanmar for making such a strong effort to fulfil criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi) of the Outstanding Universal Value for which Bagan was nominated and also to maintain the integrity and authenticity of the site that must have been challenging considering the size and complexity of the site. We note the detailed recommendations concerning a number of aspects of the site and encourage Myanmar to fulfil the recommendations in order to maintain Bagan on the World Heritage List. Our congratulations to Myanmar for their first inscription on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway would like to join the massive congratulations to the distinguished State Party of Myanmar for its nomination of this wonderful place on earth. Bagan is really a pearl that will enhance the reputation of the World Heritage List. We hope that the designation of World Heritage status will benefit the site and the people living there. We do so well aware that Bagan most likely will face considerable challenges in the handling of tourism, which may grow extensively and pose impacts on both the physical appearance of the site as well as on its social life. This is reflected in the long list of recommendations to the State party. The values are extremely vulnerable so a sustainable tourism strategy will have to be made according to the highest standards set by UNESCO. Again, as we share the happiness we also hope for the State Party's competence and will to succeed in all the preservation tasks that may emerge. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Saint Kitts and Nevis commends the State Party of Myanmar on the excellent submission of this impressive and important site of Bagan and for overcoming great challenges in the conservation and preservation of the site, which deserves inscription on the World Heritage List as recommended by ICOMOS. We therefore support the draft amendment and congratulate the State Party of Myanmar. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have had seven interventions from Committee Members. If there are no other opinions, if there are no objections to the file let me ask honorable delegates to proceed to the approval of the draft decision. No objections? No insistence on the word. My I ask the Rapporteur if there are any amendments?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson, we have no proposed amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As it was noted by all the interventions the value of this site is great and therefore there are no other opinions on the matter so I declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.20 adopted as amended [*applause*]. We cordially congratulate the delegation of Myanmar for the first ever inscription on the World Heritage List and gladly present the floor to the delegation of Myanmar. Please, you are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Myanmar:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Excellence, ladies and gentlemen, it is a proud moment not just for us but also for all of you who are a part of the inscription process. As the honourable Chairperson rightly said earlier at a side event, particularly for us to have Bagan enlisted as a World Heritage site in Myanmar. I wish to express on behalf of the Government and people of Myanmar our most profound appreciation and thanks to all distinguished Members of the Committee, Madam Rössler, Director of the World Heritage Centre and her whole team and the Advisory Bodies for your valuable support for the successful inscription of Bagan on the World Heritage List at the current session.

The honor of Bagan being inscribed on the World Heritage List owes to the efforts and collaboration of many stakeholders, government officials, intellectuals, local and foreign actors, development partners, the private sector and groups including Bagan in our hearts and local communities during the long journey of the inscription process. Our wholehearted thanks goes to many countries, namely, among others, China, Colombia, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea and Switzerland for their contributions to the comprehensive nomination of Bagan to the World Heritage List.

As portrayed in a poem in 1940, Bagan has always stood out as follows: paintings on the wall, spires of gold, mounted on high sea crests raising to heavens, the best in every style, Bagan.

Bagan is a living heritage, having endured all forms of challenges for more than 1,000 years. Today we are celebrating the joyous moment of the successful inscription of Bagan on the World Heritage List. Afterwards we will continue our efforts in conservation and management of Bagan so that this treasured heritage will remain for another 1,000 years as the heritage of humanity our heritage for posterity.

Before I conclude, allow me to take this opportunity to warmly invite you Mr Chairperson, and everyone right here to visit Bagan, the heart of Myanmar to be mesmerized by its beauty and magnificence. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We once more congratulate you and I just want to say I have been there and I think it is a great place! Thank you very much for the invitation. Now we proceed to another item of our agenda.

This is nomination 8B.21 concerned with Seowon, Korean Neo-Confucian Academies, Republic of Korea. Before I give the floor to ICOMOS to present the file, I would like to ask Mr Balsamo for some clarification.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination and it is to be found on page 119 in the English version in document INF. B8.4 and on page 112 in the French version of the same document. This notification also impacts on the proposed statement of OUV. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, the floor is yours.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found on page 180 in the English version and page 166 in the French version of document 43 COM INF.8B.1. This is a new nomination. A previous nomination was submitted in 2015 but was withdrawn before consideration by the World Heritage Committee. At the request of the State Party an ICOMOS advisory process was conducted in 2016 and 2017. Based on the recommendations of the ICOMOS Advisory report the State Party has submitted a revised nomination dossier.

This serial property comprises nine seowon representing a type of Neo-Confucian academy of the Joseon Dynasty (15th–19th centuries). The components are located across the central and southern parts of South Korea located near mountains and water as part of appreciating nature and cultivating the mind and body. The essential functions are learning, veneration and interaction with the environment. While based on common architectural forms the components have been creatively developed with individual characteristics to maximize links to the surrounding environment and understanding of Neo-Confucian ideals.

The nominated property of private academies was established in the period from the mid-16th century through to the end of the 17th century. This period saw the creation of the first seowon and their development with experiments in architectural layouts and techniques, through to a standardization of architectural types featuring veneration, learning and interaction areas. This serial property reflects the creation and development of the seowon. ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis for the nominated property augmented by the State Party justifies consideration of this property for the World Heritage List.

The property is nominated by the State Party on the basis of cultural criteria (iii) and (iv). ICOMOS considers that the nominated property meets criterion (iii), but that it does not meet criterion (iv) and that the requirements of integrity and authenticity have been met. With regard to criterion (iii) the nominated property is exceptional testimony to cultural traditions associated with Neo-Confucianism in Korea in form of educational and social practices many of which continue. It also exhibits outstanding testimony of the localization of Neo-Confucian concepts. The seowon illustrate a historical process in which Neo-Confucianism from China was tailored

to Korean local conditions resulting in academies, which are exceptional testimony of this transformative and localizing process. However, ICOMOS considers the nominated property is not justified under criterion (iv) as representing an outstanding example in a World Heritage context of a Neo-Confucianism educational ensemble. ICOMOS notes the influence from China and the transformative and localizing process, but does not consider the justification demonstrates the exceptional qualities required by this criterion.

The location, topography and the built elements largely define the overall composition of the nominated property. In many cases, this includes a sloping site for the seowon. The careful layout, form and details of the buildings are all important attributes. Other built elements include wall fences, gates, paths, stairs and stele. The seowon have an important connection to the surrounding landscape, especially because of views from pavilions, and the landscape with trees and other plants is an attribute. The intangible attributes include the learning, veneration, interaction and other sarim activities. Neo-Confucian values are still disseminated through classes and veneration ceremonies.

The proposed boundaries and buffer zones are adequate. The links between the seowon and distant landscape elements beyond the buffer zones are also important and the protection of these links is also adequate.

ICOMOS considers that the requirements for protection and management are generally adequate. Nonetheless, an overarching management document should be prepared for the whole property to supplement the management at the component level. In addition integrated presentation of the nine components, as a single property should be better developed. While some presentation of the whole property is available at components this should be enhanced. The property displays a good state of conservation and the monitoring approach is satisfactory. The main factors affecting the nominated property include fire, development pressures and insect damage; however, all factors are well understood and managed.

ICOMOS therefore recommends the property for inscription on the World Heritage List on the grounds of criterion (iii) and the draft decision including additional recommendations can be found on page 34 of the working document WHC/19/43.COM.8B. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, ICOMOS. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, let me take this opportunity to thank the Advisory Body, ICOMOS for the great report and I'm sure it's one of the few reports that dealt with academics and science, so it was more positive for revising it. Also I would like to thank the State Party for the great dossier and their patience to withdraw it and submit it again and to come for inscription. It's a unique serial inscription because it's the source of the culture. It was started from these academic and scientific places that spread throughout the Korean peninsula. A lot of people see cultural sites, but we never know where it started from, how they kept these records where the people got the learning experience. It's great for this to be listed in the World Heritage Centre. Really it's a great nomination. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie souhaite tout d'abord remercier l'ICOMOS pour le rapport qui nous a permis d'avoir une idée très précise sur ce site, et félicite l'État partie pour

la qualité de son dossier. Nous partageons l'avis de ceux qui pensent que ce site est important parce qu'il nous donne l'occasion d'abord de comprendre la structuration historique d'un processus à la fois lié à la transcendance et à la croyance mais aussi à la création de la science, c'est pour ça qu'à nos yeux il interpelle notre Organisation, non seulement par sa valeur culturelle, mais également parce qu'il constitue une pièce importante dans le cheminement et les balbutiements d'une académie qui mènent vers les systèmes d'éducation modernes. Je crois qu'il faut saluer l'État partie de nous offrir l'occasion de souligner l'importance de ce site, et on se félicite aussi que sur le plan de l'encadrement, et notamment concernant le plan de conservation, les instances consultatives estiment qu'il y a lieu de ne pas s'inquiéter par rapport à ce site. Encore une fois, nos félicitations pour l'État partie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China fully supports the ICOMOS recommendation of inscription of Seowon, Korean Neo-Confucian Academies on the World Heritage List as well as the draft decision with the same text. We warmly congratulate our distinguished delegates from the Republic of Korea on their success of inscribing a new site on to the World Heritage List. Although Confucian academies, shuyuan in Chinese began in China, the Korean seowon is also an important venue that contributes to the dissemination and localization of Confucian culture in East Asia between the 16th and 17th centuries helping the Confucian ideology blossom in Korea with the development of its own architectural design in good harmony with natural surroundings. China has already inscribed two shuyuan as part of a larger property on the World Heritage List. We hope that with the inscription of Korean seowon Confucian heritage will be better represented on the World Heritage List and the new Korean World Heritage can serve as a catalyst for more cultural exchange between the countries in the Asian region and across the world. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Indonesia would like to thank first the Advisory Body for its excellent report on Seowon, Korean Neo-Confucian Academies. Indonesia would also like to commend and congratulate the State Party on the inscription of Seowon on the World Heritage List. As Seowon property comprises nine seowon from the middle 16th to the middle 17th centuries it exhibits a remarkable testimony to cultural tradition associated with Neo-Confucianism in the form of educational and social practices in South Korea. Indonesia is confident that the State Party continues to manage the protection and conservation of the seowon property. I thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. Our delegation would first of all like to highlight that here we find ourselves before another file that is an example of best practices. Let's not forget that the State Party withdrew this file because it wanted to wait for the results of a process that was accompanied by ICOMOS, so that this could be presented again and have no problems being inscribed which is the case right now. We have also found ourselves in other situations, which actually affected the credibility of our Convention so this is an

example that all States Parties should follow. Our delegation is actually surprised by the excellent state of conservation of this site. Above all, not from a material aspect but from an intangible aspect, which is one of the fundamental pillars of this property. We would also like to state that in this kind of environment, normally these schools were designed to actually train civil servants, government workers but here it is the actual knowledge that is being protected. This was a great nomination and congratulations to South Korea. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Azerbaijan also congratulates the State Party for this nomination. It is indeed an exceptional testimony to cultural traditions associated with the Neo-Confucianism in Korea in the form of educational and social practices. It is also an outstanding testimony to architectural prototype of Neo-Confucian academies in each stage of development. We are thankful for the State Party for this nomination and for their work in cooperation with ICOMOS to update the nomination and to successfully inscribe it on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask honorable Members of the Committee whether there are other opinions and proposals. I don't see any. Rapporteur, please inform us about the draft.

Rapporteur:

We have no amendments to this decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Therefore it's clear that we are now to approve the decision. I therefore declare decision 43 COM 8B.21 adopted as amended [*applause*]. Thank you very much and we cordially congratulate you on the occasion of the inscription and I would like to give the floor the to the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of the Republic of Korea:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Distinguished Committee Members, I am the administrator of the Cultural Heritage Administration of the Republic of Korea. It is a great pleasure to see Seowon, Korean Neo-Confucian Academies inscribed on the World Heritage List today. I would like to thank the entire Committee for its recognition of Seowon as a World Heritage property that contributes to the regional dissemination of Neo-Confucianism, a governing ideology that predates during the Joseon Dynasty. I also feel tremendous responsibility for protecting the newly inscribed site. In close collaboration with the local government, the Cultural Heritage Administration will make full preparation for the integrated conservation and management of the property.

In fact, the nomination of Seowon was challenging and an opportunity for the Republic of Korea. After being recommended to be deferred in 2016 evaluation we received ICOMOS' advice in preparing the second nomination and finally succeeded in being listed today. It is my belief that through dialogue with the Advisory Body and local experts helps to more clearly understand the crucial concept of world heritage and the nomination process. Considering that there are still many States Parties who are challenged by a number of obstacles in preparing their nomination of sites. I would like to say that the Republic of Korea is ready to share our experiences with you at any time. Once again I would like to thank the Committee Members and the government of Azerbaijan as well as ICOMOS, the Secretariat and local and

international experts, all of whom were together with during the whole nomination process. Thank you very much. Now I would like to hand over the floor to my dear Ambassador Byong-hyun Lee [applause].

Mr Byong-hyun Lee:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I will be very brief. I'd like to thank all Committee Members for supporting the inscription of Seowon, Korean Neo-Confucian Academies on the World Heritage List. Seowon was set up during the Joseon Dynasty and was recognized for establishing the teacher-student lineages of Neo-Confucianism in Korea with the priority on social education and memory rites for sages. Educational traditions shaped through seowon were comprised a significant part of social and cultural principles in Korean society. I'd also like to take this opportunity to emphasize that this inscription is the result of years of consultative efforts. Today we have almost 100 representatives who came all the way from Korea, which attests to our enthusiasm for this inscription. Therefore I am very grateful to share this wonderful moment with them as well with the Korean people who will be very happy by now to hear this wonderful news. *Kamsamnida*. Thank you. [Applause]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We once more congratulate the Korean delegation for the inscription and we now move to the next matter.

This is the presentation of file 8B.22, the Großglockner High Alpine Road from Austria. May I give the floor to Mr Balsamo, please?

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination of the Großglockner High Alpine Road and it is to be found on page 24 in the English version in document INF.8B.4 and on page 29 in the French version. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you are welcome to present the file.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found on page 191 in the English version and page 283 in the French version of document INF.8B.1. The Großglockner High Alpine Road in the southern Austrian federal provinces of Salzburg and Carinthia was designed to allow tourists to experience and enjoy the scenic qualities of the Hohe Tauern mountain landscape of the eastern Alps, as well as the driving experience itself.

The landscape includes the highest mountain in Austria, the Großglockner. The road was designed and built between 1924 and 1936 under the supervision of civil engineer Franz Wallack, and the road demonstrates technological expertise in road construction as well as the expansion and exploitation of tourism in a spectacular high-mountain landscape. The 48km two-lane road has 36 hairpin bends. A feature of its design is a constant gradient of 9% on the main route and 12% on the access roads. In addition to the road itself, the associated features include curbstones, distance markers, crash barriers and other safeguards, embankments, stone retaining walls, parapets, bridges, buildings, tollgates, tunnels, telephone shelters, viewpoints and rest and parking areas.

ICOMOS does not consider that the comparative analysis justifies consideration of this property for the World Heritage List at this stage. The context for the analysis is too narrow being ultimately limited to scenic alpine roads. While a broad range of roads globally and in a range of environmental contexts are initially considered in the comparative analysis all but

scenic alpine roads are considered comparable to the Großglockner Road. In other ways, the context is not sufficiently developed to support the claims of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value. The broader theme that should be considered in a global thematic study is that of design scenic routes of this era in a global context and in a range of environmental contexts. The analysis also needs to be revised to present more compelling arguments about the outstanding qualities of the nominated property.

The State Party has nominated the property on the basis of cultural criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). However, ICOMOS does not consider that any of the cultural criteria have been justified at this stage. There is also doubt about the creativity of the engineering design of the road itself under criterion (i) and doubt about the influence of the road being sufficiently important under criterion (ii). ICOMOS considers the requirements of integrity and authenticity have not been met at this stage. In particular it is important to better understand the extent of the changes that have been made to the road over time. This includes adaptations to accommodate increasing numbers of visitors as well as to address changing standards to road safety. A notable change is the widening of the original road. While conservation measures are generally adequate some detailed aspects should be improved such as by adopting a conservation approach for the retaining walls and parapets and preparing a conservation plan including a detailed condition report with a detailed maintenance schedule for each listed monument.

The monitoring approach is considered to be satisfactory. The requirements for protection and management are adequate but improvements should be made regarding documentation including inventories and conservation plans and enhancing staff conservation expertise. In addition the management plan has an emphasis on the original design without also considering changes that have occurred and may occur in the future. The plan should recognize past and potential future changes in order to better ensure the conservation and management of the property.

ICOMOS recommends that the nominated property should be deferred in order to allow the State Party to reconsider if a robust case can be made based on a global thematic framework. This framework should consider design scenic routes in a global context and in a range of environmental contexts. This should underpin a thorough and compelling comparative analysis in order to bring into focus the potential significance of the nominated property. The evaluation of a revised nomination should also include a mission to visit the site. The draft decision can be found on page 36 of the working document WHC/19/43.COM/8B. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on behalf of the Committee? Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Australia considers that the nomination of the Großglockner High Alpine Road represents a new site type in the context of the Convention and we appreciate greatly the depth of the research in the dossier and in the supplementary material, which was extensive. Australia does support however the recommendation for deferral made by ICOMOS and in particular to allow the State Party to focus the potential of this property to meet criterion (iv) as an important example of the scenic road.

For that reason, Australia concurs with ICOMOS that a thematic study is necessary and this would assist the State Party, ICOMOS, the Committee and other State Parties similarly considering nominations under the themes of scenic roads. Finally, we would like to commend the State Party for recognizing the value in a deferral recommendation. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving Norway the floor. This nomination is about something new, something that is missing on the World Heritage List. Norway supports the draft decision for a deferral. We do so also having in mind that here we see a State Party that refrains from making efforts in order to oppose the draft decision. Norway would like to give honour to the State Party for this constructive attitude. If also the State Party whenever proceeding would cope with the recommendations to reconsider if a robust case can be made based on a global thematic framework of scenic routes in a global context and accepting the offer of cooperation and advice from ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre in doing so, the State Party of Austria would really contribute to the implementation of practices in line with the spirit of the Convention. With the decision of deferral the Committee expresses its call for sobriety for all well represented countries in the Western world in their approach to the listing of heritage of common human interest. That is why Norway puts our support for the draft decision. We would also like to hear from the State Party in this case. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We definitely will make this. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. Motor vehicles were a whole new way of transportation of life, which is of great significance globally. The Großglockner High Alpine Road in Austria is an outstanding example of a scenic highway that reflects an important moment in the history of motor vehicles. It is one of the most popular scenic highways in Europe representing the lifestyle of a generation. China appreciates the excellent work of the State Party in protection management and monitoring of the heritage and hopes that the State Party will follow the ICOMOS recommendations to revise the argument and statement of the OUV and provide a better comparative analysis so that the heritage can be more widely recognized internationally. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. In our case, we agree with the speakers before us. One thing that attracts our attention is the analysis that has been carried out and the fact that this site does not comply with criterion (i) so we would like to ask the Advisory Body given the particularity of this site, did they speak to other specialized organizations when taking this decision? Thank you.

Chairperson:

I don't see any applies from the delegates. May we listen to the State Party? Austria, please. You are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Austria:

Thank you, Chairperson. At the outset, allow me to commend our host Azerbaijan for the warm hospitality and excellent organization of this session. I would equally like to congratulate you, Mr Chairperson, on your efficient and smooth stewardship of our deliberations. Now allow me a few words on our nomination recommended for a deferral. As a nominating State Party, I will not hide our slight disappointment about this recommendation, as we are convinced of the manifold qualities of the property. It is much more than a scenic road. Nevertheless, we accept that we were apparently not able to explain convincingly the overall character of the property, thereby not establishing satisfactorily the OUV of the site.

Consequently, we welcome the opportunity to work on the recommendations of the Advisory Body by way of a thematic study. At this juncture, we shall thank ICOMOS for its advice during the nomination process and the very helpful recommendations. We thus look forward to continuing the fruitful dialogue with ICOMOS and will be closely involved in the further process ahead similar to the good experience we have made in the case of the Danube. I shall thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. *[Applause]* We greatly appreciate such an approach and we take into account the very serious work on this site and file together with the Advisory Body next year to provide inscription in the future. May I ask the Rapporteur are there any amendments?

Rapporteur:

We have no amendments proposed. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I think there was one question for the Advisory Body. We didn't hear from the Advisory Body. There was a question from Cuba.

Chairperson:

Please, Advisory Body.

ICOMOS:

Yes, thank you, Chairperson and thank you honorable delegate from Cuba for that question. The short answer is yes, as part of the evaluation process experts with specific expertise in the qualities of these sorts of roads were consulted through the evaluation process and provided their comments.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any other questions? If not, then we proceed to the approval of draft decision 43 COM 8B.22 adopted as amended.

Now we move to file 8B.23. I now invite the Secretariat to provide us with the information regarding the transnational nomination present the transnational nomination Frontiers of the Roman Empire—the Danube Limes (Western Segment), Austria, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia. Mr Balsamo, please, you are welcome.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. The nomination of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire—the Danube Limes (Western Segment) presented by Austria, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia was recommended for inscription by ICOMOS in its evaluation. The Secretariat received two letters from Hungary dated 18 April and 23 May 2019 addressed to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The letter dated 18 April informed the Centre that Hungary “wishes to withdraw of the Component part 70a (Budapest III. District Flórián Square and surroundings, Hajógyári Island and Bay – Aquincum Legionary Camp, Canabae, Fortress, Governor's Palace), namely the Governor's Palace from the Frontiers of the Roman Empire – The Danube Limes World Heritage nomination dossier submitted on 31st of January 2018”.

The letter dated 23 May, with reference to the Hungarian Government's resolution 1288/2019, informed the Centre that "Hungary wishes to withdraw the Hajógyári Island and Bay (known also as the Óbudai Island) of Budapest as a component part from the nomination.

The Government resolution number 1288/2019, attached to this letter, provides that "Óbudai Island in Budapest shall not form part of the site to be nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List".

In this regard, I would like to recall that the Operational Guidelines foresee a timeframe for the evaluation of nominations and provide that the evaluations should not take into account or include any information submitted by the concerned State Party after 28 February in the year in which the nomination is considered.

The withdrawal of a component from the nomination Frontiers of the Roman Empire—the Danube Limes entails a modification of the geographical boundaries of the property proposed for nomination and of the components that were evaluated by ICOMOS.

In this respect, ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that its evaluation could not be considered as relevant anymore, due to the withdrawal by Hungary of part of a component the site for review by the Committee differs from the site that was submitted for nomination by Austria, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia and which was evaluated by ICOMOS. Thank you, Chairperson.

H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil) takes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you, Mr Balsamo. As we have just heard, we are in quite a special situation regarding this nomination. For this reason and with your permission, I would like to seek further clarification on this matter and I would like to ask Hungary to tell us more in order to get a clear picture of the situation. Hungary, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Dear Members of the Committee, distinguished members of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, it is hard to say anything now in the name of Hungary about the present state of the Danube Limes international serial nomination. The four States Parties, Germany, Austria, Slovakia and Hungary have heard and taken note of the relevant rules and suggestions of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for many years, with full energy and in close cooperation. In 2016, they prepared a thematic study for the whole 6,500km-long frontier of the Roman Empire which was adopted by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in Krakow and one year later the Danube Limes Western segment nomination for the 1,000km-long Limes along the Danube in the territory of their countries.

The almost 2,500 pages long nomination dossier containing 175 components, 98 of them in Hungary was submitted to the World Heritage Centre by Hungary in the name of the four States Parties at the end of January 2018. During that year, ICOMOS made the evaluation and in this year, at the end of February, also a 500-page long document detailing the additional information requested by the Advisory Body. As it emerges from the final evaluation, ICOMOS greatly appreciated the nomination and proposed it to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. However, in the meantime a message was sent by the Hungarian Government to UNESCO that some part of a component part in Aquincum Budapest should be taken out from the nomination. It is the right of each State Party to take such decisions but such a request may not be accepted in the time of the final evaluation after the end of February of delivery year.

As this withdrawal arrived late, the evaluation is, according to the expression of ICOMOS, not valid anymore. It follows that our common expectations to have this property be inscribed at the 43rd session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee in Baku cannot be fulfilled and let me express my personal regret for it towards our colleagues and partners.

Of course, Hungary does not want to change its decision about the nomination of its Roman Limes and its willingness to cooperate with the other three States Parties on the nomination of the Danube Limes. On the contrary, Hungary is committed to this possible World Heritage nomination and its later extensions through the eastern segment of the Danube Limes in the States Parties of Serbia, Croatia, Bulgaria and Romania. We hope that our commitment will be accepted both by the international partners and by UNESCO.

Now, after having thorough discussions and dialogue, I believe that the other three States Parties accept the decision of the Hungarian Government and that they are ready search a way out from this unexpected and sorrowful situation. It has been decided to find a best solution and to continue the common work and to submit the slightly revised nomination dossier to UNESCO for evaluation as soon as possible. I thank all of them in the name of Hungary for their consensus and for their friendly cooperation, if we have success, the 10-years long hard work of hundreds of professionals in our countries has been not for vain. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you, Hungary. In light of what we have heard and because of the peculiarity of this situation, I would directly ask the Rapporteur if she has received any amendments?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We have received the amendments as flagged. These have been submitted by Australia, Tunisia, Kuwait, Norway, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, United Republic of Tanzania and Spain. The first paragraph would remain as it is. The second would now read, Refers the Frontiers of the Roman Empire—the Danube Limes (Western Segment), Austria, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia back to the States Parties in order to allow them to take appropriate measures with regard to component part 1608-133 (WHC/19/43.COM/8B, p. 60), previous component part 70a. And paragraph 3 would read, Recommends the States Parties to invite the Advisory Body (ICOMOS) to review the situation with an advisory mission to Hungary to take place before the end of 2019. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Since the amendment was proposed by Australia, I would pass the floor to the Australian delegation to give us some more explanation on the amendment proposed. Thank you.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Australia begins by emphasizing that the nomination this year has been recommended by ICOMOS for inscription. However, in recognition of the difficult situation facing the four States Parties and with the conveyed consent, Australia has proposed these amendments with our colleagues to the draft decision to refer the property back to the States Parties to give them time to consider and resolve this difficult situation in consultation with ICOMOS. In drafting these amendments which are co-sponsored by representatives from each of UNESCO's regional groups we have also consulted with the four States Parties and other Committee Members. We very much look forward to the States Parties resolving the current situation and bringing this nomination back to the committee at its 44th session. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I believe that the amendment proposed is clear to everybody and it has a good number of co-sponsors but I understand that Norway wants the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. As it is clear, Norway fully supports the amendment and efforts done by the States Parties of Austria, Germany and Slovakia to solve a delicate situation and willingly go for a referral. In addition, we are glad that they might be joined by the four countries Croatia, Serbia, Romania and Bulgaria who are prepared to put forward a new nomination on the Danube Limes serial nomination. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. China was initially a little surprised and a little confused why Australia and the other countries want to put forward an amendment to a file originally recommended for inscription, but now we understand and we respect Hungary's decision and therefore, for this reason, China wishes to associate ourselves with the current amended text, please. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je voudrais, au nom de la Tunisie, exprimer aussi les conditions dans lesquelles nous sommes arrivés à présenter ce projet d'amendement, et dans ce cadre-là je tiens à souligner notre grande appréciation, en tout état de cause, de l'esprit de responsabilité de l'ensemble des États intéressés dans ce dossier qui était en tous les cas très proche d'une inscription. Je crois que leur esprit de coopération, leur attachement à l'esprit de la Convention et à une décision de consensus nous a menés à cette proposition. J'ai voulu, par cette intervention, saluer cet esprit-là et dire que nous nous en félicitons. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I believe that the amendment proposed is very clear and I also understand that we have support for this decision and I believe we can move directly to its approval. No comments against so it is approved. Thank you very much.

I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination Writing-on-Stone—I can't pronounce it—I'm sorry we cannot see you well from here but you can take the floor. Serbia. Serbia, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Serbia:

Thank you, Madam. Since this is the first time that my delegation has taken the floor, let me just use this opportunity to thank warmly Azerbaijan for the excellent organization of this session and its sincere hospitality expressed to all participants. Serbia fully supports the successful outcome of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire—the Danube Limes nomination having in mind that we are involved as it was mentioned together with three other States Parties in the preparation of the future extension of this property. We strongly believe that the vision of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire becoming the largest World Heritage site deserves our full support and attention. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any more comments on the item? If not we move to the next one. Thank you very much. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi—excuse me if the pronunciation is not good—from Canada. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr Balsamo has comments to present. You have the floor, thank you.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the nomination Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi and this notification has impacts on the proposed statement of OUV and is to be found on page 48 in the English version in document INF. B8.4 and on page 53 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. ICOMOS, you have the floor. Thank you.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation report for Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi, Canada can be found in document INF.8B1 on page 225 in the English version and page 302 in the French version.

This is a sacred landscape featuring thousands of engravings and paintings on the sandstone walls of the river valley bearing testimony to the sacred beings and beliefs of the Blackfoot people of North America. Centuries-old traditions and ceremonies continue within this landscape. The nominated property is situated in the Province of Alberta, in the north of the semi-arid Great Plains of North America. The property consists of three components located along the Milk River, part of the Missouri River drainage system. The main component is Áísínai'pi and the other two components are located 10km away.

The property is located in a region of mixed prairie grasslands near the northern edge of the Great Plains. Grasslands formed an integral part of the Blackfoot seasonal round and traditional way of life. The area's geology features numerous sandstone columns called hoodoos with spectacular forms, sculpted by erosion. For the Blackfoot the region is inhabited by powerful spirits, which have left engravings and paintings on the sandstone sides of the river valley. There is a tradition of vision questing and people return to these sites to seek spiritual guidance. There are many continuing cultural practices including the transmission of traditional knowledge, gathering of plants and ochre, ceremonies, dances and rituals and the making of rock art images. There are 138 rock art localities with thousands of engravings. Most of the dated archeological sites date from about 4,500 before present up to the contact period. The oldest rock art possibly dates from 3,000 before present and many images date from 1,000 before present to the 19th century. Some of the rock art portray historical scenes of warfare. Other engravings depict ceremonies and Blackfoot material culture.

The main factors affecting the property are development in areas surrounding it including the future potential for oil and gas exploration or wind energy installations. Future and existing upstream dams and irrigation diversions have the potential to affect stream flows. There is a rodeo ground within the restricted access zone. There were exchanges during the evaluation process about the possibilities for it to be relocated and ICOMOS that this should occur as soon as practicable. The archeological sites bear witness to the past lifestyles of traditional hunter-gatherer peoples living in the Great Plains and covers several millennia. The characteristic artefacts such as stone projectile points have been found. Bison jumps and bison kill sites at the foot of cliffs bear witness to past hunting traditions. The comparative analysis is sound.

Although the State Party has proposed the nomination on the basis of criterion (i), (iii), (iv) and (vi), ICOMOS finds that criterion (iii) is the most appropriate to represent both the long history, rock art traditions and continuing cultural associations of this landscape. The authenticity of the nominated area is established. The integrity is generally satisfactory although ICOMOS considers there should be a timeframe for the relocation of the rodeo grounds to strengthen integrity. The boundaries and buffer zones are appropriate. The State Party has identified culturally important view sheds and those occurring within the property and its buffer zones are protected by provincial laws.

Legal protection is provided at the provincial and national levels, the management system is sound and Blackfoot communities are involved in the management of the park and consulted about decisions. An updated management plan has been developed and the government of Alberta has adopted it as an intra-management directive.

To conclude, ICOMOS recommends that Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi, Canada be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii) and has included several further recommendations in the draft decision. A draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value has also been provided. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you, ICOMOS, very much. I would like to know if there are any comments concerning this nomination? Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Once again we are talking about the nomination of exceptional quality and also a very good example of the presentation of the nomination that really fills a gap on the List first of all because there are very few sites where we see that the landscape is connected to sacred space but also because we are talking about the very first site that is rock art place for the native people of North America and if you take into account the amount of rock art that actually exists there as we've seen from the photos which of course are quite telling. You can see as well in the file itself that the work has been done directly with the community themselves in terms of the management system, which will guarantee its sustainability and also the degree of conservation. If we think about the risks that the rock art is exposed to well it's quite noteworthy. So thank you very much once again for the presentation and the exceptional way in which this nomination file was presented in working together with the community. Thank you very much to Canada. I think we can all be very pleased with this nomination.

Chairperson:

Thank you so much. Uganda.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Madam Chairperson, since 2004 from the time the heritage site of Áísínai'pi came onto Canada's Tentative List, my delegation was satisfied beyond any doubt that this property has come of age for inscription on the World Heritage List.

Madam Chairperson, being the largest concentration of rock art sites in the Canadian prairies amalgamating a host of 96 separate sites spanning over 2,000 years of history the Áísínai'pi is omnipotent to the tradition Áísínai'pi hinterlands whose socio-cultural, spiritual and economic livelihoods have been sustained by this heritage property through past centuries and even today. The Áísínai'pi and globally it is a masterpiece of spiritual and artistic excellence for which my delegation also adds its voice for this decision of the Committee to inscribe it on the World Heritage List. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. Australia would like to pay our respects to the Siksika people, the Blackfoot people and their elders past, present and future. We congratulate them and the Canadian Government on the recommendation for inscription of Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi. This sacred continuing cultural landscape makes an important contribution to redressing the underrepresentation of places of indigenous values on the World Heritage List. Canada must be complemented on the clear and comprehensive dossier and the approach taken to develop the nomination in partnership with the Blackfoot people. We take this opportunity to highlight the richness of indigenous cultures and the importance of free, prior and informed consent and in respecting indigenous voices in self-determination in the nomination process. It was a pleasure and privilege to learn of the deep spiritual connection of the Blackfoot people to their ancestral lands and the communication with the spirit beings who inhabit the valley. This relationship is literally written on stone through the landscape and in thousands of extraordinary petroglyphs and pictographs and maintained through their continued cultural associations of the Blackfoot people in this landscape. Again, we congratulate the Blackfoot people and Canada in the proposed inscription of this sacred landscape. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. La Tunisie voudrait remercier tout d'abord l'ICOMOS pour l'excellent rapport qui nous a permis de prendre vraiment connaissance de façon détaillée de ce très beau dossier. Je voudrais également appuyer et remercier l'État partie de nous avoir fourni un très bel exemple d'adaptation de l'homme à des conditions naturelles difficiles. Dans ces conditions de contrainte, on peut créer aussi du génie humain et le génie humain découle aussi de la contrainte, c'en est un exemple extraordinaire, qui nous ramène en fait des millénaires avant notre ère. Donc la Tunisie se félicite que le Comité s'achemine vers une décision d'inscription, mais souligne et attache beaucoup d'importance à la recommandation de l'ICOMOS quant à la relocalisation des installations de rodéo. Merci beaucoup, et félicitations encore pour l'État partie.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. China congratulates the State Party for including Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi for inclusion on the World Heritage List and thanks the Blackfoot People Nation for their contribution of such a precious spiritual heritage. The heritage is a symbol of the spiritual culture and the living condition of the local people. It has been well preserved under the careful protection by generations of Blackfoot people. The long and deep connection between Blackfoot people and their heritage also constitutes a part of heritage value, their Nation attaches great importance to the spiritual strength and its unique heritage value can be better protected and spread given spiritual strength to more people in the world. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Given the unanimous support to this draft decision, I would just confirm with our Rapporteur that we haven't received any amendments to this decision?

Rapporteur:

No proposed amendments.

Chairperson:

No proposals. Then I think we can move to adopt draft decision 43 COM 8B.25, which I declare approved [*applause*]. Let me congratulate Canada on behalf of the entire Committee for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. Canada, you have the floor for a brief two-minute statement. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Canada:

Merci, Madame la Présidente. C'est avec un immense plaisir que le Canada partage ce moment mémorable qui consiste en l'inscription de Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The significant achievement follows more than 10 years of dedication by the provincial government of Alberta and the Blackfoot Confederacy including the Mookaakin Heritage Society with guidance and advice from Parks Canada. We wish to thank ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre and the World Heritage Committee for their consideration of this nomination. I had the honour of visiting Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi for the first time in 2018 during the evaluation mission and I can attest to the immense beauty and power of this sacred place and the passion of the Blackfoot people in protecting and sharing the heritage with the world. The inscription of Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi on the World Heritage List is very timely during the International Year of Indigenous Languages. In recognition of the cultural and linguistic rights of the Blackfoot people. I would now like to turn the microphone to Councilor Martin Heavy Head, a Blackfoot elder and member of the Kainai Nation (Blood Tribe) who is speaking on behalf of the Blackfoot Confederacy of Alberta Parks who manages the site cooperatively.

Mr Martin Heavy Head:

My name is Martin Heavy Head and I am an elder with the Mookaakin Foundation and elected councilor of the Kainai. I'm here in partnership with the governments of Canada and Alberta. With the Blackfoot Confederacy, elders are very proud to have been partners in the success of the Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi nomination as a UNESCO World Heritage site. Our advice and insight were always sought for every submission and every step of the nomination. For the Blackfoot people Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi is the very heart of our ancestral land. We believe that Áísínai'pi has a powerful role to play in teaching others around the world about the sacred landscape of our people. The inscription of Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi as a UNESCO World Heritage site provides the Blackfoot Confederacy with a certainty that future generations will have an opportunity to continue our traditions, ceremonies and cultural practices. As a World Heritage site Writing-on-Stone/ Áísínai'pi will be an inspiration to all who seek to understand deep and personal connections to the land. I want to thank Aaron Domes, Alberta government workers and also previous elders that worked on this project, Adam Delany, Pete Standing Alone, Frank Weasel Head, Alan Pard, Narcisse Blood. Thank you very much. [*Applause*]

Chairperson:

Thank you, Canada. Congratulations and good celebrations while we move ahead in the room.

I would now invite ICOMOS to present the transnational nomination Erzgebirge/Krušnohoří—I apologize for the pronunciation--Mining Region, Czechia and Germany. But first I give the floor to the Secretariat. Mr Balsamo you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the nomination Erzgebirge/Krušnohoří Mining Region. This notification is on page 60 in the English version in document INF. B8.4 and on page 123 in the French version. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you, Mr Balsamo. ICOMOS, you have the floor.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation on Erzgebirge/Krušnohoří Mining Region in Czechia and Germany can be found in document INF.8B.1 on page 237 in the English version and page 238 in the French version. A related nomination was submitted in 2014 but was withdrawn by the States Parties following the receipt of the ICOMOS interim report.

This transnational serial nomination concerns the histories of a region rich in a variety of metals, which gave place to mining practices from the Middle Ages onwards. The Ore Mountains covers a mining region located in southeastern Germany (Saxony) and northwestern Czechia. The area is approximately 95km long and 45km wide. The nominated property is presented as a cultural landscape of 22 components, 17 located in Germany and five in Czechia. The 22 components relate to each of the types of ores extracted throughout the regions histories.

Each of the components of the serial nomination include a variety of sites, groups of buildings, monuments and structures, each differing in scale, type, function and role in depicting the centuries-long mining tradition of the Ore Mountains. The components contain the former mines, shafts, water management systems and other structures. Mining towns form part of the nomination together with water management systems, training academies and factories. The towns developed from monasteries that were instrumental in initiating mining activities. Silver was extracted in the Ore Mountains from 1168 to 1968 and was the starting point for ore extraction at several locations.

Many new towns were founded based on silver mining and a number of these developed into cultural centres. Silver coins were minted in the town of Jáchymov. Silver mining declined in the second half of the 16th century. After silver, tin was an important and early source. Later many other ores were mined--cobalt, iron and uranium to name a few. Scientific research and education for mining overseers allowed a resurgence of mining in the 18th century based on industrialization. There are specific historic practices associated with mining in this region that form part of the justification presented by the two States Parties.

The nominated landscape has been shaped by mining since the Middle Ages and has a rich and diverse legacy that traverses a number of categories of cultural heritage. This is a very complex nomination but has been very well coordinated by the two States Parties to present a coherent whole. The comparative analysis has demonstrated the distinctiveness of this mining landscape and has also justified the selection of the 22 components.

The nominated serial property demonstrates criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) based on the technological innovation of mining, the establishment of social structures in mining from the 12th century and the ability to present a coherent mining landscape based on diverse ore deposits and supported by settlements, forests and water management. The integrity of the cultural landscape has been demonstrated and the inclusion of each of the nominated components has been justified. While the span of 800 years of mining activities has witnessed many changes, the requirements for authenticity have been met especially for the underground

elements. A large number and variety of attributes have been identified across the serial property.

No issues have been identified regarding the boundaries and buffer zones. Many components exhibit a good state of conservation although some are undergoing substantial restoration and others are in a state of decay. The two States Parties have committed substantial resources to the conservation programme. The main factors affecting the nominated are development projects, uncontrolled vegetation of mining areas, flooding, pollution and potential tourism impacts. The legal protection and management systems are in place and well coordinated between the two States Parties.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends that Erzgebirge/Krušnohoří Mining Region--Czechia and Germany be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) and has included several further recommendations in the draft decision to aid the longterm conservation of the property. A draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value has also been provided. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments concerning this nomination? Uganda, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, Chairperson. This cultural transboundary heritage site between Czechia and Germany denotes a historic, grand methodological structural landscape of several mineral ores. Throughout the world, there is no landscape that depicts a complex evolution of metal industrialization as this mining from as early as the 12th century. The region remains a host for smelting heaps, water channels and reservoirs, mining towns and settlements and other important social-cultural architecture uniquely evolved by the regions mining towns and settlements. In summary, Chairperson, the property, which is a mining region on its own, is unparalleled masterpiece of human creativity and technological excellence in metallurgical exploitation and its associated ensemble. For this reason, Madam Chairperson, my delegation is happy to have it inscribed on the World Heritage List. I submit, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Anymore comments? I see none. As we move to the adoption of this draft decision 43 COM 8B.26 I would ask our Rapporteur if there are any amendments to it? You have the floor, thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We have not received any amendments for this draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

No amendments and no further comments so we can declare this decision adopted. Thank you very much. Please let me congratulate Czechia and Germany on behalf of the entire Committee for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. Czechia and Germany, you have the floor for a brief two-minute statement. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Germany:

Madam Chairperson, excellence, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of the German delegation I would like to first of all to say thank you very much *çox sağ ol* to our host country, Azerbaijan for its hospitality and the fantastic organization of this Committee meeting. I would then like to

express our sincere thanks and appreciation to ICOMOS for the positive evaluation and to the World Heritage Committee for this inscription. I would then like to invite His Excellency, the Prime Minister of the Federal State of Saxony, Michael Kretschmer to take the floor.

Mr Michael Kretschmer:

Madam Chairperson, Members of the World Heritage Committee, on behalf of the Free State of Saxony and especially on behalf of the citizens of the Ore Mountains Krušnohoří region, I would like to thank for the inscription to the World Heritage List. It fills us with gratitude and it is a great honor for us. The inscription recognizes the achievement of the people who have created and shaped the region over the centuries. It is now our obligation that the region's history and places will be preserved as our common cultural heritage for centuries to come. We will do our utmost to protect and preserve this new World Heritage site that should inspire future generations. I would also like to thank the ICOMOS team for their professional evaluation of the mining region. This is our contribution to a peaceful and prosperous cooperation at the heart of Europe. For me this is a wonderful example that you can learn from your history and shape our future together. I would like now to pass the floor to Czechia. *Glückauf!*

The Observer Delegation of Czechia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Please let me introduce Ms Smolíková, Deputy Minister of Culture of the Czech Republic.

Ms Smolíková:

Dear colleagues, on behalf of the Czech Republic we would like to join our German partners and friends and express our sincere gratitude to the World Heritage Committee Members for the inscription of our transnational serial nomination. We are honored to receive the distinction of the World Heritage property for the Erzgebirge/Krušnohoří Mining Region. From the beginning of the preparation of this challenging joint project we have appreciated the mutual cooperation between Saxon and Czech partners and the collegial spirit of partnership for which we are very grateful. This bilateral project is a natural continuation of the centuries-old tradition of people living together in this mining region on both sides of the Ore Mountains. Local communities, mining towns and region representatives came to Baku to hear the World Heritage Committee decision are proud that the Outstanding Universal Value of the site has been confirmed. Therefore we are aware of the importance of the sustainable preservation and presentation of this cultural heritage for future generations. We are ready to continue our efforts to ensure that our common heritage property is conscientiously managed in the spirit of the Convention. Thank you, Madam Chairperson. *[Applause]*

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Congratulations.

I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination Landscape for Breeding and Training of Ceremonial Carriage Horses at Kladrubby nad Labem, Czechia. But first I give the floor to the Secretariat. Mr Balsamo you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination, which is to be found on page 63 in the English version in document INF. B8.4 and on page 119 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, you have the floor.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation of this property is found on page 250 in document INF.8B.1 in its English version and on page 398 in the French version of the same document.

The Landscape for Breeding and Training of Ceremonial Carriage Horses at Kladruby nad Labem features a flat landscape, with sandy soils and includes fields, meadows, fenced pastures, a landscaped park, a forested area as well as buildings and farmsteads, all designed with the main objective of breeding and training horses. The nominated property is located in the Elbe Lowland, in the Střední Polabí area.

The nomination of Kladruby nad Labem has to be commended as it puts the focus on the role played by horses in human history and development, an aspect of human culture which has not been paid yet sufficient attention within the World Heritage Convention. Kladruby nad Labem had been part of the Habsburg imperial court stud farms since the late 16th century and over the centuries it has been consistently expanded, adopted and embellished to support the breeding and training of the Kladruby horses, a special type of draft horse used in formal ceremonies.

The property has been nominated under criteria (ii), (iv) and (v) as a rare synthesis of an evolving landscape and of a designed landscape created for horse breeding and training as a testimony of the application of Le Notre's principles and landscape designed combined with later picturesque design rules and as a unique example of an equestrian cultural development in Europe. The State Party has harnessed the opportunities offered by the evaluation process and has provided a wealth of additional information and document to illustrate the relationship between the design of the landscape and its functions.

The State Party has substantially improved the comparative analysis, thus correctly and convincingly positioning the nominated property among its comparators demonstrating that Kladruby nad Labem is one of the few ancient stud farms that still pursues its historic breeding programme, has retained its landscape almost intact which continues to serve its function, and still reflects the purposes for which it was designed.

The nomination dossier, the additional information and the revised comparative analysis have clarified that the property justifies consideration for the World Heritage List under criteria (iv) and (v). On the other hand, the justification for criterion (ii) has not been supported. The boundaries of the nominated property are adequate. On the other hand the southern boundaries of the buffer zone appear in some stretches to be too tight to ensure adequate protection to the nominated property.

The conservation of the property is overall adequate although the impact of several ongoing large-scale conservation rehabilitation projects need to be assessed. Factors affecting the property include potential winds storm, flooding and pollution. Sudden increase of tourism can also be of concern. The protection and management system rely on several instruments of legal, regulatory and planning nature that appear to collaborate to guarantee an effective layer of protection to the nominated property and the buffer zone. However, ICOMOS has found that Kladrubský náhon should be covered by an ad hoc designation as historical-cultural heritage, considering its primary role in the sustenance of the nominated property. The integrity requirements according to ICOMOS evaluation will be met when the boundaries of the buffer zone will be expanded to the south to include further land across the River Elbe and equipped with protective mechanisms especially from visual impacts.

The authenticity requirements have been met however ICOMOS has found that a more cautious approach in conservation would be advisable. The management system seems adequate but needs to enjoy stability. The management plan is being updated and should be

submitted as soon as ready for review. The management would benefit also from an integration of a heritage impact assessment approach into its processes.

In conclusion ICOMOS recommends that the Landscape for Breeding and Training of Ceremonial Carriage Horses at Kladruby nad Labem be referred back to the State Party in order to expand the buffer zone and to provide ad hoc legislation for the canal system. ICOMOS also provided further recommendations for the consideration of the State Party concerning a management plan, visitor strategy, risk management and interpretation of the site. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments to this draft decision? Australia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Australia thanks the State Party for presenting such an interesting nomination and we commend them for their responsiveness to the advice of ICOMOS during the evaluation process. As ICOMOS has noted in both its report just then and previously, the nomination of the property highlights the role of horses they have played in human history and that this has not been previously considered to any great extent in the World Heritage List. This was also apparent to us in reading the dossier and we hope that this theme be further elaborated in future nominations but not just for horses but more broadly in relation to properties that evidence the many ways in which animals have enriched and supported and been supported by human societies. ICOMOS has found that the property has the potential to demonstrate OUV under criteria (iv) and (v). ICOMOS has recommended referral for the property to give the State Party time to implement two key recommendations related to enhancing legal protection and expansion of the buffer zone.

Madam Chairperson, since the deadline for ICOMOS receiving further information, the State Party has made significant progress in implementing these recommendations, in particular the expansion of the buffer to the south of the property and in providing ad hoc legal protection to the canal system associated with the property through a decision now formally adopted under Czech national law and an initial draft of the new updated management plan has already been presented to the steering group established to coordinate management of the property. Australia has received detailed information from the State Party in relation to their progress in addressing each recommendation in the draft decision and on this basis Australia has been pleased to propose amendments to the draft decision to recommend the property be inscribed rather than referred.

We would like however the Committee Members to also have a chance to hear the details of this progress from the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any more comments?

Chairperson:

Kyrgyzstan, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We also agree with Australia and would like to hear from the State party, firstly their opinion on criterion (ii) from the decision and also details on the developments at the site. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the State Party for the clarifications demanded by Australia. Thank you.

The Observer Delegation of Czechia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Thank for giving us the opportunity to comment on the recommendations contained in the draft decision. I would like to inform the Members of the Committee that the relevant authorities of the Czech Republic have already started to fulfil all recommendations as formulated in the ICOMOS evaluation report and the draft decision of the Committee. We are already preparing the extension of the buffer zone of the property to the south by appropriate legal instruments and in cooperation with the local authorities. We are ready to apply all measures in order to guarantee better protection of the whole area. The amended buffer zone shall be declared by the end of this year at the latest. Concerning Kladubský náhon the water canal, the relevant authorities are well aware how important the water canal is for this cultural landscape.

Therefore the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic started with appropriate steps to guarantee better legal protection immediately after the ICOMOS evaluation mission. Currently the whole legal process is being finalized and the water canal, Kladubský náhon is already declared culture monument according to current National Monuments Act by decision of the Ministry of Culture, number 47087 from June 2019. I can guarantee that this recommendation is already fulfilled. At the same time the revision and updating of the management plan has started. The first updated draft is ready and the final version will be available by the end of January 2020. The tourist management strategy for the nominated property is also currently underway in parallel with drafting the new management plan. The steering group for the nomination has also started to work on all other additional recommendations of ICOMOS.

We strongly believe that we can succeed in sustainable management and presentation of the site. Concerning criterion (ii) we follow ICOMOS recommendations. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Are there any more comments? ICOMOS, you have the floor. Thank you.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We welcome the additional information that has been provided today by the State Party. Perhaps it would be good to consider that formal reporting about the progress made maybe by the end of the year or next year about these legal provisions being definitely approved and might be considered by the Committee as an additional recommendation if the Committee intends to progress with the amendment provided by Australia.

Chairperson:

Thank you, ICOMOS. Spain.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Yes, indeed, we were going to ask ICOMOS to comment because if the State Party sent all the documents required throughout the evaluation process and this is confirmed by ICOMOS then in this case it is not the State Party committing to take out these actions. Then we are inscribing a site under certain conditions but here the site has actually provided the information needed now and now we need to reflect that in the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much and a very good example of communication and cooperation. Thank you, Spain. Australia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Australia:

Madam Chairperson, we'd just like to say that we would welcome the addition of a further paragraph at the end of our amendments on a reporting back. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I was expecting this. Thank you very much. Any more comments? If not, I pass the floor to the Rapporteur so that she can project the text and the Australian delegation can include the addition.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. As proposed by the delegation of Australia, it's proposed to inscribe this property. The first paragraph remains unchanged. The second would read, Inscribes the Landscape for Breeding and Training of Ceremonial Carriage Horses at Kladruby nad Labem, Czechia, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (v). Paragraph 3 then would read, Takes note of the provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which follows. That's in relation, of course, to criteria (iv) and (v) only. New paragraph 4, which actually reflects former work anyway-- Requests that the State Party, working with the Steering Group established to coordinate management of the property, finalize by December 2020, the expansion of the buffer zone to the south by including further land across the River Elbe in the stretch where the boundaries are too tight or coinciding with those of the property, in order to guarantee that it is equipped in its entirety with the necessary layer of additional protection. Paragraph 5 and all those points remain un-amended. I would just note that in the amendment received by the Committee Members there was just a—point h) disappeared in that but that was not the intention and we have reinserted h). And then there is now a proposal I believe for a new paragraph, which would be for the State Party to report back to the Advisory Bodies and the Committee. I'm not sure if Australia would like to propose some words or our Secretariat will whip something up.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Are we in agreement with the proposal presented? Australia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Australia:

We are in agreement. If we could just use some standard text—unfortunately I don't have any standard text in front of me right now but to report back to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for the progress to be reviewed by the World Heritage Committee at the next session? Something standard.

Rapporteur:

Madam Chairperson, we have some standard words, I think it's just to really work out which year the report back is needed. Is it for the next session? Okay, so that paragraph, the usual practice is when we request something at this late stage it's required by 1 February so it would read, Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its...44th session in 2020. And well done to the typist, there! Thank you.

Chairperson:

Australia, are you in agreement with the text? Yes? Yes, you have the floor, Mr Balsamo.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. As we heard from the State Party that the boundaries of the buffer zone have been extended, I think we should also include a request to the State Party to submit a revised map accordingly, showing the extended buffer zone. So maybe we add a new paragraph or do it in the same. Actually, a new paragraph would be better because the deadline to submit the new map I think would be 1 December 2019.

Chairperson:

Could you please formulate the paragraph?

The Secretariat:

It would be like the one in front of us except that, request the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2019 a revised map showing the extended buffer zone.

Rapporteur:

It has just been pointed out to me that in paragraph 4 ... I think we've requested something already by December 2020 and whether it might make sense to remove the reporting back on both items to the 45th session or whether you would still like to have those two different dates and two sets of reporting?

Chairperson:

Australia, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Australia:

We are happy to move it then, Madam Chairperson, if the rest of the Committee is agreeable to that.

Chairperson:

I'm sorry, can you repeat that because we couldn't hear you well.

The Delegation of Australia:

Madam Chairperson we are happy for the reporting date to moved back by 12 months so that it aligns with the date appearing earlier in the amendments.

Rapporteur:

I think, Madam Chairperson, we are comfortable that we've got our decision consistent now so I'll just read the very last two paragraphs just to make sure we are all comfortable with this. Paragraph 6 would read, Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2020 report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 45th session in 2021 and I actually think we will probably move paragraph 6 and 7 around but we will also have, Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2019 a revised map showing the extended buffer zone. So if we could just move the positing of paragraph 7 to make it 6 so that the very last thing is the report back. I think we are comfortable that that's consistent.

Chairperson:

Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I would just like to visually check the consistency. Could we please scroll back up to the other date so that is a date which talks specifically about the buffer and by December 2020—so is that consistent with what's been included below? Can we now scroll back down? So this request here should be 2020 also.

Chairperson:

I understand I would pass the floor to the Secretariat.

The Secretariat:

I think that we assumed that the buffer zone that we hear from the floor that the buffer zone has been established and as for any other property that is considered and inscribed on the World Heritage List, we need boundaries. We will need a map as soon as possible and I think the date of 1 December 2019 is the closest that we can put.

Chairperson:

Yes, Australia. Please, go ahead.

The Delegation of Australia:

If we could—so the operative paragraph, paragraph 4 was related to a timeframe where we were requesting the State Party working with the steering group established to coordinate the management of the property, finalized by December 2020, the expansion of the buffer zone. So perhaps we could ask the State Party to confirm whether it is in the position to provide the clarification of the buffer zone by the 1 December 2019. If that is the case then we can make that the operative date in the two clauses.

Chairperson:

Thank you, Australia. I think it's better at this point that we listen to Czechia on this topic. You have the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation de la Tchéquie (Observateur) :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. La République tchèque est prête à élargir la zone de protection de ce site d'ici la fin de l'année 2019. Donc nous pouvons tout à fait soumettre une carte avec les nouvelles frontières du bien d'ici décembre 2019. Merci, Madame la Présidente.

Chairperson:

Australia, okay? Thank you. ICOMOS? Okay? Thank you. Are there any more comments? I think we don't have any more comments and we can move then to the adoption of draft decision 43 COM 8B.27. Adopted [*applause*].

Chairperson:

I would like to tell you that with this inscription we have reached the number of 1,111 sites on the World Heritage List! [*Applause*] On behalf of all the Members of this Committee, let me congratulate Czechia for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. Czechia, you have the floor for a brief two-minute statement. Thank you very much.

The Observer Delegation of Czechia:

Dear Madam Chairperson, Members of the World Heritage Committee, dear colleagues, on behalf of the Czech Republic, I would like to express our sincere gratitude for the trust you have placed in us by this decision. We are very honored by your choice to inscribe The Landscape for Breeding and Training of Ceremonial Carriage Horses at Kladruhy nad Labem

on to the World Heritage List as we feel that this property can significantly broaden the notion of the word heritage. And we sincerely thank all of you who have supported this nomination. I am sure that you have just made the staff of Kladruba nad Labem the happiest place on earth!

It's a great honor for the Czech Republic, regional authorities, many experts and all local partners involved in the project. We commit ourselves to follow all recommendations of the Committee and ICOMOS and we will inform the World Heritage Centre of all future progress in this regard as soon as the steering group submits all additional materials. We will do our utmost to protect and preserve this property. Madam Chairperson, dear Members of the Committee it is my pleasure to invite all lovers of the landscape and horses to visit this new World Heritage site. Thank you very much. *[Applause]*

Chairperson:

Thank you. Congratulations.

I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination Water Management System of Augsburg, Germany. But first I give the floor to the Secretariat. Mr Balsamo you have the floor. Thank you.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination and it is to be found on page 67 in the English version in document INF.B8.4 and on page 21 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation of this property can be found on page 262 in the English version and page 253 in the French version of the ICOMOS evaluation report.

The Water Management System of Augsburg is a sustainable system of water management evolved in successive phases through the city's application of innovative hydraulic engineering, demonstrating an exemplary use of water resources over the course of more than seven centuries to the present day. The geomorphological features of the region where Augsburg is located in enjoys an abundance of water resources which have been managed since early times. The Water Management System of Augsburg is comprised of a series of 22 elements: one canal complex and one water course system; four drinking waterworks structures; two water engineering structures; three monumental fountains adorned with bronze sculptures; one water-cooled hall; and ten hydraulic power stations. Some water canals were mentioned in documents dating from as early as 1276 when water was channelized and brought to the city to supply mills, tanneries, textile producers and goldsmiths. At least by 1545, a strict separation between drinking and processed water was achieved throughout the system of watercourses. The network of canals wasn't reached until the 19th century and was renovated in the 20th century. Drinking waterworks were in use between the 15th and 19th centuries. They included pumping machinery initially driven by water wheels and later by turbines in order to lift water in expansion basins on top of the towers, from which it could flow by gravity through wooden pipes.

Water engineering structures comprise Hochablass weir, with its original machinery and the ancient Galgenablass culvert for water flow documented from 1545 to today. Water-cooled hall is a rare example of a large proto-industrial food processing structure, known as Stadtmetzg

in use from 1609 to 1930. Hydraulic power stations include some of the first examples of hydraulic power stations from the 19th century that use hydropower to generate energy. Ten power plants represent this typology and are still in use. Three of them are evidence of the continued development of hydroelectricity in Augsburg.

The property has been nominated under criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi) for the early system for separation of drinking and processed water which had supplied drinking water to the city for more than 300 years; for the innovative and hydraulic engineering; for generating power from water; for the continuous exemplary use of water resources for sustainable water management that has been working for more than 700 years. T

he state of conservation of the nominated property is overall adequate despite damages suffered in Augsburg in World War II. The main factors currently affecting the property include development and transport infrastructure pressure, environmental factors and potential natural disasters. A proactive conservation approach though has been established. The State Party has fully harnessed the evaluation process and has expanded a more focused comparative analysis has demonstrated that the water management system in Augsburg has no comparator for the separating of drinking water and processed water and the ingenious system to lift and channel water. The Augsburg fountain masters have contributed to this development and exported their experiences to cities in Belgium, Franc, and Austria as well as other places in Germany.

Throughout the evaluation process, the boundaries of the nominated property have been expanded to include some key elements as well as to expand significantly the buffer zone which now includes the city forest, the source of ground water and the immediate setting of key elements within the property. The canals enjoy a five-meter buffer of legal protection. ICOMOS in this regard suggests undertaking further exploration on how the buffer zone relates to the broader setting to reinforce the protection, particularly of canals and watercourses.

The comparative analysis proves that the property deserves consideration for the World Heritage List according to criteria (ii) and (iv). On the other hand, the arguments supporting criterion (vi) complements the justification of two recognized criteria although do not support criterion (vi). Integrity and authenticity conditions have been met. The protection of the property is adequate including legal and planning protection instruments. The management system includes a World Heritage office established by the Augsburg municipality to coordinate the implementation of the management plan, which is already in place.

ICOMOS therefore recommends that the Water Management System of Augsburg, Germany is inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) and there are additional recommendations that have been explained. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan) resumes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have had the presentation from ICOMOS. Are there any comments from the delegations? I don't see any one...China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. The Water Management System of Augsburg, Germany is an exceptional example of a sustainable system if water management and utilization of water resources in history. The water quality management was at a modern, urban level, which was achieved through continuous development and innovation creating a beautiful and livable urban life lasting for 700 years. This is of great significance to today's governance. We sincerely congratulate Germany on its inclusion in the World Heritage system. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Water Management System of Augsburg is a sustainable system of water management evolved in successive phases through the city's application for innovative hydrologic engineering, demonstrating an exemplary use of water resources over the course of more than seven centuries to present day. Water and Augsburg's strategic location at the crossroads of important trade routes in south-central Germany were key foundations in the growth and prosperity of the city, its population and status as a flourishing metropolis. The architectural and technological monuments in the nominated property preserve successful social technical ensembles that are vivid testimonies to the city's continuous and successful urban administration and management of water. Having said this we anticipate that the city's development and potential project may evolve in that sense we support the recommendation by ICOMOS for the heritage impact assessment to be done for the future project. We congratulate the State Party for this nomination and support its inscription. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie voudrait tout d'abord remercier l'ICOMOS pour la qualité du rapport qui nous a été soumis et également revenir au dossier présenté par l'État partie pour souligner sa grande qualité et son importance pour la complétude de notre Liste du patrimoine mondial. La question de la gestion de l'eau a toujours été au cœur de l'organisation des sociétés humaines, et ici nous avons une addition d'un élément ingénieux qui remonte à une période assez reculée, extrêmement intéressante, et on voit que l'État partie a présenté déjà des éléments qui garantissent la bonne conservation de ce site. Ce site vient, ou viendrait, s'ajouter à une série de sites sur notre Liste du patrimoine mondial relative à la question de la gestion de l'eau. J'ai en tête le site de Kairouan, en Tunisie, avec une très belle mécanique et une très belle ingénierie liée à la gestion de l'eau de l'État et de la ville. Voici donc un dialogue à distance géographique et à distance chronologique pour les mêmes besoins de la cohérence de nos sociétés humaines. Encore une fois, félicitations à l'État partie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Do we have any draft amendments?

Rapporteur:

We have no draft amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We proceed then to the approval of the decision. If there are no other opinions or objections may I declare decision 43 COM 8B.28 adopted as amended [*applause*].

Chairperson:

Our sincere congratulations to the State Party. We congratulate Germany with the inscription and we would like to give the floor to the representative of Germany. Ambassador, you are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Germany:

Mr Chairperson, excellences, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of the German delegation, I would like to thank ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee very much for this inscription and I would like to pass the floor to the representative of the city of Augsburg, Mr Thomas Weitzel.

Mr Thomas Weitzel:

Dear Mr Chairperson, dear Members of the World Heritage Committee and Advisory Bodies, let me first extend our profoundest gratitude on behalf of the city of Augsburg and the German Federal State of Bavaria for inscribing the Water Management System of Augsburg on the World Heritage List. We would also like to thank ICOMOS sincerely for their professional and constructive evaluation and the positive recommendation. Furthermore, I would like to thank the whole team which elaborated over these last years with great effort and responsibility and scientific and practical experience the nomination process.

We all thank the Committee for inscribing an 800-year-old water management system on the World Heritage List, an urban landscape of canals, monument fountains, water towers, water works and power plants which have become an example for sustainable use of water resources over the course of more than seven centuries to present day. The technique invented in Augsburg of sustainable separation of drinking and processed water was an important source for the development of the city for its richness in art, for industrial inventions and for new hygienic standards for the community. The decision demonstrates vivid testimonies to the city's continuous and successful urban administration and management of water.

The city of Augsburg and the Federal State of Bavaria consider the inscription of the Water Management System of Augsburg on the World Heritage List as a great honor. We proudly accept the obligation to safeguard, conserve and present these important monuments for our future generations and for humanity as a whole especially if we consider that the United Nations deems that at least in 2030 all people should have access to clean drinking water. The commitment of the city of Augsburg is for example best showcased by the latest obligation to become a member of the worldwide network Blue Community. We recognize water as a human right and we promote publically financed owned and operated water and wastewater services. As the Augsburg fountain masters and pump engineers exported the technological experience from the 16th century on to several European cities, we would like to share and convey this history and knowledge now with the world community.

Dear Mr Chairperson, dear Members of the World Heritage Committee, thank you very much for the inscription [*applause*].

Chairperson:

Thank you very much and once more congratulations for the inscription.

Now we are moving to the next item, which is document 8B.29. I would like to invite ICOMOS to present the nomination Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region, Poland. ICOMOS you have the floor.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region is a set of four prehistoric and proto-historic mining sites—I'm just waiting for the PowerPoint to appear Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Can you bring the item to the screen, please? Can we have the file on the screen, please?

[time lapses due to technical difficulties]

Not to lose time I would like to give you information that today at 6:30 but we will start at 7 p.m. in the International Mugam Centre, which is next to the Carpet Museum another architectural building, we have a special evening of jazz prepared by our Mali musicians. They came from Mali especially to make this concert today. The group consists of representatives from Mali, France, Burkina Faso and Azerbaijani musicians so for those who are interested in jazz, we invite you to be there at 7 p.m. to enjoy the nice music. The buses will be ready to assist your transportation to the site after 6 p.m. This is one brief announcement. So now we have it on the screen. ICOMOS, you can move to the file. Thank you.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region is a set of four prehistoric and proto-historic mining sites dating from the Neolithic and Bronze Ages. The raw material, a bluish gray-striped flint is an upper Jurassic limestone.

The property is composed of three flint extraction and one settlement sites connected to the mining activity with an overall size of close to 350 hectares. Krzemionki Opatowskie is the largest of the four components selected, in terms of extraction and export volume, and is also the best documented with 4000 shafts recorded over an area of 78 hectares. Five extraction systems on this site have been described ranging from shallow pits to large underground galleries and chamber mines. The underground mining system is particularly remarkable in dimension with some of the mining chambers extending to 500m². The nature of the geological substrate, a very hard limestone, explains the stability of the surrounding rock mass, which enabled the extensive horizontal development of galleries, and thus exhaustive mining of the flint beds during the Neolithic period, and also the conservation of these underground workplaces but also allowing them to be accessed by visitors today. The remains document the major aspects of production, organization and use and transmission of techniques. These are linked to the conditions of the deposit, enabling the hollowing out of very large underground chambers that are the largest known for the prehistoric exploitation of flint.

ICOMOS considers that the polished axes produced and their scale of distribution is emblematic of the Neolithic period. Although the Borownia and Korycizna component sites have not yet been subjected to thorough excavations the mining landscape contains further shafts and chambers. Here the preservation of the surface remains thanks to the conservation of the Neolithic mining landscapes and enables and understanding of the exploitation processes. The site of Gawroniec is the source of a very rich set of flint artefacts illustrating that its resident community was directly involved in working at the flint mining sites.

ICOMOS considers that the property meets criteria (iii) and (iv) as well authenticity. However, ICOMOS is concerned about the condition of integrity in terms of intactness. This concern arises from a combination of factors including a not yet functional buffer zone, negative impacts of a working quarry and the need for the management plan to be effective in ensuring the adequate protection and management of the property. ICOMOS considers that management of the property and the proposed cultural park will require clarification as well the way in which the local development plans provide an additional level of protection. ICOMOS considers that while the property meets criteria (iii) and (iv) integrity is not yet sufficiently demonstrated and ICOMOS therefore recommends that the nomination of Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region, Poland be referred back to the State Party to finalize the legal protection for the property and to take appropriate measures to reduce the impact of the working limestone quarry.

ICOMOS further recommends including heritage impact assessment processes within the management system of the property and ensuring that the research objectives remain adequate in view of the conservation plan. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now do we have any comments? Hungary, please. Welcome.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Hungary congratulates the State Party for its excellent work on the nomination dossier and thanks ICOMOS for its thorough evaluation. Hungary agrees that Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region should also be inscribed on the World Heritage List because of its historical significance, because of the well-based nomination file, because of the fact that its products were distributed in large areas. ICOMOS acknowledged that proposed criteria (iii) and (iv), the authenticity and integrity and also the management of the property that required only some clarifications gave some recommendations. Taking into account that the property under full legal protection and that the working limestone quarry in the buffer zone will be closed soon, that some of the recommendations of ICOMOS have already been fulfilled or are in progress by the State Party. There cannot be any big objection against this better evaluation. Therefore, Hungary proposes to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The nominated property the Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region consists of four mining sites dating from the Neolithic and Bronze Ages where striped flint was mined and processed. The nominated property covers a wide range of mining techniques on the same site, Krzemionki Opatowskie, with more than 4,000 extraction structures. This site is the largest one and has been excavated since 1923 and under State protection since 1945 when the site was given historical monument status and a reserve was actually created. Thank you very much ICOMOS for your evaluation and report.

According to the ICOMOS report, the state of conservation is satisfactory and ICOMOS considers that the local land development process must clearly be established. The nominated property meets criteria (iii) and (iv). The comparative analysis justifies consideration of the property for the World Heritage List. After the evaluation of all presented information and documents by the State Party who could strongly say that most of the recommendations were already done or under implementation. As an example, we can underline the development pressure in the Krzemionki Opatowskie region is very limited. There is no evidence of risk coming out from development. Local development plans will ensure that the buffer zones provide an additional level of protection for the nominated property. The longterm strategy and programme for archaeological research is under development.

All the respective local governments and agencies responsible for heritage protection accepted the management plan and signed an agreement to cooperate and organize themselves in order to make the protection, conservation and preservation of the nominated property as effective as possible. The State Party agrees with ICOMOS that the cultural park is a legal form of protection dedicated to the cultural landscape. Its introduction was announced in the nomination dossier. The process of the establishment was initiated in June of this year.

Taking into consideration all of the above, our delegation suggests to inscribe the nominated property Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii) and (iv). Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have carefully reviewed the nomination file and subsequent documentation of ICOMOS and the State Party. We understand that the concerns towards integrity of part of the serial site and the legal protection might have already been addressed by the State Party and would like to ask the delegation of Poland to be given the floor to clarify that to the Committee. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. The Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region is an unusually large-scale prehistoric mining site, which provides a unique witness to the mining technology, production life and social organization in early human history. China thanks Poland for adding this important heritage on to the World Heritage List. We concur with the point made by Hungary and Azerbaijani delegations as well as Bahrain. We feel that in view of the exceptional value of this property, there is no need to delay the inscription of this very important and unique property. We welcome information that the nominated property has been granted full legal protection, the management plan has been developed and its implementation has already been started as well as the creation of a cultural park. We therefore support the amendments proposed to the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. It might not come as a surprise that Norway listens carefully to the recommendation given by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and that we support the draft decision. We find that it's important to respect the referral mechanism as a checkpoint or a kind of point of reflection towards inscription and a final approval of OUV as referred to in paragraphs 77 and 78 in the Operational Guidelines. However, in this case we won't go against consensus. I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Poland is used to studying, conserving and protecting mining sites and two years ago in Krakow we were able to visit incredible sites linked to mining or extraction industries. It seems there is knowhow to identify sites which have Outstanding Universal Value in this area and, in this file all the information is provided and give us guarantees that Poland is able to manage sites such as these. Therefore we support the amendment put forward by Hungary. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

The United Republic of Tanzania congratulates the State Party of Poland for this interesting dossier of a serial property comprising three striped flint extraction sites in one settlement. Tanzania thanks ICOMOS for the comprehensive report and analysis in one of the largest and most significant prehistoric mining regions in the world.

Chairperson, my delegation notes with satisfaction that ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies consideration of this property for the World Heritage List. We have also noted that out of the three criteria proposed for nomination ICOMOS considers that the property meets two criteria, namely, criteria (iii) and (iv).

Chairperson, it is our understanding that ICOMOS does not deny the integrity of the component of this serial nomination; its concerned with the condition of integrity of the whole. Yet, my delegation has been informed on the new initiative, which has been realized by the State Party since the beginning of this year. It is important to also note that according to ICOMOS the nomination meets the condition of authenticity.

Chairperson, my delegation is also informed of information that the State Party has already started to implement all the five recommendations from ICOMOS proposed to protect and conserve this nomination. Considering the position of ICOMOS coupled with the new information provided by the State Party, my delegation is confident that the State Party is able to fulfil its obligations to protect and conserve the nomination under the proposed criteria.

As such, Tanzania agrees with the position of Bahrain, Azerbaijan and supports the amendment proposed by the distinguished delegate from Hungary to inscribe this nomination on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As you know we are fervent defenders of technical sites and technical development and we want to make sure that there are good relationships between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. We are offering confidence to the country to implement the corrective measures that are needed in agreement with the amendment that has been put forward and in referral to what Norway has said I believe we are moving towards a consensus. However, I also wanted to recall that the credit and trust that the Committee has to display when it comes to making decisions also has to take into account political situations and we have to make sure that we continue to be a credible organization without going into too much political issues but mainly looking at the technical issues. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Brazil would like to commend Poland for proposing this nomination and ICOMOS for its report. We would welcome more comparative analysis in order to verify criterion (i) but as it seems there is a growing consensus in the room for an inscription

under criteria (iii) and (iv), Brazil would join the consensus in that sense. We believe that in terms of legal protection and management the measures are adequate for protecting the property, even though they could be improved. Since the conditions of authenticity have been met, we would join our colleagues of Bahrain and ask the State Party to provide some more clarification on the conditions of integrity for the protection of this property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Ma délégation remercie également l'ICOMOS pour son rapport analytique sur ce bien. De l'avis de l'organe consultatif, le bien en série proposé pour inscription constitue un exemple exceptionnel, car le site offre la possibilité de reconstituer l'organisation des activités spécialisées ainsi que les activités domestiques se déroulant à proximité des fosses d'extraction. Ces informations sont dans la plupart des cas inaccessibles aujourd'hui. L'ICOMOS indique en outre que l'analyse comparative est satisfaisante et que la prise en compte de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial est pleinement justifiée. Nous notons en outre la mise en œuvre des recommandations telles que l'élaboration du plan de gestion et la création de parcs culturels. Sept des informations complémentaires restent encore à fournir par l'État partie, mais la disposition favorable et constructive de l'État partie, comme bien d'autres l'ont relevé, nous conforte dans le soutien de la proposition d'inscription de ce site très important et unique sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, selon la recommandation de l'ICOMOS sur la base des critères 3 et 4. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have an addition to the proposed text by ICOMOS. It is initiated by Hungary so I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur to update us.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As flagged, Hungary's proposed amendments to this decision to inscribe the property. The second paragraph would read, Inscribe Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region, Poland, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv). Paragraph 3, Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which follows. New paragraph 4 would read, Requests the State Party to—paragraph a) former paragraph 4—sorry, 2 a) there is deleted. New paragraph a) Continue implementation of the management plan to ensure the effective protection of the nominated property. The next subparagraph is un-amended. The next one would read, Finalize as soon as possible the process of creating the cultural park, in order to make the buffer zones effective. The next subparagraph is un-amended. Former paragraph 3 remains un-amended but will become paragraph 5 and there is a new final paragraph proposed, requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2021, a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 46th session in 2022. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. During the intervention, there were several questions concerned with the position of the State Party. May we first, before going to discussion of the draft, to ask the State Party to make their intervention and give an explanation.

The Observer Delegation of Poland:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Firstly, I would like to thank the Committee for the opportunity to provide additional information. Secondly, I would like to remind that in the opinion of ICOMOS consideration of this property for the World Heritage List is fully justified.

Regarding the ICOMOS recommendation for referral, the delegation of Poland is happy to provide firm assurance to the Committee that the few noted issues have in recent months all been properly addressed. The procedure for strict legal protection of the Gawroniec settlement component part has been finalized. It was inscribed on the Register of Monuments by virtue of decision on 28 February this year. Our respective local governments and agencies responsible for protection as well as Krzemionki Museum and State Forest authorities endorse the management plan and signed an agreement and letter of intent on 19 February 2019. They cooperate in order to make the protection, conservation and preservation of the nominated property fully effective.

The quarry located in the buffer zone of the Korycizna mining field has limited impact on the proposed OUV of the nominated property. The quarry is located next to residential and recreational areas, which effectively already means that possible negative impacts are controlled at the appropriate level. Further, new extensions of quarrying will not be issued due to the strong opposition by local communities and by the strategic partnerships of the nominated property to the continuity of such activity. Local municipalities have already launched the process of the creation of the culture park by signing a letter of intent on 14 June this year. Development pressure in the Krzemionki region is extremely limited. Local development plans which are a condition for the establishment of a culture park will ensure that the buffer zone will provide an additional level of protection for the nominated property. Polish authorities have already taken key actions of immediate and long-term impact to improve understanding protection management of the property.

Therefore, Poland would greatly appreciate the valued support of the World Heritage Committee Members for the inscription of the Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region on the World Heritage List during this session of the Committee in Baku. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Taking into consideration decisions made by this Committee earlier today, Norway would like to change paragraph 6 into, requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2020, a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 45th session in 2021.

Chairperson:

Can we accept this? During the interventions it was expressed the common opinion to support the idea. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Si nous croisons le paragraphe 6 et nous remontons sur la traduction en français de l'expression « as soon as possible » – je pense que c'est le point 7 –, en fait il y a une question de nuance. L'anglais, c'est bien « as soon as possible », mais on traduit par « dès que possible » en français, ça laisse une marge. Est-ce qu'on peut améliorer le français en disant par exemple « achever le plus tôt possible », ou « le plus rapidement

possible » ? Parce que derrière il y a une question d'urgence. Si on dit « dès que possible » en français, c'est comme si ça laissait des portes [pour que ça se fasse plus tard] : si vous avez le temps ; dès que vous aurez le temps, vous pouvez le faire. Donc voilà la nuance.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Can we make changes in the text? It's done already? Can we approve this version? In the French version also? No objections. Okay, so should we go to the approval of the newly proposed draft in whole? I don't see any objections. Therefore, I declare decision 43 COM 8B.29 adopted in a new version [*applause*]. We congratulate Poland with the inscription of this very important site and I give the floor to the State Party. Please, you are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Poland:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I wish to congratulate you, Mr Chairperson for your leadership and the Government of Azerbaijan for the efforts in organizing the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee and your great hospitality here in Baku. On behalf of the State Party of Poland and the Ministry of Culture of National Heritage, I would like to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to all the Members of the Committee for inscribing the Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region on the World Heritage List. Especially, I would like to thank our distinguished colleagues from the Hungary delegation for giving us the opportunity to present our updated information. Let me also express my gratitude for ICOMOS for their constructive remarks. We welcome them with satisfaction and appreciation for the hard work reflected in our nomination dossier.

Finally, I would like to address special thanks to all people involved in the nomination process especially the experts from the Krzemionki Archeological Museum and Reserve, the State Forest authorities and the National Heritage Board of Poland. As a country with a long tradition of strict adherence to heritage protection rules, we are honored that the next nomination from Poland has been acknowledged as a World Heritage site. Now allow me to pass the floor to the representative of the people engaged in the nomination process.

Representative:

Thank you. Krzemionki Prehistoric Striped Flint Mining Region inscribed on the World Heritage List, this is the dream of many that came true. Dear Chairperson, Committee Members, Advisory Bodies, excellences, let me express our gratitude to all of you, gratitude on behalf of Polish archeologists, geologists, mining engineers, landscape architects, biologists, inhabitants of the Krzemionki region and many, many others. The justification of the Krzemionki region's significance and the list of its value and attributes is long. Krzemionki is the evidence of the wisdom and courage of our ancestors who were living and working there for far over 2,000 years. They changed our world and now they are changing our lives for the heritage they have left. Thank you once again on behalf of our great grandparents and new generations to come. Thank you. [*Applause*].

Chairperson:

Permit me once more on behalf of the Committee Members to congratulate you with this inscription and honorable Members of the Committee, dear delegates, with that point we are finishing today's afternoon session. Tomorrow we will start our consideration at 10 a.m. and note that Bureau members have to be in the room at 9:30 a.m. to update the procedures. Have a nice evening and join us at the jazz whenever you want.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

SEVENTH DAY – Sunday 7 July 2019

THIRTEENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev
later: H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil)

Chairperson:

Can we start honourable Members of the Committee? As you know, and you all participated yesterday in the discussions, we are succeeding in approving and discussing the documents of the files. We managed to look through 24 files. Now we have to start the last 10 nominations. But honourable delegates, if you permit me I will start today with a little bit—not a little bit but serious and sad information. You know that we are discussing the heritage sites. We discussed matters concerned with the history of the human being and we must always remember that human history also consists of intangible heritage. We always pay tribute to the personalities, to the people who made a great impact on the history of art including music.

Last night, we received very sad information concerning a world class Brazilian musician who was born in Juazeiro, internationally known since the 50s. He had a very long career in music; he played with great musicians and composed songs that nowadays are known in the world very well. The father of the musical style *bossa nova*, João Gilberto passed away last night. In view of his success from all generations and his work as an expression of contemporary musical heritage, his death is a big loss for the culture of humanity. We have a proposal on behalf of the Bureau members to commemorate him by one-minute standing. Please. [*one minute elapses*] God bless and let him rest in peace. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Honorable Members of the Committee, we now start the discussion on 8B. So Brazil, please. Welcome.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like to express in the name of the Brazilian Government and in the name of the Brazilian people our appreciation for your most considerate gesture of solidarity on the occasion of this great loss for Brazil. The Brazilian people are in grief for the passing away of João Gilberto, one of the most outstanding musicians of our country, the father of *bossa nova*, a unique musical style internationally known. Joao Gilberto leaves Brazil and the world a legacy of beauty, poetry and lyricism that touches the hearts of people in Brazil and in all part of the world. So thank you very much once again, you personally and all the Members of this Committee for this most considerate gesture. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We start now the discussion on item 43 COM 8B.30 and I would like to invite ICOMOS to present the nomination. But before that I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr Balsamo to give us information about the Royal Building of Mafra–Palace, Basilica, Convent, Cerco Garden and Hunting Park (Tapada), Portugal.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. Just to remind the Committee that we received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the nomination the Royal Building of Mafra–Palace, Basilica, Convent, Cerco Garden and Hunting Park (Tapada), Portugal and this notification is

on page 96 in the English version in document 8B.4 and on page 89 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you are welcome for presentation.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found on page 284 in the English version and page 362 in the French version of document 43 COM/INF.8B1.

Conceived by King João V at the beginning of the 18th century as a tangible representation of his idea of the monarchy and of the State, the nominated property encompasses an imposing quadrangular edifice, the Royal building, a garden and large landscape area. The nominated property is located some 40km northwest of Lisbon and 8km inland of the Atlantic coast.

Through the nomination process, the buffer zone has been enlarged and made more consistent with the protection needs of Mafra. The Royal building houses the King and Queen's palaces, the Royal Chapel, shaped like a Roman baroque basilica, a convent for 300 friars, with its infirmary and apothecary, a library, still preserving 36,000 volumes from the Portuguese Kings' collection. The palatial complex is completed by the Cerco Garden, a formally designed garden and by the Royal Hunting Park (Tapada), a multifunctional landscape supplying a variety of resources for the operation of the Palace. Construction of the complex started in 1717 and was mostly completed by 1735, although some parts were still under construction at King João's death in 1750. The building continued to be embellished with sculptures, paintings and the organs in the church until the outbreak of the Peninsular War.

The property has been nominated under four criteria: (i), (ii), (iv) and (vi) as an exceptional representation of King João V's conception of the monarchy and of the State, in which each social component had its role: the aristocracy, represented by the Royal residences; the Church, illustrated by the basilica; and the people, represented by the Convent, all gathered in one single building. King João V's ideological programme is reflected in the layout of the building, in the Roman Baroque architectural language, in its multi-functionality in particular the infirmary, the library and the school, reflecting the importance accorded to health and education. A wealth of research, particularly focused on the Palace has been deployed, despite the loss of archival resources on Mafra to support the nomination.

The State Party has benefited from the evaluation process: the augmented comparative analysis has been able to demonstrate that there is room for the Royal Building of Mafra on the World Heritage List, even though a number of Royal residences are already listed, in particular for the presence of the Tapada, the boundaries of which remained unchanged since its establishment. However, not enough information has been presented in the nomination dossier and in the additional information on the Tapada and a substantial increase of documentation on this key element is needed to support the justification for OUV and guarantees for adequate management as cultural landscape.

ICOMOS considers that only criterion (iv) has the potential to be justified by the Royal Building, the Cerco Garden and the Tapada, all together. Criterion (i) focuses mainly on some architectural elements of the royal building and the expanded comparative analysis does not support this criterion for the whole property. The arguments presented to support criterion (ii) focus primarily on the Royal Building only and the information provided throughout the nomination process do not suggest that the Cerco Garden and the Tapada could contribute to supporting this criterion. The arguments presented to justify criterion (vi) can contribute to strengthen and to complement the justification of other criteria rather than justify criterion (vi).

The conditions of integrity and authenticity, to be fully demonstrated, would require additional documentation to be presented on the heritage features of the Tapada in particular. The boundaries after the modification proposed by the State Party to the buffer zone are now adequate, and the legal protection is in place.

Conservation is overall adequate but can be improved, especially in specific areas of the property and an integrated conservation programme should be further elaborated. In February 2019 an updated collaboration protocol was signed by all responsible bodies. It represents a first commendable step to achieve a coherent vision for the whole nominated property, which needs to be accompanied by an integrated management system.

To sum up, ICOMOS recommends the nominated property be referred back to the State Party in order to develop a landscape study and a cartographic inventory of the Tapada heritage features; to strengthen the management of the Tapada from a cultural heritage perspective; and to develop a more robust management system for the whole property. There are a few additional recommendations for consideration by the State Party. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask the honourable Members of the Committee to comment? Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the Advisory Bodies for their report. And I think that Brazil, after the evaluation of this nomination by the Brazilian National Heritage Institute we conclude that this nomination has solid ground to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. According to the ICOMOS report we just heard there is a high degree of authenticity of the location and site, form and design, materials and substance in the Mafra building complex. The property exhibits remarkable specificities and includes all the elements that reflect its significance. According to the analysis made by our national advisory bodies the site qualified fully for inscription under criterion (iv).

I would ask you then, Mr Chairperson, to consider the draft amendment the Brazilian delegation has proposed with this recommendation of inscription of the site under criterion (iv) and this draft amendment also incorporates all the recommendations that have been made by UNESCO Advisory Bodies. I would very much like, Mr Chairperson, to ask you at this point to pass the floor to the distinguished delegation from Portugal to present to all the Members of this Committee some further comments and clarifications on this nomination. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

I think according to the Rules of Procedure we have the right to give the floor to the honourable State Party. Please, you are welcome, Portugal.

The Observer Delegation of Portugal:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. And thank you for the honor of addressing this Committee once again. I thank the Ambassador of Brazil for her statement on this inscription. We strongly believe as she does that Marfa meets all the conditions to be inscribed. Concerning authenticity and integrity of the property, ICOMOS recognizes that they have been demonstrated. ICOMOS further recognizes that there is room for Marfa on the World Heritage List. Concerning the criteria, we believe that the criteria we propose are correct because we wish to inscribe a building of obvious outstanding value that has a garden and hunting ground attached to it, not the other way around, that is, a hunting ground with a palace and church

attached to it as ICOMOS suggests. But we can accept, Mr Chairperson, criterion (iv) in line with what ICOMOS proposed.

On a wider perspective, Mr Chairperson, I would like to recall that Portugal has not submitted a candidature to the World Heritage List for the last eight years. We did this for reasons of principle, as we were Members of this Committee for half of this time. But also because we have at heart the credibility of these processes and of the Convention itself. I say this to underline that any candidature Portugal may present will be the result exclusively of our deep conviction that we are dealing, indeed with a property of exception cultural and historical value and that the dossier has been prepared in a very serious and scrupulous way supported by significant scientific knowledge, as ICOMOS recognizes in this case. Otherwise, Mr Chairperson, Portugal would not present such a dossier.

I do believe this property should be inscribed and I wish to assure ICOMOS and the Centre whose advice we very much value, and all Committee Members that the recommendations included in the evaluation report of any Portuguese inscribed property will be carried out in full and in a credible way. As far as the Palace of Marfa and its grounds are concerned, the implementation of all recommendations has already started and some have already been completed. I thank you, sir.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais commencer par une remarque de procédure, si vous me le permettez. Le fait de donner la parole à l'État partie en début de discussion priverait peut-être les autres États membres du Comité de poser des questions et de demander des clarifications, parce que je ne verrais pas qu'on donne plusieurs fois la possibilité à l'État partie de répondre pour donner des clarifications supplémentaires. Mais quoi qu'il en soit, je crois que nous sommes devant un dossier de grande qualité et je voudrais remercier l'État partie d'avoir mené un travail qualitatif, et remercier l'ICOMOS de nous avoir éclairés par un certain nombre de remarques. Je me félicite de voir l'État partie se rallier à l'ICOMOS pour une inscription sur le critère déjà vérifié actuellement, à savoir le critère 4, ce qui est une convergence sur l'avis ou vers l'avis des experts et également permet d'avoir une décision solide de ce Comité. Mais j'aurais aimé – mais je parle là vraiment dans le sens où je ne sais pas si on va en avoir la possibilité – avoir une précision de l'État partie sur ses démarches, puisqu'on l'a entendu dire qu'une partie des éléments requis ont été soit déjà totalement mis en place, soit en bonne partie, sur ce qui a été fait en matière d'inventaire cartographique des caractéristiques patrimoniales de la Tapada. C'est un élément je crois important pour que le Comité sache si cette décision peut être prise dans la direction de l'amendement proposé par le Brésil. Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and good morning to you all. Today as yesterday Norway chooses to listen very carefully to the recommendations given by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and to support the draft decision. We still find it essential to respect the referral mechanism as a checking point towards inscription and the final approval of the OUV as referred to in paragraph 51, 77 and 78 in the Operational Guidelines. In this case, however, we cannot go against the consensus. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. China appreciates the assessment of ICOMOS and first of all, we fully concur with what our distinguished Ambassador of Brazil put forward and what was echoed by Tunisia and others. China considers that ICOMOS itself has already considered the justification for inscription is soundly argued in the nomination and that it is supported by a significant amount of research and documentation. Furthermore, ICOMOS recognizes the revised and expanded comparative analysis that has been carried out demonstrates that this property has its place on the World Heritage List. It is on those grounds that we are also delighted that the State Party has assured us that the recommendations pertaining to this property will be fully implement. China therefore considers that the Royal Building of Mafra should be inscribed during the present session of our Committee. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Uganda fully aligns itself with the position expressed by the delegation of Brazil and other distinguished speakers before me. We wish to underscore the fact the ICOMOS appreciates the soundly argued narrative of the property's nomination dossier. ICOMOS further acknowledges that the inscription of this property is justified. We also take note of the commitment of the State Party to implement the ICOMOS recommendations. On the basis of these positive signals, Mr Chairperson, my delegation is also convinced that rather than the proposed referral status this property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania thanks the State Party for this nomination and it also commends ICOMOS for a thorough analysis and its recommendation on this nomination. However, Tanzania wishes to get clarification from ICOMOS, why criterion (iv) cannot be used to inscribe the property—if I understood properly. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Azerbaijan thanks ICOMOS and the State Party for the work and prepared dossier. My delegation also supports the statement made by the delegation of Brazil on the justification of criterion (iv) for inscription. We believe that this exceptional site--and ICOMOS recognizes this--that it fits for criterion (iv) for inscription but at the same time my delegation also supports the recommendation of the Advisory Body, of ICOMOS to develop a more robust management system for the site as well as a conservation programme. So with this in mind, Azerbaijan supports the amendment proposed by Brazil. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would like to thank ICOMOS for the technical evaluation and we would also like to congratulate Portugal for the quality file that has been presented to us from a historic and cultural point of view. We agree with the other States Parties regarding the Outstanding Universal Value of this site and we also believe that Portugal has the means to make sure that the recommendations put forward by ICOMOS will be implemented in order to protect this property. There can be no doubts regarding the quality of this file and therefore we support the inclusion of this site on the World Heritage List. We need to make sure that we are consistent with decisions that we take in this Committee therefore we support the inscription of this site on the List under criterion (iv) and we believe the State Party will continue to work on the recommendations. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

La Délégation de Bosnie-Herzégovine:

La délégation de Bosnie-Herzégovine soutient la proposition du Brésil. Nous sommes toujours très heureux d'avoir sous les yeux une proposition aussi bien préparée. Il s'agit donc de remercier la délégation et les experts du Brésil et de l'UNESCO qui nous ont préparé une proposition si complète. Nous soutenons aussi la proposition de donner toujours la parole au pays concerné pour qu'il nous donne des explications dès le début, pour faciliter notre travail, s'il y a des malentendus, s'il y a des choses à éclaircir, pour rendre notre travail plus efficace. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous voulons ici reconnaître le travail accompli par l'État partie et également l'évaluation faite par l'ICOMOS. Si nous regardons l'avis qui nous est proposé, l'avis de renvoi, et si nous considérons le renvoi, le bien a un potentiel pour être inscrit, c'est-à-dire que, en termes de critères, le bien satisfait quelques critères, et notamment, en écoutant l'ICOMOS, nous sommes tout à fait d'accord que le critère 4 soit considéré pour inscrire ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Toutefois, comme il y avait des réserves, et d'ailleurs l'avis de renvoi le justifie, le pays devrait fournir un certain nombre d'éléments additionnels pour pouvoir justement compléter et valider la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. En écoutant l'État partie, nous avons eu confirmation que certainement ces éléments ont été présentés à l'ICOMOS. En croisant donc ces deux informations, de l'ICOMOS et de l'État partie, nous sommes tout à fait dans la position d'appuyer l'inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Toutefois, nous interviendrons à nouveau, quand nous allons regarder le projet d'amendement présenté par le Brésil, pour peut-être apporter d'autres contributions additionnelles. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please. You're welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. If I understand correctly, we have a question from the honourable delegate of Tanzania for ICOMOS concerning why ICOMOS does not consider that criterion (iv) has not been met yet. ICOMOS had a long extensive discussion about the property particularly this referral back is related to the fact that the Tapada has been found as the key element for this nomination, for this royal complex to be inscribed on the List in the future with

this additional recommendation. We have a beautifully documented Royal Building extensively, precisely—it has been a pleasure for all ICOMOS panel members to read but it has been found that the Tapada has not been so adequately documented. We don't have enough information and considering the key role played by the Tapada, according to ICOMOS' view, in the recognition of this property within other royal residences for this specific park, which has remained almost within its original boundaries. It's very specific. That is why ICOMOS considers that it isn't possible for the time being to proceed with a recommendation for inscription. I hope I have clarified our position, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much. I would like to thank ICOMOS for this further explanation concerning the Tapada, the Hunting Park. I would like to say for us that first of all Mafra was not nominated as a cultural landscape but as a Royal Building with all its estate. Secondly, we do not see how further graphic documentation on the Hunting Park would be so essential for the inscription. The State Party provided a detailed description, accompanied by ancient and modern maps and photos of the park and its heritage features. Furthermore, the Park in its entirety is within the boundaries of the property and is protected by a range of surrounding buffer zones. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Indonesia would like to thank ICOMOS for its thorough evaluation of the Royal Building of Mafra and commends the State Party for preparing a comprehensive nomination on the unique and exceptional ensemble of multifunctional building and gardens. Indonesia understands that the Advisory Body considered the property as a site based on the categories of cultural properties set out in Article 1 of the 1972 World Heritage Convention and agrees that the property meets criterion (iv). The Operational Guidelines defines criterion (iv) to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history. After following the discussion and considering the additional information as well as the commitment of the State Party, Indonesia considers that the Royal Building of Mafra qualifies all the requirements to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. However, Indonesia encourages the State Party to conduct a landscape study and cartographic inventory in order to enhance the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Indonesia would like to join other Members to support the amendment to the draft decision proposed by Brazil. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Zimbabwe fully supports the statement of the distinguished Ambassador of Brazil and as the distinguished representative who have spoken before me. We understand that ICOMOS itself considers the dossier of this nomination is soundly argued in terms of inscription and that the State Party has done a significant amount of research and provided documentation supporting this objective. ICOMOS also considers that the revised and expanded comparative analysis demonstrates that this property has its place on the World Heritage List. We have just received assurance from the State Party concerning the full

application of the recommendations made by Advisory Bodies concerning this property. For these reasons we consider that this property should be inscribed under criterion (iv). However, we urge the State Party to seriously consider the recommendations of the Advisory Body in the management of the property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Good morning, Chairperson. Australia would also like to agree with ICOMOS. We feel that although criterion (iv) has been justified for the Royal Building of Mafra we agree with ICOMOS that the contribution of the Tapada to the values of the property under criterion (iv) does need further substantiation. However, we feel that there is a consensus in the room towards inscription and we can agree with that consensus given the amendments provided by Brazil under paragraph 4, which specifically requires further landscape study. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, let me thank the Advisory Body for their great report. Regarding the draft amendments submitted by Brazil we support it especially after hearing from the Advisory Board two times and the commitment of the State Party and how the dossier was fully prepared and a lot of the documents were clarified according to the extra information we received so again we want to support the draft amendments submitted by Brazil.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have to revise the draft decision submitted by Brazil and supported now during the interventions. So may I ask the Rapporteur, please?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As heard, Brazil has provided us with proposed amendments and that's been supported by many in the room. The first paragraph would remain unchanged. The second would read, Inscribes the Royal Building of Mafra—Palace, Basilica, Convent, Cerco Garden and Hunting Park (Tapada), Portugal, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iv). The next recommended subparagraphs have all been moved to further in the document so all of them are absent from here. They are moved to after paragraph 3, Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which follows. Then former paragraph 3 would now become paragraph 4 and those first three subparagraphs from the original have been inserted here with amendments to reflect the language changes and a change in 4 b) which would read, Using the information above to reinforce the management of the cultural dimension of the Tapada, deleting landscape there. Then the following amendments are to reflect that it would be an inscription and there is a new paragraph 5 which reads, Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2020 a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the proposed draft decision? Any amendments? Any changes? May I apply to the honourable Members of the Committee whether should we proceed with this draft in whole or paragraph-by-paragraph? Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Moi je voulais éventuellement écouter l'ICOMOS. Si on l'inscrit sur le critère 4, toute la dimension paysagère devrait quand même être vue. Je ne sais pas. Je pense que là il y a quand même certains éléments qui devraient être vus par rapport au critère qui a été choisi. Si c'est le 4, est-ce que la dimension paysagère devrait continuer à être prise en compte dans les recommandations ? C'est vraiment une question, j'aimerais avoir des précisions là-dessus. Merci.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. ICOMOS considered originally that the Tapada was important and needed for the justification of the property to be inscribed and insufficient documentation—there was a gap that needed to be covered and that is why the recommendation concerning the development of certain types of studies considering the archival documentation being insufficient so to carry on-site studies to document this was necessary and that is why this recommendation—if the Committee considers that the landscape mentioned, the Tapada as a part of this big complex is relevant as ICOMOS thinks the recommendation concerning the landscape needs to be kept. But that depends on the decision of the Committee Members.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So we leave this item here as recommended. Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Just to explain that paragraph 4 a) does still require a landscape study although the reference from landscape has been removed from paragraph b).

Chairperson:

I think that it reflects the requirement from some delegations and we can proceed with the whole text if you don't mind. If so, decision 43 COM 8B.30 is declared adopted as new version [*applause*]. Let me congratulate the State Party with the inscription of this very important site and now again we are returning to the next item also connected with the Portuguese nomination, item 8B.31, Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte in Braga, Portugal. May I ask Mr Balsamo to proceed? Sorry, sorry, sorry, Portugal, the floor is yours.

The Observer Delegation of Portugal:

Thank you, thank you, Mr Chairperson. It is a very important moment for us because heritage is not our past, it's our present and it's the future if we accomplish our duty. In the name of Portugal, I want to thank our friends from Brazil as well as other Members of the Committee and ICOMOS and UNESCO. Your work has been of utmost important to us and all the recommendations approved will be taken into consideration and effectively implemented. Our humanity can be illustrated with two words, books and music. In books you find knowledge and science, in music you find heart and creativity. The Royal Building of Mafra is an extraordinary example of architecture and landscape, full of books and music with an extraordinary library and wonderful organs and carillons. In times of artificial intelligence we need more than ever cultural intelligence, intelligence with sensibility, with human sensibility, with human awareness. We are very grateful for your decision to inscribe Mafra, a place of culture, of science, of arts on the World Heritage List. Thank you very much and now please allow me to give the floor to the Mayor of Mafra.

Mayor of Mafra:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson, ladies and gentlemen, the Mayor of Mafra wants to share the proud honor in the recognition felt by the community of Mafra and all the partners of this project concerning the inscription of the Royal Building of Mafra on the UNESCO World Heritage List. It is a historic moment for Mafra and for Portugal, of course. But above all a future commitment for all the parts involved in this project. For Mafra, this recognition by UNESCO is not a point of arrival but a starting point for a collective awareness of the increased protection of the property, deep respect for our common heritage by the role it plays in the community. We hope this recognition will reinforce the full public enjoyment of the site and the introduction of new dynamics, positioning it as a meeting place for all the people of the world. A special thanks to the Executive Committee and all those who directly and indirectly collaborated with this application more than 10 years ago when we started this challenge. Finally, we have the pleasure to invite all those present to visit the Royal Building of Mafra. Thank you, Mr Chairperson. [Applause]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. And we once more congratulate you on the occasion of inscription.

Now again, we return to Portugal so, Mr Balsamo clarification on this item?

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the nomination of Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte in Braga, Portugal and this notification is on page 110 in the English version of document INF.8B.4 and on page 105 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, please. You are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found at page 297 of the English version and page 376 of the French version of document 43 COM/INF.8B1.

The Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte in Braga is a cultural landscape located on the steep slopes of Mount Espinho overlooking the city of Braga in the north of Portugal. It is a landscape and architectural ensemble constituting a sacred mount symbolically recreating the landscape of Christian Jerusalem and portraying the elaborate narrative of the Passion of Christ—the period in the life of Jesus from his entry to Jerusalem through to his crucifixion.

Developed over a period of more than 600 years, the ensemble is focused on a long and complex Via Crucis or Way of the Cross that leads up the mount's western slope. The elaborate set of stone stairs and paths is interposed with a series of chapels that house sculptural collections evoking the Passion of Christ, as well as fountains allegorical sculptures and formal gardens. The Via Crucis culminates at the church on top of the mount, where the main altar features a representation of the Calvary, being the site where Jesus was crucified. The nominated property illustrates a European tradition of creating *Sacri Monti* or sacred mounts. This was a concept initially promoted by the Catholic Church's Council of Trent in the 16th century, in reaction to the Protestant Reformation. These sacred mounts were subsequently realized at many locations in Europe and beyond. The sanctuary in Braga, carried out primarily in a Baroque style and surrounded by a lush park and woodland, is a relatively early, extensive and unified version that reflects the grand religious narrative typical of the Church's Counter Reformation endeavours.

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies consideration of this property for the World Heritage List. The State Party nominated the property under criteria (ii) and (iv). ICOMOS considers that the nominated property meets criterion (iv) but does not consider that criteria (ii) has been justified. The documented influence of the nominated property appears to have been limited to an important property in Brazil, Bom Jesus de Congonhas, as well as later sanctuaries in Portugal. However, details of this influence and the role of the property as a model for other examples of sanctuaries in the world are lacking, and overall the interchange does not meet the level of Outstanding Universal Value.

The proposed boundaries and buffer zone are adequate. ICOMOS considers the requirements of integrity have been met but the requirements of authenticity have not been met at this stage. The form and design of the ensemble have evolved over a period of centuries, and there is only a limited understanding about what currently remains of the landscape planting's historical design or substance, and its related meaning.

The requirements for protection and management are not fully adequate at this stage. In the case of the landscape, the apparent limited understanding of the landscape's attributes related to the original or historical design and their meaning is not satisfactory. In addition, improvements should be made regarding documentation, institutional arrangements for fire prevention and fire fighting, and monitoring of visitor impacts. The state of conservation is generally good following about 20 years of continuous work on the conservation and restoration of the property. A current major conservation project is still to be completed, and some areas of the property still require attention. A further phase of work is planned for the future and funding should be secured to undertake this work in a timely manner. The main pressures affecting the property are urban expansion/development, fire and visitor pressures. With regard to monitoring, the overall approach is generally satisfactory. However, additional indicators are required regarding the woodland and to address threats to the property.

ICOMOS recommends that the nominated property be referred back to the State Party to allow it to: complete a landscape study on the history of the woodland, parks and gardens of the sacred mount in order to provide a greater understanding of the meaning of the vegetation and landscape to the sacred place; and to develop a more complete and detailed understanding of the selection of plants, as well as alterations to the species and layout of these attributes over time, supplementing the landscape attributes based on this work, and using this information to update management planning for the landscape. The draft decision including additional recommendations can be found at page 45 of the working document WHC/19/43.COM/8B. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask for the comments from the honourable Committee Members? Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like to commend Portugal for proposing this outstanding property. In some circles it is also called the Father of Bom Jesus de Congonhas, which is a property in Brazil already inscribed on the World Heritage List so we are very much attached to this property. We would also like to thank ICOMOS for its report. As we could hear, there are only a few issues that remain to be verified for its inscription on the World Heritage List we would just like to tackle two issues regarding authenticity and protection and management since from ICOMOS' report in terms of integrity criteria, comparative analysis and so on and so forth, this property, this nomination has met the necessary requirements.

With regard to authenticity, going to form and design the ensemble has evolved. We believe that the quality such as function, location, setting and especially the spirit of the property remain

quite unchanged in the last two centuries and in that sense we strongly believe there is a case for authenticity for this property. In terms of management and protection, additional information provided by the State Party leads us to the conclusion that the overall protection and management are adequate even though there is room for improvement and in that sense we believe that the recommendations of ICOMOS should be kept in the decision and should be requested to the State Party implement those recommendations but that should not hinder its inscription on the World Heritage List at this stage. Therefore, Mr Chairperson, we propose that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List at the present session.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie voudrait d'abord remercier l'ICOMOS pour le rapport qui nous été fourni sur ce dossier, et l'État partie de l'avoir instruit de cette qualité, à ce niveau de précision et à un niveau scientifique à saluer. Nous soulignons le fait que, dans le rapport de l'ICOMOS, il y a vérification du critère 4 et je souhaiterais, Monsieur le Président, si vous le permettez, qu'on demande à l'État partie si une inscription sur la base du critère (iv) seulement, comme on l'a fait pour le dossier précédent, pourrait lui convenir. En tout état de cause, nous trouvons que ce dossier offre des éléments extrêmement importants et précieux sur une période importante de l'histoire, et un état de conservation déjà de haut niveau. Nous souhaiterions également savoir si l'État partie pourrait nous fournir des informations sur les démarches de son inscription sur la liste des monuments nationaux et également ce qui est envisagé en vue de juguler l'expansion et le développement urbain autour du site, ainsi que ce qui a été prévu, si une inscription advient, concernant l'impact d'un accroissement raisonnablement croissant du tourisme sur ce site. Nous souhaiterions savoir quelles sont les dispositions déjà prises par l'État partie par rapport à ces deux points importants sur l'équilibre global de ce dossier. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. The Spanish delegation would echo what Brazil has said and we also believe that this property should be inscribed on the List. If we think about the two questions ICOMOS pointed out about referring the candidacy, they have already actually been justified by the State Party as steps they are dealing with right now. And keeping with that, since the State Party is here we would like to get more information about those two issues, which could lead us to make the decision to inscribe this site, and these two issues, which are already being dealt with, could be then included as recommendations for further work. The Tunisian delegation has mentioned the legal framework that our delegation is also concerned about especially whether or not it has been declared a national monument already. Well, we've spoken with the Portuguese delegation and we would like when they speak that they talk about that issue as well. We think the system just like in Spain that when the procedure for listing a site as a national monument with maximum protection, that itself means that it will enjoy maximum protection in the country. So we would like the State Party to please have a chance to speak and explain those issues so that this site could be inscribed if of course the rest of the Members of the Committee are convinced by the arguments that they hear from the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Azerbaijan thanks ICOMOS and the State Party for the cooperation of this nomination and as ICOMOS recognized in its recommendation this site is an outstanding example of the landscape and architectural ensemble illustrating the Counter Reformation in Catholic Church in Europe. With this in mind we believe that this site justifies inscription on the World Heritage List based on criterion (iv). But I would like to ask to give the floor to the State Party to respond to the ICOMOS recommendations with regard to the landscape study as well as the management plan of the landscape. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I think that we will give the floor to State Party after the interventions of the Committee Members because they may have additional questions. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous félicitons l'État partie pour un deuxième dossier assez intéressant présenté pour inscription. Ils ont également l'évaluation faite par l'ICOMOS qui nous semble être logique et pratique. D'ailleurs ils sont d'accord pour que ce bien soit inscrit sur la base du critère (iv), et également ils sont tout à fait d'accord que les détails sur l'intégrité sont pris en compte ainsi que l'analyse comparative. Toutefois, ils émettent quelques réserves concernant l'authenticité et la partie gestion et protection. Donc nous sommes d'avis que le bien soit inscrit tout en demandant à l'État partie de pouvoir clarifier également s'ils se sont préparés pour mettre en œuvre les recommandations concernant la dimension paysagère du bien, et également de nous apporter des éléments additionnels par rapport à la protection et à la gestion.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania thanks the State Party for coming up with this wonderful nomination.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Tanzania also commends ICOMOS for the thorough analysis on its recommendation and the conclusions. Chairperson, reading from the analysis of the evaluation of ICOMOS we believe that the attributes of the proposal's Outstanding Universal Value are well defined. The state of conservation is of good quality. The comparative analysis is justified but also the nominated property meets criteria (ii) and (iv). The nominated area retains all attributes that support the proposed Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the requirements of integrity have been met. Conservation measures are adequate and the monitoring system approach is satisfactory. Chairperson, inadequacies that have been identified by ICOMOS could be part of the recommendation while the site is inscribed. Tanzania therefore goes in line with the other distinguished delegates who have proposed to inscribe this property under criteria (iv) and (ii). Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Once again we would like to thank the State Party for the quality of this file and also thank the Advisory Bodies for the report. We

believe the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte bears testimony to the religious culture that exists in the country for over 200 years and its also has elements of the Roman architecture and it allows us to see heritage as an important symbol for our country. We believe that this site should be inscribed on the List under criterion (iv) and we also believe that the situation is favourable for into place the relevant protection measures. We also thank Portugal for giving us more information regarding how they are implementing the recommendations that have been put forward by the Advisory Body. Therefore, we can support the amendment put forward by Brazil. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. The property in question is surely a very important place and deserves to be a World Heritage site. However, Hungary understands that the ICOMOS evaluation is right and well based saying and proposing a referral of the nomination back to the State Party. At the same time Hungary will not go against the consensus of the Committee Members. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all let me thank Portugal for the great file submitted and also the Advisory Body for their very clear and good report submitted. This is an example of a file that if we had an earlier dialogue between the State Party and the Advisory Body, I think a lot of the recommendations and requirements—it's very minor--or continuation of the study--I think this file had more dialogue before the final report it would be ready for inscription. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. Zimbabwe notes that the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte in Braga is a property of exceptional value as ICOMOS itself recognizes and the comparative analysis fully justifies consideration for its World Heritage listing. The only seemingly shortcoming raised in the evaluation report has to do with what is considered a limited understanding of the landscape, its origin and history. We don't share this perspective. On the contrary, we think that substantial information which has been provided by the State Party at different moments of this process gives us sufficient understanding of the historical origin of this property. Concerning the different recommendations contained in the report we have been assured by the State Party of their full implementation so Zimbabwe sees no reason to delay the inscription of this property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Mr Chairperson, while thanking the State Party of Portugal for presenting a very important property for nomination we have the same questions

posed by Brazil, Tunisia, Spain, Azerbaijan and others and would therefore like to make our statement after listening to the State Party of Portugal in response to the questions posed. I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

La Bosnie-Herzégovine rejoint les pays qui ont soutenu cette proposition. Merci.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now may I ask the State Party to give their brief answers to the questions raised in the interventions of the honourable Members of the Committee?

La Délégation du Portugal (Observateur) :

Merci, Monsieur le Président, de m'avoir donné à nouveau la parole. Je remercie aussi les États membres qui sont intervenus et leurs commentaires, et aussi l'ICOMOS pour son évaluation de ce bien et le fait d'avoir reconnu qu'il s'agit en effet d'un bien d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle et qu'il a sa place dans la Liste du patrimoine mondial, je cite. Les distingués délégués du Brésil et de l'Espagne ont déjà relevé les aspects les plus importants qui justifient pleinement à nos yeux l'inscription de ce bien pendant cette session du Comité.

En effet, la seule question de fond suscitée par l'ICOMOS, et qui est répétée tout au long de l'avis, concerne une prétendue insuffisance de la compréhension de l'évolution historique du paysage, ce qui se réduit notamment à l'absence d'une étude approfondie de ce paysage. Ce point vient d'ailleurs d'être soulevé par le distingué délégué du Zimbabwe. En fait, cette étude figurait déjà, mais en portugais, dans le dossier de candidature. Par la suite, une version anglaise de cette même étude fut transmise à l'ICOMOS. J'en ai d'ailleurs une copie ici. Les promoteurs ont aussi répondu d'une façon complète à d'autres questions concernant cet aspect spécifique. Donc, la compréhension du paysage ne peut être que considérée comme suffisante aujourd'hui, et l'authenticité du bien amplement démontrée, tout comme son intégrité, toujours reconnue par l'ICOMOS.

Concernant les recommandations, et je sais que justement cela préoccupe les délégations, nous les reprenons dans leur intégralité, telles que proposées par l'ICOMOS, et je réitère qu'elles seront suivies scrupuleusement et appliquées d'une façon crédible. En fait, elles sont déjà en train d'être mises en œuvre et je peux vous dire, recommandation par recommandation, à quel stade. Mais je voudrais aussi adresser avant tout cette préoccupation concernant le classement de ce monument. Eh bien, ce processus est complet ; le bâtiment, le site est classé, et de toute façon tout site inscrit à la Liste du patrimoine mondial devient automatiquement site classé au Portugal.

Concernant une autre question de M. l'Ambassadeur de Tunisie, que je remercie, sur les critères, nous acceptons le critère (iv), mais c'est vrai que Congonhas, un autre sanctuaire au Brésil qui est l'héritier, enfin, qui a été inspiré par le Bon Jésus du Mont, a lui été classé sous le critère (i) également. Donc si les délégués souhaitent en plus du critère (iv) y ajouter le critère (i), c'est évident que nous n'avons aucune objection.

Alors très rapidement, pour conclure, Monsieur le Président, et répondre aux questions tout à fait compréhensibles des délégations. Concernant la recommandation d'améliorer la documentation, c'est en train d'être fait, et le travail est bien avancé. Finaliser le processus de classement : j'en ai déjà parlé. Obtenir le financement nécessaire ; ce financement est garanti. S'agissant de compléter un plan de gestion afin de pouvoir contrôler la fréquentation des

visiteurs : ce plan existe déjà, il est en train d'être approfondi davantage. Développer les indicateurs : c'est en train d'être fait. Fournir un engagement ferme sur la suppression du bar en terrasse : c'est aussi fait.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

La Délégation du Portugal (Observateur) :

Donc je crois que toutes les recommandations soit sont déjà complètes, soit sont en train de le devenir. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask ICOMOS for their comments?

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. Perhaps the only comments to be made with regard to this landscape issue in particular is that it was a matter for several discussions in accordance with the evaluation process and those points where ICOMOS and the State Party have opportunities to discuss these matters or exchange further information. But through that process, ICOMOS was still left with questions with sufficient doubt that in so far as we could see and understand the connection between the, if you like, built fabric of this property and the religious narrative being presented. There was not the comparable level of understanding of how the landscape contributed if it contributed at all to this property being a sacred property and having a carefully constructed religious theme running through all aspects. Because this is a cultural landscape, ICOMOS felt that it was an important gap in the information available which was the basis for ICOMOS' suggestion for referral.

Just with regard to the study, which I think the honourable delegate from Portugal has referred to, if we are thinking of the same document, this only came through in an English version with the factual error letter that was provided with the State Party so that actually has not been possible for ICOMOS to undertake an assessment of and lastly, I think there was a suggestion of the possibility of adding criterion (i) to the suggested criteria that might be considered. This is not something that was either included within the nomination dossier and its certainly not something that has been considered in any way through the evaluation process. ICOMOS would advise the Committee that this is not a sound suggestion at this stage given the documentation in the evaluation process undertaken.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais d'abord remercier le représentant de l'État partie de nous avoir fourni de très utiles informations pour notre décision, et nous avons écouté avec beaucoup d'intérêt les réponses du représentant de l'ICOMOS. Pour cela, la Tunisie est favorable à une inscription sur la base du critère (iv).

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. Mr Chairperson, Uganda takes note that ICOMOS considers this property as an exceptional one and that the comparative analysis justifies its

inscription on the World Heritage List. We also believe that there is substantial and significant information made available by the State Part fully clarifies the issue of the understanding of the historical origin of the landscape, which now sounds totally satisfactory. As we also have the guarantees from the State Party, that it will fully implement the actions recommended by ICOMOS my delegation finds it appropriate to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as the discussion is coming to the end, I would like to ask the Rapporteur—we have the draft decision proposed by Spain so, please, you are welcome.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As heard, Spain has proposed amendments to this decision, supported by many other Committee Members during the discussion. The first paragraph would remain the same. The second paragraph would read, Inscribes the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte in Braga, Portugal, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of criterion (iv). Then former paragraph 2 a) and b) would be deleted. Paragraph 3 would read, Takes note of the following provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. And for ease of reading I have not included the provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value on the screen to avoid excessive scrolling which makes some of us feel a little ill. But please note that all Committee Members have received that provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value in hard copy so that should have been seen and of course that will follow. Former paragraph 3, now paragraph 4 remains unchanged until g) which is a new subparagraph and that reads, Developing a more complete and detailed study on the understanding of existing plants supplementing the landscape attributes based on this work, and using this information to update management planning for the landscape. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we have to finalize the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

Rapporteur:

Sorry, Mr Chairperson, we have got the provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and all Committee Members have that. I just didn't put it on the screen because we keep scrolling through and it makes everyone...

Chairperson:

So it's fine. We can adopt the document in the version presented here. ICOMOS.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. Just a suggestion for the Committee to consider that with all of these additional recommendations that the standard wording about a report back to the Committee at a future time for consideration of progress with the recommendations would seem well worthwhile.

Chairperson:

Thank you. So we will take it for the note. Can we proceed to the...

Rapporteur:

Sorry, may I just clarify that the Committee would like to include an additional requirement for reporting back or whether that is not something the Committee would like to include?

Chairperson:

Brazil?

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I think for the sake of consistency with other decisions that have been taken in that sense we would take on board ICOMOS' suggestion and recommend the State Party to report perhaps by 2021?

Chairperson:

That is reasonable.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you

Chairperson:

Thank you. So in this version we can approve the document as proposed by Spain and supported by other delegates for the inscription and the version of the draft is...Please.

Rapporteur:

Apologies. We were typing that very quickly. It would be required by 1 December 2020, the report if it is for examination in 2021, so just confirming 1 December for the submission.

Chairperson:

Yes, got it, got it. Okay. So, thank you very much. I declare... Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Monsieur le Président, nous aimerions revenir sur le paragraphe g). Ça pose un problème de formulation. Je pense qu'on pourrait proposer la formule suivante : « développer une étude complète et détaillée sur les attributs... ». Je reprends : « développer une étude complète et détaillée sur les végétaux ». Merci.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. I would just like to confirm that paragraph, developing a more complete and detailed study on the understanding, or, developing a more complete and detailed study on the attributes of existing plants? I might just suggest that attributes has a very specific meaning in terms of the Convention and whether understanding may be more appropriate but of course it's up to the Committee to decide on the language.

Chairperson:

Angola.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Oui, je suis d'accord, on peut ajouter « sur les attributs des végétaux existants ». Voilà. Merci.

Rapporteur:

Okay, so I think we are clear now in the French to add attributes but to leave as understanding the English, which I think, is the same or more appropriate meaning.

Chairperson:

Can we accept this version? Thank you. Therefore decision 43 COM 8B.31 is approved in the new version.

Chairperson:

[*Applause*] We congratulate on behalf of all Committee Members the State Party of Portugal and I would like to give the floor once more to the State Party. Welcome.

La Délégation du Portugal (Observateur) :

Merci beaucoup, merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président. C'est un grand plaisir et un honneur que l'inscription de ce bien, parce que la culture et le patrimoine pour nous ne sont pas les monuments, mais les monuments dans leur relation avec les personnes ; et dans nos mains il n'y a pas de pierres mortes, toutes les pierres deviennent vivantes. Nous remercions beaucoup le Brésil, l'Espagne, tous les membres du Comité, l'ICOMOS et l'UNESCO. Le sanctuaire du Bon Jésus du Mont est un espace extraordinaire de vie, de personnes, de religiosité, de tolérance, de convivialité. C'est un bien commun, dans le sens le plus fort du terme. C'est un lieu de présence multiple, de partage et de coopération, et nous savons tous et toutes que les grands moments, les grandes avancées de l'humanité ont été faits à travers la coopération et non à travers la compétition et le conflit. Enraciné dans la communauté locale, ouvert à tous et à toutes, le Bon Jésus du Mont se projette maintenant dans le monde comme patrimoine mondial de tolérance et de paix. Merci beaucoup pour votre décision d'inscription et permettez-moi de donner la parole au représentant de la confrérie qui est responsable du sanctuaire.

Representative of the Sanctuary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson, thank you Ambassadors. On behalf of the Confraternity of the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte in Braga, I want to thank all the Members of the Committee for the inscription of the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte on the World Heritage List of UNESCO as well as the collaboration of the World Heritage Centre. We thank ICOMOS for the recommendations provided. The Confraternity of Bom Jesus will take them in full consideration. And we also thank those who have participated in the preparation of the nomination and I remember all the generations before that built and have cared for the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus. We are proud and happy that the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus is on the List. It is an architectural and landscape ensemble, which has been built and enhanced over a period of over 600 years reaching a unique formal and symbolic complexity and a monumental character with no precedence in the context of Europe sacred mounts. This is the end of a 20 years-long period of conservation and rehabilitation of the Sanctuary. A new chapter starts today in the life of the Sanctuary. It is our intention to be the promoter of the World Heritage Convention and deepen our cooperation with other World Heritage sites seeking to best practices for heritage conservation, management, use and communication. We look forward to having you in Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte in Braga and the very old city of Braga. Thank you very much. [*Applause*]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much and once more our congratulations.

Now we can proceed to the next item to be considered. This is 8B.32 connected with Monuments of Ancient Pskov from the Russian Federation. May I ask Mr Balsamo for comments?

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the nomination of the Monuments of Ancient Pskov and this notification also has impacts on the proposed statement of OUV of the site. This is found on page 121 in the English version of document INF.8B.4 and on page 67 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

May I ask ICOMOS to present the file?

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Monuments of Ancient Pskov are located in the historic city of Pskov in the northwest of Russia. The originally nominated property included 18 serial components composed of two fortifications and one bell tower, two monasteries, three cathedrals, 11 churches and three administrative chambers. Seventeen components are located in the historic centre of the city of Pskov, while the ensemble of Snetogorsky Monastery is situated to the north-west on the right bank of the Velikaya River.

The two examples of fortification architecture are the 15th century Pokrovskaya Tower, previously an integral component of a larger fortress and the 16th century Gremyachaya Tower, which is part of the previously extensive fortification walls on Gremyachaya Hill. However, both of these in ICOMOS' view do not make a relevant contribution to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Two complexes of administrative chambers were also included, one in the Pskov Kremlin and the Pogankin Chambers within the outer part of the historic centre, both dating to the 17th century. Likewise, these were also not seen as making a significant contribution to the property's OUV.

Exceptional among the Pskov monuments, however, are the churches, both individually and at times in monastic structures, which illustrate the architectural mastery as well as decorative ornaments produced by the Pskov School of Architecture. The Pskov School developed from the earlier Novgorod School and was formally established as an independent School in the 14th century. It became most influential in the 16th and 17th centuries, after Pskov entered the Russian State. The School is known for its architectural works, which illustrate simplicity in form, and similarity among a range of built monuments, often featuring asymmetries, integration of their natural setting, and organic architectural forms. The mastery of the School's output is transmitted in these religious structures, which are characterised by added spaces such as side-chapels, vestries, narthexes, porches, galleries and belfries. These churches are the best-preserved testimony of the School's output.

Out of the initially proposed 14 churches and cathedrals, ICOMOS considers that 10 meet the high benchmark of Outstanding Universal Value. These 10 selected churches and cathedrals maintained their immediate property settings in the form of access routes, gardens, fences, as well as vegetation, which contribute to the traditional atmosphere of these spiritual abodes and integrate their natural surroundings with continued religious use. ICOMOS considers that these 10 component sites of the serial nomination meet criterion (ii) and the conditions of integrity and authenticity.

ICOMOS further considers that the boundaries should be revised in line with the reduced component selection and that monitoring indicators and the visitor management strategy could be strengthened. ICOMOS recommends the inscription of a reduced series of 10 churches and cathedrals as indicated in the draft decision under criterion (ii). The additional recommendations address the before mentioned issued and are included in your draft decision. Thank your very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you ICOMOS for the presentation. Azerbaijan, you wanted the floor.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We thank ICOMOS for its report. The Pskov is one of the best representations of Russian history of its statehood and the Orthodox Church. We are very surprised that this is the first time that it is inscribed so it's not inscribed for a long period of time before. For us this Pskov is one of the best examples of this school of architecture, which is recognized as one of the most artistic and original in the Russian Federation and even beyond as it inspired a lot of artists across Russian and beyond to develop the architectural skills. In that sense we believe that this site has an exceptional value for all humanity. Integrity and authenticity are also met. Conservation measures, protection and management are intact with the ICOMOS requirements. What is left is just to congratulate the State Party and ICOMOS for this exemplary work and congratulations for the inscription of this site. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China congratulates the State Party of Russia for the Monuments of Ancient Pskov to be included on the World Heritage List and appreciates the Russian government for adding to the World Heritage List a masterpiece of an important architectural School that has had wide influence. China also appreciates the professional evaluation opinion given by ICOMOS. We concur with the point made by Azerbaijan and we really want to congratulate Russia again. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway welcomes this site to the World Heritage List. Pskov is not only one of Russia's oldest and most interesting cities, it's the home of one of the world's most important schools of architecture. The School and the religious buildings in Pskov are so beautiful in the way that they are such a refined and clarified form. These buildings express a kind of purity and spirituality that harmonizes so well their surroundings. No wonder that the Pskov School of Architecture has had such a great influence in Russia. Congratulations, Russia [*Russian spoken*], with the site Churches of the Pskov School of Architecture. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Brazilian delegation would like to congratulate the Russian Federation for this very important nomination, which features a cradle of Russia culture. We understand that this nomination for its geopolitical and historic significance reflects the essence of Russia's civilization and deserves rightful recognition as a World Heritage site. We commend the Russian Federation for the consistent work carried out by experts for more than one decade that resulted in this very successful accomplishment. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. The Zimbabwe delegation would like to thank ICOMOS for the extensive review of the nomination presented by the State Party of Russia. We also commend the State Party for the excellent nomination, which recognizes that there are different architectural traditions in the world. These architectural traditions are represented in different styles and decorative elements produced by the School of Architecture between the 12th and 17th centuries. Zimbabwe supports the recommendation of the Advisory Body to nominate the property on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. Hungary congratulates the State Party for this excellent nomination first of all because this property is really very important both in historical and in architectural respects. It was emphasized also in the evaluation of ICOMOS. Thank you for this evaluation and Hungary fully supports the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We join in the congratulations on the inscription of Monuments of Ancient Pskov on the World Heritage List. We also noted that there were extensive information exchanges between ICOMOS and the State Party in order to get all the information and evaluate this file. We thank again.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. We would like to sincerely commend the Russian Federation for this nomination file that they have brought to us. If we look at the examples that come afterwards, it can have an affect on what comes afterwards. This architectural school is one in itself but it also affected the architectural development in many other areas as well so it's very important that we remember the origins of certain sites and cultures and that someone has made contributions that lead to the flourishing of a whole religious, architectural development in a whole region of the world. This is an example of where there was the start and then spread out into the architecture of a religious system that has created a beautiful world heritage for all of us. Thank you very much ICOMOS for the report they have given us and to the Russian Federation as well for having carried out the amount of work that they did to give us this exemplary example of architecture. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

We would like to congratulate because this architecture can be an inspiration to contemporary architects to learn something after five centuries of work. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask all honourable Members of the Committee--are there any other opinions or objections to the draft proposed by ICOMOS? I don't see any. Do we have any additions, Rapporteur?

Rapporteur:

No amendments, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

So there are no amendments. Therefore, I would like to declare decision 43 COM 8B.32 adopted as amended [*applause*].

[*Interpretation from Russian*] We would like to congratulate the delegation of the Russian Federation on the inscription of these monuments on the World Heritage List.

[*English spoken*] Our congratulations to the Russian Federation. The floor is yours, please.

Russia Federation:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, I would like to express our deep gratitude to ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre and all Members of the Committee for the inscription of our nomination to the World Heritage List. The city of Pskov with its richest heritage is very dear to our hearts. It is one of those ancient Russian cities, which constitute the credo of our culture and civilization. But it is also a part of European history and culture. It should have been on the List long ago and we are happy that this long-awaited moment of inscription has finally arrived. Mr Chairperson, with your permission Madam Yemelianova, First Vice-Governor of the region of Pskov would like to say a few words.

Ms Yemelianova:

[*Interpretation from Russian*]

Dear Members of the World Heritage Committee, we thank you for your support of our nomination of the Churches of Pskov School of Architecture. We are highly honoured. We are grateful to ICOMOS for the work they have done while evaluating the Pskov nomination. We thank sunny Azerbaijan for the warm hospitality. I think this a mutually enriching and creative partnership. The monuments of Pskov School of architecture are the embodiment of the spirit of Russian national culture. They are exquisitely simple and modest, laconic and genuine, picturesquely asymmetrical; hold a great emotional strength, deepness and sincerity. The Pskov School of architecture has had an influence on the development of church architecture in and outside Russia. Being a source of inspiration for architects from Brazilian Rio de Janeiro to Italian Bari. We completely understand the responsibility we hold after the inclusion of Pskov monuments of church architecture on the World Heritage List. We will do everything possible to ensure the implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee and the preservation of Pskov architectural masterpieces for future generations, for the sake of high spiritual and moral values and preservation of the world's cultural diversity. Thank you very much. [*applause*]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination Risco Caído and the Sacred Mountains of Gran Canaria Cultural Landscape, Spain. ICOMOS you have the floor.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Risco Caído and the Sacred Mountains of Gran Canaria Cultural Landscape encompass a central mountainous area on Gran Canaria Island, sheltered by the Caldera de Tejedá, and formed of cliffs, ravines and volcanic formations. The property contains a large number of troglodyte settlements, which bear witness to the efforts of the island's original inhabitants to adapt to a difficult environment. Its size is around 9.5 hectares.

The property contains a set of manifestations of an extinct insular culture that seems to have evolved in total isolation, until the arrival of the first Berbers from the North and later the Spanish conquest. The inscriptions, similar to those found in the Maghreb region, provide proof of the local presence of a pre-Hispanic culture on the island. The troglodyte settlements consist of habitats, granaries, and cisterns, together with sites containing a large number of cave art images. The early Canarians preferred areas dominated by volcanic material and tuff sands, which were relatively easy to sculpt using stone or bone tools.

The cavities, referred to as “temples” or “almogarenes” are documented throughout the island of Gran Canaria and are suspected to have been created as astronomical markers and to be linked to a possible cult related to the stars and Mother Earth. Risco Caído was carefully sculpted, with a perfectly symmetrical vault and a window open to the sky. The specific geometry of the cave enables the illumination by the first rays of the sun of certain decorative elements at successive periods of the year.

The archaeological sites of Risco Caído and the Sacred Mountains of Gran Canaria illustrate an exceptional testimony to this extinct insular culture that seems to have evolved in isolation for more than 1,500 years. Its vestiges survived in time and space, shaping the landscape and facilitating traditional land management practices such as transhumance, terrace-farming installations, and water management.

ICOMOS considers that the property meets criteria (iii) and (v) and that the qualifying conditions of authenticity and integrity have been met. ICOMOS further considers property boundaries and protection are adequate and that merely some elements of the management system could be further improved. ICOMOS recommends that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List and further requests the State Party to strengthen some management mechanisms as outlined in the additional recommendations. Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson.

H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil) takes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Thank you. I would like to know if there are any comments concerning this nomination? Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Australia would sincerely like to thank Spain for putting forward this nomination. We were absolutely fascinated by this extraordinary cultural landscape and the descriptions of the site's astronomical significance, cave art stone constructions connected by a network ancient of paths that continued to be used by local communities. The inscription of this property greatly enriches the diversity of values and places on the World Heritage List, particularly in the expression of landscape of tangible and intangible

values, the lives and beliefs of past and present communities and their interactions with the environment. We fully support inscription. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor. Thank you.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. La Tunisie voudrait remercier l'État partie et le féliciter de nous avoir fourni un très beau dossier et un cas extrêmement intéressant dans ces belles îles des Canaries. Ce site troglodyte et cet habitat exceptionnel que l'on retrouve un peu partout sur le pourtour méditerranéen est particulièrement remarquable et exceptionnel dans ce cadre insulaire. Nous trouvons que c'est un très beau site qui mérite sa place sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et nous rejoignons, bien entendu, l'organe consultatif dans son appréciation de la vérification des critères (iii) et (v). Donc nous sommes très heureux d'appuyer cette inscription et de féliciter l'État partie de nous offrir un si beau dossier. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. First of all let me thank the State Party of Spain for the great nomination and also the Advisory Body for the great report. Just one last thing for Spain--thank you so much for the great job. You made our job so easy. We definitely support the nomination. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. China congratulates Spain's Risco Caído and the Sacred Mountains of Gran Canaria Cultural Landscape to be included on the World Heritage List. This is a very unique cultural landscape. The archaeological sites, rock art manifestations, grand geomorphology and ecosystem diversity are testimony to an extinct insular culture that seems to have evolved in isolation for more than 1,500 years. China also appreciates ICOMOS' recommendations to strengthen the research development monitoring programme, disaster prevention plan and tourism strategy for an extraordinary cultural landscape and implement the management model that involves the participation from different stakeholders. China also believes that Spain as a major cultural heritage country can protect and carry forward another World Heritage. We fully support inscription. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil.

The Delegation of Brazil:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. I would merely like to commend Spain for this exceptional nomination. This is an outstanding cultural landscape that has tangible traces of the wisdom of prehistoric men and women. Moreover, the beauty of the site is inspiring. We would like to congratulate Spain for the excellent work that they have done which deserves its place on the World Heritage List and very much respects the Global Strategy thereof.

Chairperson:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. Cuba would like to thank the State Party, the Kingdom of Spain for having contributed with this nomination file in creating more balance and credibility of the List and also for the recognition of these extinct cultures. Cuba expressly supports inclusion on the List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania wishes to congratulate Spain for this innovative nomination. Tanzania also commends ICOMOS for the thorough analysis and recommendations and conclusions. Tanzania supports the draft decision to inscribe this property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Azerbaijan also joins the previous speakers in congratulating the State Party for this nomination. It is not only a testimony to the exceptional architectural and rock art but it's also a very beautiful site. Congratulations. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We also would like to thank the excellent quality of this nomination file presented by the State Party and the detailed analysis made thereof by ICOMOS. This is a valuable site that will be strengthening the World Heritage List as some Members of the Committee have already mentioned. This site connects landscape, astronomy, nature and early development of humanity showing a deep-growing knowledge by the inhabitants of the island at a time that goes so far back in the past. It shows the extent to which they understood nature and the universe. We think criteria (iii) and (v) have been proven, integrity and conservation of the site are adequate as well and we also take note of the small measures for improvement—the management system that should be implemented by the State Party and we are sure that they will do so. Guatemala would like to commend the State Party of Spain for this nomination. We support its inscription on the World Heritage List. It is an exceptional site that shows proof of an age that must be preserved as part of universal history. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any more comments? If not I would ask our Rapporteur if there are any amendments proposed to this draft decision?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We've received no amendments.

Chairperson:

Well after having heard such favourable comments of welcoming this decision it is with great pleasure that we declare this decision 43 COM 8B.33 approved [*applause*]. Thank you. We would like to commend the Spanish delegation on behalf of all the Members of this Committee and I'd like to ask them to take the floor. Thank you very much. The floor is yours, Spain.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. We would like to express our thanks to Azerbaijan for having organized this 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee and the Ministry of Sports and Culture would like to thank ICOMOS for its excellent work as well as the Members of the Committee for their comments where they welcome the inclusion of this property on the World Heritage List. We would also like to thank the World Heritage Centre for its commitment with the Convention. With this inscription Spain is adding one more property, which is an example of the island cultural landscape and shows the cultural diversity that exists in our country. I would like to let our representative of the Canary Islands, the Director of Heritage take the floor now.

Representative:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Madam Chairperson, on behalf of the government of the Canaries, we would like to thank ICOMOS and the Members of the Committee for giving us the honor to be part of the World Heritage List from today on. The world adapts to the new rules and is sometime losing its cultural manifestations including the troglodyte habitat but the original people are not disappearing from the island. Actually, their image is found within the big transformations that we've seen in the new social political status that can be found in the Canary Islands. This is to a great extent exactly what we are celebrating today here in Baku, recognition of the people of the Canary Islands; we are the sons and daughters of those first islanders who came before us in this marvellous land that knows how to take care of its cultural heritage. We are very proud and very touched to be able to share in this declaration and to see that this is becoming an example of this human adventure of which from ancestral times in a collective memory all people of the Canary Islands have been part of. This is a challenge and a responsibility for us and for the entire world paying attention to the way in which we take care of the Risco Caído and the Sacred Mountains of Gran Canaria Cultural Landscape. Thank you very much [*applause*].

Another representative:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Madam Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and president of the government, on behalf of our people of the Canaries we would like to welcome the recognition that is given to us by the Members of the Committee and those who have signed the Convention as well thanks to which this site is now on the World Heritage List. We have always been aware of the fact that nomination of the Sacred Mountains of Gran Canaria nomination was not really an objective but rather a setting that allowed us to move towards recognizing this and validating it for future generations. It is a heritage that all of you have recognized today; you have recognized its Outstanding Universal Value and it's a place that is an example of the odyssey of cultures of the islands, territories which were trapped between the heavens and sea that also have taken advantage of their Amazigh roots, which have been maintained throughout time by those who have lived on the islands of the Canaries. Thank you to all who have made it possible for this to happen today. Madam Chairperson we would just like to ask you that just for a few seconds if you can listen please to the sounds of those islands, sounds of the past that we can still hear in our memory today. [*castanets are played*] [*applause*]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Jodrell Bank Observatory, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. ICOMOS you have the floor.

ICOMOS:

Thank you Madam Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found at page 349 in the English version and page 386 in the French version of document 43 COM/INF.8B1.

The Jodrell Bank Observatory is one the earliest radio astronomy observatories in the world and is located in a rural area in northwest England. The Observatory played a pioneering role in human understanding of the Universe from the 1940s. The site encompasses a number of radio telescopes and supporting functional buildings, including the iconic Lovell Telescope and large Mark II Telescope and it is surrounded by open countryside, which, importantly, is free from radio interference. The Observatory is now the hub of the United Kingdom's national wide array of up to seven radio telescopes including the Lovell and Mark II Telescopes.

ICOMOS found that the comparative analysis justifies consideration of this property for the World Heritage List and notes that it relies upon the two-part ICOMOS-International Astronomical Union thematic study on astronomy and archaeo-astronomy. ICOMOS considers that the nominated property meets criteria (i), (ii), (iv) and (vi). Jodrell Bank Observatory is a masterpiece of human creative genius related to its scientific and technical achievements. The adaptation and development of radar and radio frequency reflectivity to develop radically new equipment were a key part in the development of entirely new fields of scientific research and led to a dramatic change in the understanding of the Universe.

The Observatory represents an important interchange of human values on a global scale on developments in technology related to radio astronomy. The scientific work at Jodrell Bank was at the heart of a global collaborative network, and important technological developments were influential in many parts of the world. Jodrell Bank represents an outstanding example of a technological ensemble, which illustrates the transition from traditional optical astronomy to radio astronomy and the associated consequence for the understanding of the Universe.

The property is also associated with the peacetime development of what is called "Big Science" as a major change in the way in which scientific research was supported and undertaken. The surviving evidence related to the evolutionary development of radio astronomy makes Jodrell Bank an outstanding example of such a technological ensemble. Jodrell Bank is directly and tangibly associated with events and ideas of outstanding universal significance. Understanding of the nature and scale of the Universe has been dramatically changed by research in radio astronomy at the Observatory.

The property boundary has been drawn to incorporate a minimal area, nonetheless it has been defined so as to include all the attributes that belong to and represent the history of Jodrell Bank as a property of Outstanding Universal Value related to pioneering astronomical research. The proposed buffer zone corresponds to an existing and legally based Consultation Zone established in 1973 to protect Jodrell Bank from radio emissions in its vicinity. The structures at the Observatory have been subject to modifications, repairs and upgrade works since the 1960s.

ICOMOS considers that the state of conservation is generally good. The main factors affecting the property are development within the property or in the area surrounding it, and maintenance of the large steel structure of the Lovell Telescope. However, there are generally few factors that might pose a threat to the property and its proposed Outstanding Universal Value. In this context, ICOMOS considers that the requirements of integrity and authenticity

have been met. Conservation measures for the Observatory are generally adequate. Ongoing care will be needed to respect and portray the historical character of the buildings and site development, recognising the relatively primitive character of some buildings and the historical changes undertaken with little regard to aesthetics or quality construction.

The arrangements for protection and management are adequate and the monitoring approach for the Observatory is generally satisfactory. There is a management structure including the site's main user groups, heritage management is integrated with research, operations and engineering functions, a conservation management plan and detailed site gazetteer are key management documents, and heritage management is supported by a range of specialist staff.

ICOMOS therefore recommends the property for inscription on the World Heritage List on the grounds of criteria (i), (ii), (iv) and (vi), and the draft decision with additional recommendations that can be found on page 49 of the working document WHC/19/43.COM.8B. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, ICOMOS. I would like to know whether there are any comments concerning this nomination? Spain, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. The Spanish delegation is very happy with this file which just like the one before it is linked to astronomy completely in line with the thematic studies that have been carried out by ICOMOS linked to science, technology and astronomy. We can perhaps say that there was a shortcoming or a gap on the List with regard to observatories and that gap has now been filled. Here we are protecting scientific knowledge and believe that this is a reason to celebrate because this observatory was at the service of science even during times of conflict and it brings us up to the current day's inscription so congratulations to the United Kingdom and we should all congratulate the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Madam Chairperson this property is a marvel of state-of-the-art observatory science and technology in all manners of sophistication and is supported by an impressive nomination dossier worthy of inscription on the World Heritage List. In that regard my delegation supports the draft decision towards inscription of the property on the World heritage List and I congratulate the State Party of the United Kingdom. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Norway finds it easy to join the congratulations to the distinguished State Party of the United Kingdom for this excellent nomination. We hope that the World Heritage status will provide inspiration for further ground-breaking research at the Jodrell Bank Observatory. The Committee is invited to inscribe this property with just a few recommendations and with no request to be added to the workload of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies. We believe that the few recommendations that are given should be in comfortable reach for the responsible entities to fulfil. So hopefully, by deciding upon an

inscription the Committee in this case will not clear the ground for another almost endless row of mission reports and concerns in the future. Now the 20th century and modern technology of radio astronomy will be represented on the World Heritage List beside the earlier inscribed sites representing the preceding optical methods. A gap is then filled in regard to this very specific but significant type of cultural heritage. So here, Europe really contributes to the adequacy of the Convention. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Je passe maintenant la parole à la délégation de la Tunisie. S'il vous plaît.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci beaucoup, Madame la Présidente. Je voudrais au nom de la Tunisie féliciter la Grande-Bretagne de porter un dossier extrêmement important. Notre délégation a pris l'habitude d'intervenir de manière spécifique lorsque le Comité est saisi de dossiers qui touchent plusieurs thématiques importantes pour l'UNESCO. En voici un qui le démontre de fort belle manière. Je crois que, tout d'abord, la solidité du dossier se vérifie quant à la confirmation par l'organe consultatif de la présence d'au moins quatre critères susceptibles de justifier son inscription, ce que la Tunisie confirme et appuie. Mais ce dossier nous paraît aussi extrêmement important puisqu'il touche à la fois à la question de la culture, à la science, mais également à la pédagogie et donc à l'éducation. Il est donc au cœur de ce triple centre d'intérêt de notre Organisation et c'est pour ça qu'il nous paraît non seulement mériter l'inscription mais aussi toutes nos félicitations à l'État partie. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. Now I give the floor to Cuba. You have the floor.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. With this nomination, just like the one before it, we recognize the creativity and contribution to the World Heritage List. We think this is a very solid nomination not only in terms of its Outstanding Universal Value but also in terms of the procedure that was followed in order to achieve this inscription. It has been recognized based on four of the criteria linked to the Convention so we support this inscription on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, distinguished delegate from Cuba. Now I give the floor to Brazil.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We would like to commend the State Party of the United Kingdom for presenting this very robust nomination. As we've just heard from ICOMOS in its evaluation how substantive work has been done to present this nomination. We think that this session in Baku will be a landmark in terms of World Heritage related to astronomy. We have just inscribed a property in Spain that relates to astronomy in its prehistory and now we jump all the way to the 20th century with this property. We have also inscribed the city of Jaipur in this session, which also hosts an astronomical observatory, which is already inscribed on the World Heritage List. So with this inscription that we are about to adopt we believe that we have filled an important gap in the narrative of how heritage contributes to astronomy. On that note, we fully support and commend the United Kingdom for this nomination. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. After this massive expression of support I would like to ask if there are any more comments. I don't see any more comments so in this case I would like to ask our Rapporteur whether we have any amendments to the proposed draft decision. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We have no proposed amendments to this draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

In view of the report of the Rapporteur it is with great pleasure that this Committee declares approved decision 43 COM 8B.35. Approved. Thank you [*applause*]. I would like to congratulate in the name of all Committee Members the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on behalf of all of this for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. You have the floor. Thank you, United Kingdom.

The Observer Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Humanity has always regarded the skies above us with wonder and curiosity and we have longed been driven to learn about what lies beyond our planets. For many thousands of years, the exploration of the wider universe was limited to what we could see through the visible spectrum of light. It was only in very recent history with the development of radio astronomy that we have been able to apply new methods of studying our universe beyond what we can see with our eyes. Jodrell Bank Observatory played a pivotal role in the development of this new field of astronomy.

Thanks to the World Heritage Committee, the Observatory is now recognized as a masterpiece of human creative genius. And as the distinguished delegate of Tunisia has just acknowledged, this site embraces the breadth of UNESCO responsibilities across education science and culture.

On behalf of Her Majesty's Government, I would wish to thank the Members of the Committee for inscribing this exceptional site on the World Heritage List and I would like to thank the excellent team at the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their analysis and scrutiny of the nomination. This inscription will ensure that Jodrell Bank Observatory continues to inspire young people and future generations to engage with science and technology, to explore space, the final frontier and to boldly go where no one has gone before! As with any World Heritage site success has many parents. I wish to congratulate the University of Manchester and in particular, Professors Teresa Anderson and Tim O'Brien for their work in preparing the nomination. With your permission, Madam Chairperson, I will pass the microphone to Professor Anderson to say a few words.

Professor Anderson:

Thank you. On behalf of all the people of Jodrell Bank Observatory the University of Manchester and those who are a part of our wider community, we would also like to thank the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and all the Advisory Bodies. And of course our thanks go to the World Heritage team in the UK--some of whom are with us today—for all their invaluable advice and support throughout the process of nomination. Jodrell Bank Observatory as you have seen is a place of iconic telescopes and simple buildings, a place where people come together from nations across the world to explore some of the biggest questions facing humanity—How did the universe begin? How did the stars and planets form? Does life exist beyond the Earth? We are proud and humbled now to sit along side other more ancient observatories on the World Heritage List recognizing that we are taking only the most

recent steps on humanities long journey towards understanding our place in the universe. Thank you, again [applause].

Chairperson:

I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace, Azerbaijan. The Draft Decision concerning this nomination can be found in document 8B.Add. Before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr Balsamo you have the floor.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Just to remind the Committee that we received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace, and this notification is on page 40 in the English version of document INF.8B.4 and on page 45 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you have the floor.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The historic town of Sheki is situated in the central North of Azerbaijan along the southern edge of the Greater Caucasian mountain range. Sheki's historic centre was built as a reconstruction of an earlier town after mud floods in 1772 and is characterized by a traditional architectural ensemble of houses with high saddle roofs. Located along important historic trade routes, the architecture was influenced by Safavid, Qajar and Russian the building traditions. The Khan's Palace in the northeast of the town together with various merchants' houses reflect the wealth generated by silkworm breeding and trading of silk cocoons in the late 18th and 19th centuries.

This is a referred nomination. In its 2017 evaluation of the original nomination, ICOMOS recommended that the property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List. At the 44th session in 2017, the World Heritage Committee referred the nomination back to the State Party in order to further advance conservation and management mechanisms and recommended that the State Party prepare an action plan for conservation and preservation of the nominated property. In February 2019, the State Party submitted supplementary information related only to conservation and protection. As a revised nomination dossier has not been submitted and as no further mission has been undertaken, the sections in the ICOMOS evaluation report on description, history, justification of OUV, factors affecting the boundaries and ownership remain unchanged from ICOMOS' first evaluation. Our new text thus relates only to the supplementary information that has been submitted.

The nominated area corresponds to the historic quarter Sheki and covers an area of approximately 120 hectares and is surrounded by a buffer zone. Although the history of Sheki dates back at least two millennia, the current historic town was built around 30 years after the establishment of the Sheki Khanate in 1743, when the old settlement was destroyed by flooding and rebuilt on higher ground. The town soon regained its prosperity on the basis of trade particularly in silk, along the well-established trade routes to which it had long been linked. The traditional Sheki houses in the new town were each enclosed by high walls within which were residential buildings of mud bricks in timber frames and plasters and painted in ochre colors. Many houses have deep verandas facing in a southerly direction and around them planted with mulberry trees to feed the silkworms the gardens produced cocoons that were a source of wealth for the city. Today, only some 4% of house still remain from this founding period.

A mere 18 years after the city was founded, the short-lived Sheki khanate was abolished by the Russian Empire. Some 60% of buildings now reflect this period of Russian administration while a third belong to the more recent Soviet period after 1920. The form of the city as we see it today is thus a mosaic of these different periods.

Unfortunately, in the late 20th century, renovations that did not comply with adequate international conservation standards have partially changed the character of Sheki as a traditional settlement. The historic centre of the town was its citadel built in 1790 alongside the major trade route and a key focus of trading activities. Throughout the 19th century, Sheki remained a trade town under Russian military control. Sericulture blossomed, factories were built with machinery imported from Italy and France and the resulting silk exported widely to Europe. By the early 20th century there were some 127 factories in the town. Sadly, little remains of these industrial enterprises and the one or two buildings that do survive are in private ownership. After a fire in the town in 1852 the area around the centre near the citadel was remodelled and the Russian presence is reflected in the new buildings of river stone and fired brick. The wealth generated by the renaissance in trade in the 19th century was also reflected in the houses of merchants with their constructions being significantly different from the more modest earlier forms.

At the height of its trading activities, the town had five caravanserais to service the large number of caravans traversing the routes. Two survive, one of which is now a hotel. The Khan's palace within the citadel was initially built in 1797 during the reign of Mammad Hasan Khan. This is the only remaining structure of the much larger original palatial complex designed by the Persian architect Haji Zainal Abdul. Its lavish decorations include a mosaic of colored glass set in a wooden latticework on the entire southern elevation and elaborate interior plaster work in frescoes painted at different times. The palace underwent major restorations in 1955-65 and again in 2002.

As no new information has been provided on the justification for inscription, integrity and authenticity, these parts of ICOMOS' evaluation have not altered from our first text. We would like to recall we could not see the potential for the property to demonstrate the proposed criteria and that integrity and authenticity had been affected by past and recent developments and restorations and could not meet the necessary levels and that overall, the property could not justify Outstanding Universal Value. In our first evaluation, ICOMOS provided recommendations on conservation management, capacity building and the protection of setting.

The supplementary information provided by the State Party in January 2019 includes an action plan for the conservation and rehabilitation of the historic centre of Sheki and the restoration manual. The action plan provides an assessment of the conservation challenges that face the historic town and its landscape setting. It is an aspirational document that analyses the conservation threats and challenges but does not provide more than a general approach to how these might be addressed. The restoration manual is seen as a code of practice for operators involved in the management and recovery of the historic city. The action plan and the restoration manual are both useful resource and guidance documents that could and should form the basis for the development of planning guidelines and perhaps stronger protection for individual buildings. Currently, the documents have no status nor are there formal means of implementation in place.

In summary, ICOMOS thus has not been in a position to reassess the potential significance of the property, nor to reconsider the recommendations of its first evaluation, as no additional information on these aspects had been requested nor received. ICOMOS considers that this referred back nomination confirms the need for a further review of the referral back process as decided by the Committee at its last session.

In conclusion, Chairperson, noting that no new information relating to the potential significance of the property has been submitted, which would have allowed ICOMOS to reassess this aspect of the property, ICOMOS reiterates its first recommendation and recommends that the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's palace, Azerbaijan should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your report. I would like to know whether there are any comments by Members of the Committee? Kuwait, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Dear Committee Members, we have here a decision, not a draft decision, a decision that was taken two years ago by a large-- most of the Members of the Committee were involved in that decision and the decision stated for the dossier it was referral with a very specific requirement—a very specific requirement—I say it again—about the state of conservation and the management. And the State Party, it took them two years to prepare this report thoroughly. It took them two years, the reason for that, they made sure all the requirements were met according that the decision, not the draft decision.

They established a Presidential Decree in October 2018, to make sure all those implementations to be implemented to the highest level. They initiated Governmental identity. They allocated manpower, human resources for that. They have been trained and allocated for those to implement those in that decision, not in the draft decision. They brought also international experts, well known within the Advisory Body. No one can question their ability, again to prepare those documents. After all that we believe that all the requirements were met for that decision two years ago. That is why the State of Kuwait submitted a draft amendment to inscribe this on the given document.

One more thing, Madam Chairperson and dear Committee Members, this Committee is the heart of UNESCO. This is the intergovernmental committee that the decision comes out of this committee as our cultures. What would happen if we don't respect and implement our own decisions? I think we are going to lose our procedures, we are going to lose our—again, let me say it again, we are going to lose our integrity. I've been hearing the word procedure and integrity so many times in the last few days in Spanish, French and English. Everyone focusing on integrity and the procedure of this Committee and this is the only way we can implement them through our own decisions. How can we face the international community, the local community, the local government, the States Parties if we don't implement our own decisions? I think this is a turning point in history and for sure again, you know, I'm highlighting for sure, the State of Kuwait does not want to be part of a Committee that has lost its integrity. That is why once again I am submitting a draft resolution to inscribe the dossier. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you, Kuwait. Angola.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier l'ICOMOS et l'État partie d'avoir soumis à notre appréciation ce dossier qui nous paraît être assez complexe, non en termes de qualité scientifique, mais peut-être complexe en termes d'avis émis et de la décision qui doit être prise. Je pense, Monsieur le Président, que nous devons faire fonctionner nos intelligences et peut-être contrôler également nos émotions par rapport à ce dossier. Je commencerai par revenir un peu en arrière, deux ans en arrière. Le Comité avait renvoyé ce dossier pour que l'État partie complète quelques pièces, notamment le mécanisme de

conservation et de préservation, et également l'élaboration d'un plan d'action pour la conservation et la préservation du bien. Ça, c'est la décision prise en 2017, d'accord.

Je partirai sur deux hypothèses. La première hypothèse serait que, même si l'État partie n'avait pas soumis ces pièces, la logique serait de maintenir la même décision. C'est la première chose, la première hypothèse. Je ne mentionne même pas s'ils ont remis ou pas. Donc même s'ils ne les avaient pas remis, la décision serait maintenue : renvoi. La deuxième hypothèse est que peut-être l'État partie s'est donné le travail de développer un nouveau dossier. Il se sentait peut-être capable de soumettre un nouveau dossier pour un nouvel examen. Donc l'avis émis par l'ICOMOS se base peut-être sur un nouveau dossier soumis par l'État partie. Je parle d'hypothèses, je ne confirme rien.

Ceci étant, nous aimerions, avant que nous puissions donner notre avis, écouter l'ICOMOS. Est-ce qu'ils ont considéré la décision du Comité il y a deux ans de travailler sur le dossier qui a déjà été discuté à Cracovie, et qui montrait déjà qu'il y avait une valeur universelle exceptionnelle avérée, ou ont-ils travaillé sur un nouveau dossier qui a fait objet d'une nouvelle évaluation ? Et, de l'autre côté, l'État partie également devrait nous donner des informations, s'ils ont remis des pièces qui leur avaient été demandées il y a deux ans ou s'ils ont développé un nouveau dossier qui nous place devant un avis de non-inscription. Je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente.

Chairperson:

Je vous remercie infiniment. J'ai pris note de votre suggestion d'écouter l'ICOMOS, mais je vous demande un peu de patience parce que nous allons passer la parole à l'ICOMOS pour qu'il se prononce après avoir entendu les membres du Comité. Merci beaucoup. I would now pass the floor to China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. China is also very much puzzled with the recommendation of ICOMOS for this Committee. We know that two years ago, at the 41st session in Krakow, a decision of referral was given with very specific instructions to the State Party of Azerbaijan to perform mainly, only in the area of preservation, the enhancement or improvement of preservation and management. Therefore, from a logical point of view, some OUV must have been established otherwise the Committee wouldn't have given a verdict for referral. Therefore, we feel that there is a great inconsistency in reaching a conclusion for non-inscription. This is the first point.

The second point I wish to point out is that the State Party of Azerbaijan has been for the past two years taking a great deal of actions in performing just what they were asked to do at the Krakow Committee and they in fact issued two presidential decrees to ensure the preservation and management improvement actions. These, ICOMOS, I understand acknowledged the reception of those action plans. Therefore we feel that this inconsistency is the major issue and I echo the distinguished colleague of Kuwait and to an extent our Angolan colleague mentioning that we are talking about the same file. Of course we are talking about the same file. Azerbaijan never raised a different file in this regard.

Therefore, the inconsistency is the major issue that we feel should be dealt with. And we support the amendment of the recommendation led by Kuwait. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We have reviewed ICOMOS' evaluation with particular attention, as we yet again face a situation where a clear difference of opinion on the values of a proposed site is presented between the Advisory Body and the State Party. We note and appreciated the scientific merits of the evaluation. And we would also like to emphasize our commitment as Committee Members to respect decisions of previous Committees, in this case decision 41 COM 8B.20 which we also perceive as falling short of providing clear guidelines to the State Party to ensure all requirements for inscription are met before a decision on the List is adopted. Nevertheless, the State Party has fulfilled the requirements laid out in that decision and we would ask that the floor is given to the State Party to outline the positive measures taken in this regard to Members of the Committee. As we have all experienced during our time here in Azerbaijan, the State Party's commitment to preserving cultural heritage is not questioned and we trust that the recommendations adopted by this Committee will be fulfilled by the State Party in conformity with its obligation to the World Heritage Convention. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We would like to thank ICOMOS for its report, which we have attentively reviewed with the experts of the National Heritage Institute. There are certainly relevant points in this report that would merit clarifications from the State Party but its main argument is that the property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List due to lack of additional information to evidence its OUV and to the fact that its integrity and authenticity have been affected by past and recent developments and restorations. It may be important to also consider different views on this matter.

Professor Pietro Laureano of IPOGEA, Traditional Knowledge Research Centre of Florence, has led an international team of specialists that ascertained that the historic city of Sheki has retained its original aesthetic qualities integrating new cultural and original impacts from the 18th to the 19th century while preserving the urban morphology and traditional construction types. In fact, approximately 80% of the buildings in the nominated area have been preserved.

The Brazilian experts who analysed the nomination file have emphasized the fact that as ICOMOS points out, Sheki's architecture and urban testimony are very homogenous when compared to other settlements in the wider region, which in itself distinguishes Sheki as a unique architectural landmark on the Silk Road. We understand however that these are not the questions that need to be discussed here.

At its 41st session, this Committee decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party in order to further enhance conservation and preservation mechanisms with a view for their better implementation. As was explained on the first day of this session, a referral is granted when the requirements concerning Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity are met but there remains the need for a limited amount of minor, supplementary or additional information to be supplied by the State Party. We believe that this has been attended by the State Party by means of two-years of work on a thorough action plan for conservation and rehabilitation of the area which addresses the requirements of decision 41 COM 8B.20 as the delegation of Azerbaijan will be certainly glad to explain in detail. If this Committee is to be consistent with its own decision it cannot at this point refuse inscription of this site on the basis of information that the State Party was not asked to provide.

For this reason, the Brazilian delegation has decided to co-sponsor the amendment of Kuwait in favour of inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Indonesia would like to join the other Members of the Committee in recalling the Committee decision adopted in Krakow in 2017 which decided referral status for the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace, in order to further enhance conservation and preservation mechanisms with a view to their better implementation. The referral status implies that the nomination has met comparative analysis, integrity and authenticity and the criteria as set out by ICOMOS in its checklist for recommendation.

Considering this, in our opinion the State Party is not obliged to provide new information with regard to the potential significance of the site unless it is stated in the previous decision, which it is not. In addition, paragraph 3 of decision 41 COM 8B.20 states as follows, recommends the State Party to prepare the Action Plan for conservation and preservation of the nominated property in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. So the recommendation for the State Party is only to prepare the Action Plan, which has been submitted by the State Party on 30 January 2019, as mentioned in the Advisory Body report. While paragraph 4 of the decision conveys encouragement for the State Party to consider several other suggestions to improve the management of the property. Indonesia would like to recommend the Committee to be consistent with its decision since inconsistency will impair the credibility of this august Committee.

With respect, Madam Chairperson, Indonesia is of the view that not to inscribe, the evaluation of the Advisory Body is incorrect and irrelevant. Indonesia would like to support the amendment proposed by Kuwait and other Committee Members. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania commends both the State Party and ICOMOS for their patience and endurance while working on this time-consuming nomination of the Historic Centre of Sheki. It is however very unfortunate that the results we see now are not to our expectations and they are not very awarding.

Chairperson, the question of putting up a List of World Heritage is not only precious but also an honour to this Committee. Tanzania feels depressed because of what has been presented before us. The year before last year in Krakow, Poland a decision by this Committee was to refer the nomination to the State Party for an affirmative finalization on the advancement of conservation and preservation mechanisms, preparation of an Action Plan for the conservation and preservation of the nominated site. It is the understanding of this delegation that whatever was done by design or by default was done in good faith and guided by the three pillars of criteria, authenticity and management in view of the technical knowledge available at that particular time.

Chairperson, our delegation wants to ask a simple question that we think that if responded to, it will probably enlighten us on the reality and probably it will help our delegation to understand the cause root to the file status that has been presented before us. Chairperson, assuming a site without any Outstanding Universal Value finds itself on the World Heritage List whether by design or by default or by human error, what would it be the tangible or intangible impact or threat or harm to that particular site or to the national community and the socioeconomic plans

or to the international community, particularly the States Parties, or to the local, national and regional beneficiaries of this property? If there is no threat, why should we labor on our own makings, own mistakes and our own imperfections? This situation could have been avoided as per decision of the Committee. Chairperson, let us be guided by our own developed and approved guidelines to avoid personalization of our action. Chairperson, I submit.

Chairperson:

Thank you. La délégation de la Tunisie, vous avez la parole. Merci beaucoup.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je crois que nous sommes devant un dossier important, non seulement pour le déroulement de cette session mais, je crois, pour l'ensemble des sessions que ce Comité a organisées jusque-là. C'est pour ça, Madame la Présidente, au nom de la délégation de la Tunisie, que je ne parlerai pas du site qui est proposé à l'inscription et reviendrai, je crois que les enregistrements sont disponibles, à une intervention que j'avais faite lors de la 42^e session, et que je dirai probablement mot pour mot ce que j'ai dit dans le cadre de cette session à l'occasion d'un autre dossier.

Quel est le pouvoir de ce Comité ? Ce Comité, selon sa Convention et selon ses règles de procédure, peut décider de trois choses : il peut décider d'inscrire, de renvoyer ou de différer. Le cas qui nous intéresse aujourd'hui fait l'objet depuis deux ans d'une décision de renvoi. Pour que ce soit clair, pour toutes les personnes qui nous suivent, je vais vous lire ce que veut dire renvoyer. L'article 159 nous dit : « Les propositions que le Comité décide de renvoyer à l'État partie pour complément d'information peuvent être à nouveau présentées au Comité. » Le même article termine en nous disant : « Une proposition renvoyée qui n'est pas présentée au Comité dans les trois ans suivants est considérée comme une nouvelle soumission et nouvelle proposition. » Nous ne sommes pas dans ce cas-là. L'État partie est revenu vers le Comité dans le laps de temps de ces trois ans. Ça veut dire que la première décision court toujours. Ce dossier fait l'objet d'un renvoi. Je ne rentrerai dans les considérations spécifiques ni techniques, vous savez quel est le respect que l'on doit à la connaissance et au savoir scientifique des organes consultatifs, nous l'avons démontré tout le long de cette session et des précédentes.

Je me demande, je crois que nous avons un système juridique qui nous lie ici, et la valeur des systèmes juridiques ne vaut que par la prévisibilité de leur application. Un système non prévisible n'est pas un système qui garantit une sécurité juridique, et les États parties sont en droit d'exiger que le Comité garantisse cette sécurité juridique. Or si aujourd'hui, et nonobstant les arguments scientifiques auxquels on peut consentir par moment – mais ce n'est pas là le problème –, nous sommes dans la phase où l'État partie est revenu en situation de renvoi, comment pourrions-nous sans nous déjuger nous-mêmes, - j'étais assis au siège de la Tunisie pour la 41^e session, - comment, sans nous déjuger, allons-nous revenir et dire que l'on revient à un niveau juridique en deçà. Cela me permet de dire que ce Comité ne peut pas fonctionner d'une session à une autre comme une cour d'appel de ses propres décisions.

Il y a une stabilité, il y a une prévisibilité et il y a une cohérence à nos décisions. La Tunisie se réserve le droit de revenir pour discuter les éléments propres de ce dossier lorsqu'on aura clarifié cela. Il y a un enjeu à mon avis important de cohérence de nos propres décisions. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Merci infiniment. Kyrgyzstan, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We would also like to join the amendment proposed by Kuwait and we will not repeat what has already been said here but we would like to highlight a couple of things. First, we are also of the position that the Committee should be consistent with its own decisions and therefore, as we heard already a referral so then we should go further. Secondly, we are also of the strong view that the proposed property meets cultural criteria. I will mention only one, that Sheki together with Tbilisi and Ganja are on the Silk Road and this part of the Silk Road has two dimensions. One is the connection of the land route with maritime routes, which go from the Caspian to the Black Sea; and the second dimension is that this region is part of the northern Silk Road, which goes further to the north. Thirdly, there are different views between ICOMOS experts and the ICOMOS report and the State Party on their state of conservation of the historic architectural and urban fabric. The State Party's report says that about 72% of all buildings have preserved their historical character of which 26% have just minor changes. I think we should ask the State Party to give us a little bit more information on the status of their Action Plan and its legal status. Maybe that will give us more information and ground for the decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. My dear colleagues, we have still eight speakers on the list and our interpreters stay only until 1:15, so I would like you to be very brief in your comments so that we can finish the evaluation of this item very soon. Thank you. I pass the floor to Bosnia and Herzegovina, please. Again, be as brief as you can. Thank you.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

We support and co-sponsor the amendment that Sheki should be inscribed on the World Heritage List and we are very pleased with the documents the State Party provided in the last period for the inscription of Sheki. We see some welcoming procedure in the last two years and then in this report and preparing the report of the Advisory Body and it would be very useful to hear from the State Party to get more explanations. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, very briefly, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. The delegation of Uganda joins likeminded delegations in sharing with our distinguished hosts of the Republic of Azerbaijan the anxiety of expecting inscription of Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace to the World Heritage List.

Madam Chairperson, my delegation has looked at the outcome of the scrutiny of the nomination file as guided by the Operational Guidelines for implementation of the World Heritage Convention. We observe the technical note by ICOMOS front-running draft decision 43 COM 8B.36 raises doubts on the sufficiency of detail of the maps in connection with the narrative of the history involvement of the property therein becoming the basis for questioning the historical accuracy surrounding the property and hence not inscribe it on the World Heritage List.

Furthermore, Madam Chairperson, it is recorded that in accordance with Decision 41 COM 8B.20, adopted at the Committee's 41st session in 2017 in Krakow, new information related to the potential significance of the site was supposed to be furnished by the State Party but which for now appears to bolster the penalty of not inscribing the property on the World Heritage List.

Madam Chairperson, my delegation is utterly concerned as to whether ICOMOS completely exhausted the synergies of requesting the additional information from the State Party alongside consulting its own thematic and relevant international studies. A draft amendment is in place and my delegation is associated with it. I rest my case, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. My dear colleagues, time is running out and maybe the interpreters will be running away for lunch. So please, be brief. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We are an expert committee. These experts should decide and take the final decision because of the cumulative scientific knowledge. Politics between organizations and States Parties should not come into the forefront in individual cases and preclude our decision-making. It puts the Committee in a difficult position.

We make policy and standard setting decisions in many cases and all our decisions matter for the future. This Convention has become what it is because we are building, stone by stone, sometimes having to turn some of the stones, sometimes realizing that the stones don't fit. This allows us to learn from unfortunate or ill-guided decisions, adjust and improve. Yet, we find ourselves again in a situation where it's hard to find a way out. Although this Committee last year reiterated that OUV is only recognized at the time of inscription, the previous decision in this case is argued to pre-empt the outcome of future decisions. This puts not only the Committee, but also the nominating State Party in a difficult position. We are convinced we can do better in the future.

And we wish again to appreciate and commend Azerbaijan's strong commitment in reforming the nomination process to allow for early and strengthened dialogue, improve guidance, further sharing of experience and knowledge, as well as focused capacity building. This will contribute towards more mature nominations, with a shared and agreed understanding of what we are nominating and ultimately fewer deviations and improved decision-making.

In this regard, we also wish to recall the evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative from 2011 and Norway continuously has to remind itself of the many well-founded recommendations therein concerning the Committee and its conduct.

The records from 2017 describe, and I quote, "a referral on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii)" while the decision itself was without clear guidance and we see that there is a significant discrepancy between the evaluation presented just before and the sentiments expressed by other Members in relation to this nomination. Norway appreciates the efforts of the State Party in implementing the previous decision, but, we must emphasize that the very core of this nomination, its proposed statement of OUV as per the amended draft decision proposing criteria (ii) and (v) is not evaluated on its individual merits.

Hence, we feel left in a vacuum and we see at this point that we must support the draft decision. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. In the interest of time, Zimbabwe supports and co-sponsors the amendment made by Kuwait and others on the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank so much. Burkina Faso, you have the floor.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente. Répondant à votre appel, je dirai que la délégation du Burkina Faso est dans un état d'esprit où il soutient la proposition d'amendement du Koweït. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Merci infiniment. Spain, you have the floor. And please, think about time.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Yes, thank you, Chairperson, we will try to be as brief as possible but you will understand that our delegation feels obliged to intervene. Our country decided to withdraw one of its files after a very negative evaluation from ICOMOS. However, we feel that we could have been able to debate our file as we are doing with this one now. Now we see ourselves in a situation where we are debating a file that was the subject of a non-inscription decision. We believe that this is a perfect example of lack of credibility in the Convention and from day one when we talked about the code of conduct that we need to respect here as States Parties and this is perhaps a drop in the ocean because we know that perhaps with this we are not going to achieve anything but we would really ask everyone to be playing on a level playing field. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Hungary, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. The State Party has made a huge work on the nomination of the property Sheki for many years and also again has made efforts to meet its commitments regarding the recommendation of the Committee decision taken in 2017. ICOMOS was of the opinion both times, this nomination reached the Committee that it did not have authenticity and integrity and did not meet any of the criteria and proposed it not to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. However, the property was referred back to the State Party and so this case shows once again that there is an urgent need for the review of the referral mechanism. Maybe the role of the Bureau could be to corroborate the evaluation process in the future. But for now taking into consideration all circumstances, we support this nomination to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. We are grateful for the nomination as well as for the additional information that we have received from the State Party linked to the decision taken in Krakow as well as the evaluation carried out by ICOMOS. Thanks to the detailed documentation we have been able to see the relevance of this site and its cultural value. We believe that the State Party has followed all the recommendations that were asked of it by this Committee so we join our voices to Kuwait, Angola and the others, especially when it comes to the consistency and continuity of this Committee. All of this has been very eloquently outlined by the delegate from Tunisia. All of us are bound to act in a consistent

manner as we are taking historic decisions in this Committee and therefore we support the amendment. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Australia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Australia:

Madam Chairperson, I apologize perhaps for lack of brevity here but there are important things that need to be said. Australia deeply regrets the circumstances in which we find ourselves as a Committee returning to the Sheki nomination and well appreciates the difficulty this causes us collectively and for Azerbaijan. No State Party should be placed in this situation again.

In 2017, the nomination was recommended not for inscription. None of the proposed criteria could be justified, though we do note from the record of the meeting and what we recall of the discussion that some Committee Members at the time saw the nomination as potentially having Outstanding Universal Value. As we all know properties on the World Heritage List must have all three pillars of OUV justified. In 2017, the Committee referred the nomination but unfortunately gave no guidance to the State Party that it should provide further evidence to justify the potential OUV of the property or undertake further comparative analysis to further demonstrate how the property can be considered exceptional. Instead, the referral decision focused solely on management and protection issues and we note that the State Party has faithfully complied with this decision.

The draft decision in front of the Committee today again has the recommendation that the property should not be inscribed. We agree that unfortunately this is the appropriate recommendation given that no further evidence to justify the potential OUV has been provided to ICOMOS and due to the decision to refer the nomination ICOMOS was not able to undertake a mission to the property. ICOMOS therefore has not been in a position to reassess the potential significance of the property nor to reconsider the recommendation of its first evaluation. It is not reasonable to transfer on to ICOMOS the responsibility for the consequences of the Committee's Krakow decision. It did what it was required to do under the Operational Guidelines.

As this case illustrates, Committee decisions to refer or defer a nomination without clear guidance on requirements for justifying OUV create a challenging situation for the State Party, the Committee and the Advisory Bodies. Here we draw again the Committee's attention to our Decision 42 COM 8, adopted in Bahrain which states that OUV is recognized at the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List. The Committee is not bound to continue a progression of previous decisions on nominations but must make decisions based on current evidence.

A decision to either refer or defer a nomination cannot be a guarantee of inscription in the future but provides the State Party with an opportunity to present to the Committee a revised nomination. In our opening intervention on general Item 8, we spoke in more detail about our concerns about past decision-making and our confidence that the nomination reform now before the Committee will yield improvements to uphold the credibility and integrity of both the World Heritage List and the deliberations of this Committee.

We particularly thank Azerbaijan for its leadership in the reform process as Chair of the ad hoc working group where Azerbaijan plays a strong guiding voice for reforms that will strengthen the technical foundations of this Convention through improved dialogue with the Advisory Bodies. Better process will deliver better outcomes.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Saint Kitts, could you please be as brief as possible. Thank you.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson, we will be very brief. Saint Kitts and Nevis recognizes the significance of the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace submitted by the State Party of Azerbaijan. We note the comments and concerns expressed so we won't be going over those by previous speakers and as a result we support the general consensus of opinion with regards to inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

I would ask the delegation of Azerbaijan if there are any comments they want to bring to our knowledge? Thank you.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the Committee Members for their position and questions they asked. Let me give you a bit of background on the situation.

The nomination dossier has been worked on for six years by the team of local and international experts. In 2016, it was submitted for evaluation to the Centre and ICOMOS. In 2017, there were discussions on this issue in Krakow and many colleagues referred to this decision. Here I would like to thank ICOMOS for their recommendation that was produced in Krakow. Actually, although we disagreed with the scientific evaluation of ICOMOS, we strongly agreed with their evaluation when it comes to the conservation, management, monitoring and preservation of the site. And the Committee that discussed this issue agreed on the value of the site but recommended for referral given those recommendations reflected in the ICOMOS decision. So we took these recommendations as much as we can in a very serious manner. The colleagues mentioned here the Presidential Decree, just to show you the seriousness and commitment of Azerbaijan to fulfil the requirements and recommendations of ICOMOS in its first recommendation.

There was a special management team established following this recommendation, a state tourism agency. A special budget and staff were allocated to strengthen the management of the site. Apart from that, we have invited international experts in this field to help us, the State Party, in addressing the recommendations of the Krakow decision. In that sense, the restoration manual and Action Plan were adopted by the State Tourism Agency and here I would like to come back the ICOMOS report saying that these documents have no legal value, which is not true because when it was already submitted as an additional information to ICOMOS, it was already endorsed and had started to be implemented by the State Agency.

Many colleagues refer to the legal gap. I do agree, I do agree that there is a legal gap and trap that Azerbaijan and the Committee Members have fallen. I don't want to blame ICOMOS for this trap. But what we are most concerned with is that during this period when the Krakow decision was discussed and when we had the communication with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, we had not been informed that there would be a potential trap for the State Party without having any provisions regarding the potential Outstanding Universal Value. And on the top of that, I should say that when additional information was provided by Azerbaijan, during the five-month period ICOMOS neither contacted us nor sent any information that there is a legal trap that you may provide additional information, which can testify to the OUV. So

there was no attempt for the communication from ICOMOS to ask the State Party to provide this additional information.

So my country, with this in mind, with all the information that was already said, my country is sparing no effort to chair the ad hoc group and to introduce the mechanisms which can prevent in the future States Parties from falling into this kind of difficulties that we are facing. And I appreciate the countries that raise this issue that we need to be consistent with the decisions that were taken beforehand. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would pass the floor to ICOMOS for some brief comments. Thank you.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. ICOMOS would agree that this is procedurally a very complex issue and just to clarify ICOMOS' role which is to assess the information that is provided to us by the State Party, which was first the nomination in 2016 and then later the supplementary information in 2019, which is what we have done.

Recalling decision 42 COM 8 which has already been mentioned by the honourable delegate from Australia, there was a clarification by the legal adviser on the meaning of referral which set out very clearly that Outstanding Universal Value is recognized at the time of inscription of the site on the World Heritage List and not prior to that stage. In other words, when the site is referred that does not mean that OUV has been recognized.

And ICOMOS considers that the decision made at the 41st session was not helpful to the State Party, as it did not make clear that the property had not met Outstanding Universal Value and the State Party was not specifically requested to supply justification for Outstanding Universal Value as has just been indicated.

So, ICOMOS did not have the opportunity reassess its initial evaluation in relation to Outstanding Universal Value and as we have suggested in our presentation, we do consider that this is a difficult issue that does lead to the need for the operationalization of the referral process to be reconsidered. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would now ask our Rapporteur to present the draft decision. Sorry, Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. On avait posé des questions et on avait besoin de ces réponses pour pouvoir nous positionner. Donc deux choses, très rapidement, de manière très brève. Tout d'abord, pour une question de cohérence, l'État partie a soumis les documents qui lui ont été demandés et nous avons reçu des copies. Une question de cohérence, l'État partie a accompli ce qu'il devait faire à la lumière de la décision qui a été prise à Cracovie. Nous sommes tout à fait d'accord pour que le bien soit inscrit.

Deuxième chose, il y a un problème de procédure sur lequel nous devons revenir, il faudra peut-être qu'on mette en place un groupe de travail, car on a des difficultés par rapport aux Orientations. La Convention donne un certain nombre d'éléments. Si on parle de renvoi, qu'est-ce qu'il faut que l'État partie fournisse en termes d'éléments ? Mais en écoutant les échanges ici, c'est comme s'il y avait d'autres pièces qui manquaient. On a donc besoin de réviser les Orientations et de les rendre plus claires, pour que les gens sachent. Si le dossier est renvoyé donc il n'a pas de VUE, donc s'il n'a pas de VUE est ce qu'il faut remettre un autre

dossier retravaillé ? C'est-à-dire qu'il faut qu'on soit clair. L'Angola aimerait qu'un groupe de travail soit peut-être mis en place pour affiner un peu les Orientations concernant le renvoi, le différé, etc. Je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. Nous avons pris note de votre suggestion. Merci infiniment. Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. This delegation would like to note that the additional explanations provided by Azerbaijan and we therefore support the draft decision by Kuwait whereby we want to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. First of all, we would like to say that the Advisory Body as well as the State Party have actually done their job. This is what we need to recognize. We shouldn't be judging the State Party for not having complied with the recommendations of the Advisory Body. However, we do have to review the decisions that we take and indeed some of the previous decisions that we have taken have led us to this situation. Some Members of the Committee have made reference to how important it is to make sure that it is very clear to adopt OUV when we inscribe a property. However, when we interpret the Convention, when we review the files we say that we are recognizing Outstanding Universal Value even before we have actually accepted or inscribed the file. This is the situation that has led us to this point. So Cuba believes that the most logical and prudent step is to inscribe this particular property. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I don't see any more comments. I think we can ask the Rapporteur to present the draft decision with its amendments. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Rapporteur:

As flagged, we have received amendments formally from Kuwait, China, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kyrgyzstan, Zimbabwe, Uganda, Tunisia and Brazil but supported from many others on the floor. Paragraph 2 would read, Recalling Decision 41 COM 8B.20 adopted at its 41st session (Krakow, 2017). Paragraph 3 would read, Inscribes the Historic centre of Sheki with the Khan's Palace, Azerbaijan, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (v). The next paragraph would now read, Takes note of the provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which follows. Paragraph 5 then reads, Recommends the State Party to give consideration to the following: a) revise and adopt the Management Plan of the Historic Centre of Sheki; b) prepare and adopt Conservation Master Plan for the property; c) define guidelines for residential house restoration and prepare planning instruments (Regeneration Urban Plan) to incentivize private participation in this process; and I'd just like to point out that as the Rapporteur I have changed the language in the amendment given for planning instruments. It said plan of instruments but my understanding that the correct interpretation from the French is planning instruments but I'd just like to confirm that I've made that change. And the fourth point, d) ensure the monitoring of all processes of urban rehabilitation by the Site Management Team. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Madam Rapporteur. The Secretariat has asked for the floor. Please, go on.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I think it would be worthwhile to understand from the States Parties that put forward the amendment whether their intent is to inscribe the site as a cultural landscape or not, because when we read the statement of criterion (v) it will appear that the site is presented as such and in this case paragraph 3 should include the mention that it is inscribed as a cultural landscape. So maybe you wish to ask the States Parties that put forward the amendment whether the site should be inscribed as a cultural landscape.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

A small but important point, Madam Chairperson and just to be clear, there is a very strong mood in the room for inscription and Australia will certainly not go against the mood of the room. But just on a number of other decisions where we made inscriptions, we have required or requested the State Party to come back with a report on the progress in implementing the recommendations of the Committee so I would suggest that we should similarly add a last amendment here which would ask the State Party of Azerbaijan to report back to the Committee on progress in implementing the identified requests.

Chairperson:

Kuwait, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Just to answer the question from the Secretariat, it should be cultural heritage.

Chairperson:

Thank you all very much. The last paragraph has been added. I thank you for all your comments and at this point we with great pleasure can declare decision 43 COM 8B.36 approved. Congratulations [*applause*]. I would also like to extend to the delegation of Azerbaijan the congratulations of all Committee Members and pass the floor to the delegation of Azerbaijan. Please, take the floor.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the Committee Members, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for their cooperation. Without you, it would not be possible for us to understand the problems, the shortcomings that we were facing and do our homework within these last two years. Sheki for us is not only a testimony of the city located on the Silk Road, it is also one of the remaining historical cities in Azerbaijan. The second one is Baku, which is already inscribed on the World Heritage List. So with your decision, with your help I think it is another contribution to preserve this unique historical centre which suffered a lot from natural disasters, from conflicts, from invasions so thank you very much for this support and thank you very much for your understanding. Now I give the floor to our Minister of Culture.

[Minister of Culture of Azerbaijan]:

Excellences, on behalf of the government of Azerbaijan I would like to thank you for the decision taken and I would apply with the readiness of the Government of Azerbaijan to implement all necessary requirements which were put in front of us by the Advisory Body. We are dedicated to cooperation and very strong coordination of our activity within the framework of this inscription, with ICOMOS and all others. We would highly appreciate the support from your side. The Government of Azerbaijan, the leadership of Azerbaijan, His Excellency the President and the First Vice President delivered to us the obligation to ensure you of the full awareness of Azerbaijan to fulfil the requirements of the international community on this matter. Thank you very much to all the Members of the Committee and the experts for the great support of Sheki. Today Sheki will celebrate the day of happiness. Thank you very much [applause].

[Representative of Sheki City]:

[Interpretation from Azeri] Dear Madam Ambassador, dear ladies and gentlemen, on this memorable day at this session of UNESCO World Heritage Committee I would like to declare that the Historic Centre of Sheki city has got the support and I would like to express my deep gratitude on behalf of Sheki residents to you all. Committee Members, this is a historical city, and to preserve its historical face this is the most primordial task of our Government. Many decrees have been signed and Sheki Khan's Palace, bridges, mosques as well as residential houses - they belong not only to our people, they belong to the treasury of World Heritage of humankind. As the representative of Sheki city I would like to declare that this site of World Heritage will be preserved to the best possible conditions, and all conditions of UNESCO and Advisory Bodies will be implemented. I express my special thanks to you and invite you to our beautiful city of Sheki. Thank you.

Chairperson:

I would pass the floor now to the Director of the World Heritage Centre who has an announcement to make. Thank you for your attention.

Ms Rössler:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. Because of the delay this morning we will start the afternoon session at 3:15 p.m., so you have time for lunch. And we have a 2 p.m. working group on the revision of the Operational Guidelines and also we have the third cycle of the exercise of periodic reporting for the Asia Pacific region, and ICOMOS has the ICOMOS 2020 General Assembly presentation in Room B3. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. We shall resume the afternoon session at 3:15. Thank you very much.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.

SEVENTH DAY – Sunday 7 July 2019

FOURTEENTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 5.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev

Chairperson:

Honorable Members of the Committee, as we agreed we are little bit late to start but still we have to do it. Now we are going to present another item for consideration. This is item 8B.37, Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano a Valdobbiadene, Italy. The draft decision concerning this nomination will be presented by ICOMOS. Please, ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Good afternoon. The ICOMOS evaluation of this nomination can be found in document INF.8B1.Add on page 12 in the English version and page 38 in the French version.

The nominated cultural landscape is located in the Veneto Region of Italy and is a smaller portion of the region's large Prosecco wine production area. The World Heritage Committee referred back this nomination at its 42nd session in Manama last year, and requested the State Party to refocus the proposed Outstanding Universal Value, refine the boundary and buffer zone, and complete an aspect of the protection of the property.

In July 2018, the State Party requested the assistance of ICOMOS. Through an Advisory Mission and other exchanges, this dialogue enabled a complete reconceptualization of the justification of Outstanding Universal Value, enabling a sharpened consideration of attributes, selection of criteria, review of issues of authenticity and integrity, and reconsideration of the boundary and buffer zone.

The previously nominated area shown on this slide of over 20,000 hectares was similar to the designation of the Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore DCOG area, with a buffer zone of more than 23,000 hectares. The property now consists of an area of just over 9,000 hectares focused on the hogback landform and vineyard areas. The buffer zone has also been reduced. These changes have allowed the State Party to focus on the areas of greatest authenticity and integrity, and to exclude areas that were not coherent in relation to the history, land use condition and character.

The landscape is characterized by hogback hills, small vineyards on steep inclines with narrow grassy terraces called *ciglioni*, creating a mosaic patterning or patchwork of forests, small settlements and vineyards, all combining to provide spectacular views. The revised focus is on the interaction of human settlement in the specific topographical context of the hogbacks. Land use practices give the landscape its distinctive "chequerboard" appearance with rows of high vines known as *bellussera*, interspersed with rural settlements and forests. Careful management of water, forests and erosion also contribute to the distinctive characteristics of the landscape. Because of the steep terrain, much of the vineyard work is done by hand. Sustaining ecological processes is important to support the values of this landscape.

The revisions to the boundary and justification to accord with the hogback landform has assisted a more coherent justification for Outstanding Universal Value according to criterion (v). While changes have occurred and various challenges remain, the revised nominated property meets the requirements of integrity and authenticity. The boundary and buffer zone are appropriately delineated.

The factors affecting the nominated property include urban development and expansion, agricultural transformations, landslides and demographic and socioeconomic shifts. Poor quality infrastructure, urbanization and industrial constructions in the buffer zone detrimentally impact on the setting; and there are buildings in the property and buffer zone in poor condition. Future wind and solar power installations in the buffer zone could also create a detrimental impact in the future. The legal protection and management system for the property are adequate, although further implementation is needed.

In 2018, the World Heritage Committee indicated three bases for the previous nomination to be referred back. The first requested the State Party to redefine the nomination refocusing the potential Outstanding Universal Value on criteria (iv) and (v). Through the dialogue with ICOMOS, the State Party has opted to present the nomination on the basis of criterion (v) alone. The second asked the State Party to redefine the boundaries and buffer zones. ICOMOS considers that this has been crucial to the improvement of the nomination and has underpinned a more coherent nomination. The final point asked the State Party to complete the adoption process by the 28 concerned municipalities of the tool “Technical rule–Articolo Unico”. This has been achieved.

To conclude, ICOMOS recommends that Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene (Italy) be inscribed in the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (v) and has included a number of further recommendations in the draft decision to aid the long-term conservation of the property. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I have comments from Committee Members? Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais, au nom de la Tunisie, remercier l'ICOMOS pour le rapport, que ce soit le rapport écrit qui nous a été remis ou le rapport oral que nous venons de suivre, et je voudrais particulièrement remercier l'État partie qui, à la suite de la décision de l'année dernière, a gardé le contact avec les instances consultatives et apporté un certain nombre de modifications significatives sur une partie de son dossier, ce qui a permis d'avoir la recommandation d'inscription que la Tunisie appuie. Mais je rappelle pour cohérence, puisque depuis ce matin on parle de cohérence, que nous, nous voyons déjà depuis l'année dernière que ce dossier avait quelques velléités qui lui permettaient d'aller vers l'inscription. On est content aujourd'hui que, après les modifications qui ont été faites, un grand nombre d'observateurs et de scientifiques trouvent que cette proposition, dans ce cas-là, peut être envisagée dans une logique d'inscription. Nous nous en félicitons et nous remercions l'État partie d'avoir fait ces efforts.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. This is an application that is well constituted and well presented. It's a combination of a good project with a respect for the standards. No one wants an application to be referred. What the State Party did was to take the advice from the Advisory Body and we have a good application for inscription. This involving cultural landscape which dates back to the 17th century has certain features that have traversed human history because of geography allows for the development and survival of the community. The local communities are obviously the basis of such a project. Perhaps the local community who is making the request should be in charge of ensuring that the constant temptations offered by industrial progress not be heeded in order not to damage an element

that in a few minutes will become part of the World Heritage of humanity. We would like to thank Italy and express our trust in the State Party to follow the recommendations and to make sure that this place in the world will be kept as it is and will be worthy of remaining on the List. Congratulations to the State Party and congratulations to ICOMOS for the work they accomplished. We really support this inscription.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Mr Chairperson, this heritage property, which is located in northern Italy in a spectacular sequence of hills is a meriting part of this Italian wine. The steep gradient of the hills has dictated non-mechanized propagation of the vineyards by the wine growers since the 1800s. In other words, Mr Chairperson, the State Party of Italy is presenting to us a viticulture landscape born out of the unique interface between nature and man. Over centuries, Mr Chairperson, this landscape denotes the evolution of best custom-tailored land use practices spanning unique stabilization of the slopes yet interspersed with forests, small woods and rural settlements. Respectfully, Mr Chairperson, the delegation of Uganda is satisfied with the draft decision to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List as an outstanding example of mixed human interaction with the environment, unique viticulture land use and traditional human settlement as echoed by criterion (v) of the Convention's Operational Guidelines. I congratulate the State Party of Italy and thank ICOMOS for the wonderful presentation of this nomination. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. It's just a very brief intervention to congratulate the delegation of Italy for the very hard work done since the adoption of our decision last year in Manama concerning this site. I think that we are facing a case, a very successful case of a referral which led the country to work in close coordination with the Advisory Bodies who today present, I mean the Advisory Bodies present a very successful, a very positive report based on the work done by the country. So I would very much like to congratulate Italy on this beautiful nomination. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I think there is no reason to speak about the value of this site as it speaks for itself and it is really very visible from this photo—it's an exceptional cultural landscape where we can see the testimony of human interaction between environment and nature. Of course, we congratulate the State Party of Italy for this work and as it has already been expressed by colleagues, after the referral decision in Bahrain their work and cooperation with ICOMOS—this dialogue and engagement with ICOMOS makes this nomination today successful so we wholeheartedly congratulate Italy for this and announce, it's Prosecco time. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Chairperson for giving me the floor. I would like to join the previous speakers, first of all to Brazil, because I see that we have on the one side a very successful nomination, which could be evaluated by ICOMOS successfully with a proposal for inscription. And secondly, because I can remember a discussion I had about this nomination last year in Manama—the decision of referral has its meaning exactly like in this case. Because it is the meaning and the significance of referral to give the possibility of a State Party to enhance its nomination and to return with a new revised nomination and then the Advisory Body gives the possibility and gives a good proposal for inscription. So let me congratulate Italy and thank ICOMOS for the evaluation.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China wishes to join the previous speakers in congratulating Italy for a very successful nomination and inscription. We wish to use this opportunity also to commend the wonderful job ICOMOS has done. We all remember last year when the case encountered difficulties and then we noted that there was great satisfaction that ICOMOS and Italy worked together. So it is a classic example of close collaboration between the Advisory Bodies and State Party involved in solving a case and presenting a beautiful property and we congratulate the State Party of Italy. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We agree with the other Members of the Committee who spoke before us. The OUV of this site is a reality and is recognized as an example of the relation between society and nature in the long run. At the previous meeting, Guatemala supported the decision to refer this application and now we have a file, which meets all the requisites for inscription. We would like to congratulate the State Party for implementing the measures relating to the nomination and we are about to inscribe a new site on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have one nongovernmental organization that wants to make an intervention. Please, you are welcome.

Observer NGO (Pesticides Action Network Italia and World Heritage Watch):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. On behalf of the Pesticides Action Network Italia and World Heritage Watch, I kindly urge you not to inscribe Prosecco Hills as a World Heritage site. The nomination of Prosecco is highly contentious in the region. Hazardous pesticides are intensely used over the entire vineyard areas both urban and rural. They have already proven adverse effects on the health of the local population and the quality of life in the region. People suffer from them day by day. For years, citizens of the Prosecco region have been strongly protesting against the nomination. Local residents together with numerous organizations have been organizing marches, petitions and sit-in protests demanding to stop the process of inscription until the use of hazardous pesticides is stopped and the well being and health of inhabitants are ensured. Most recently, on 28 June, a group of residents organized a sit-in in front of the UNESCO building in Venice. Unfortunately, UNESCO has not yet developed procedures for

the management and control of the use of synthetic pesticides despite having them declared as a threat as early as 1972, but also in three other official UNESCO documents.

The nomination of Prosecco has revealed the urgency that the Committee should adopt a policy document that World Heritage status is incompatible with the use of toxic pesticides and that World Heritage properties and their buffer zones must be free from their use or at least provide a scheme for a progressive ban whose implementation is monitored by UNESCO. Do you really want to pass on to future generations a model of a polluting industrialized monoculture as a world cultural heritage where its residents suffer from it affects and continuously fights for a change? Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will take note. As far as I understand there are no other comments from Committee Members? We don't have any additional drafts?

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

As far as there are no amendments and additions to the draft, I propose to approve the document in common. Therefore, I declare decision 43 COM 8B.37 adopted as amended [*applause*]. Our sincere congratulations to Italy and you are welcome to make your intervention on behalf of the State Party. Welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Italy:

Honorable Chairperson, my sincere gratitude to the Government of Azerbaijan for organizing the current session of the Committee and for its gracious hospitality. I would like to thank the Committee Members and all the States represented for the decision to approve this inscription. This confirms the global consideration for my country's outstanding natural and cultural heritage as well as the commitment of the Italian authorities in favor of UNESCO. This is a great recognition for Italy and for the Veneto region that has been able to value the extraordinary qualities and traditional features of this distinctive cultural landscape of exceptional global value. The authentic landscape is an expression of an agriculture mosaic unique in the world, the result of the hard and passionate work of men and women in a sustainable and lasting manner.

Looking forward, we have therefore even more exciting challenges in terms of preserving, protecting and managing the specific and traditional agriculture of the attractive territory as universal heritage to be transmitted to future generations for the benefit of humankind. Finally, I wish to express gratitude to all those who believe and contributed to the realization of this wonderful project which we consider as a starting point to the future. It will be essential to continue with the same effort and dedication in order to fully exploit the potential of the Prosecco Hills of Conegliano a Valdobbiadene. In this regard, I am pleased to give the floor to the president and friend of the Veneto region, Luca Zaia, accompanied by undersecretaries Picchi and Borgonzoni. Thank you.

Mr Zaia:

Thank you, Minister. There are so many people I would like to thank today. First of all UNESCO, the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and all its Members, the President of ICOMOS and its staff, the scientific committee, the Italian government with me today, my friend the Agriculture Minister, Mr Gian Marco Centinaio and the people, the farmers and families that live in the wonderful area of the Prosecco Hills. I am really enthusiastic about the inclusion of the Prosecco Hills on the UNESCO World Heritage List. This inclusion will make us more

responsible towards our territory, which is now part of the entire world's heritage. Our commitment now is to preserve the exceptional site for our future generations. After 10 years of hard work, we can finally celebrate a unique moment in which we feel really proud for this achievement for joining the UNESCO world. The Prosecco Hills perfectly represent an outstanding example of traditional human settlement and the land use representative of a specific culture resulting from human interaction with the environment. From now on our aim is to do our best to obtain the most fruitful results from the UNESCO examination. Thank you very much [*applause*].

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. And once more congratulations on behalf of the Members of the Committee to the State Party of Italy.

Now we proceed to the next nomination, which is 8B.38. It is connected with the 20th-Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright, United States of America. Before going to the presentation I would like to ask Mr Balsamo to give some clarification.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation for the nomination of the 20th-Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright and it is on page 124 of the English version of document INF 8.B4 and on page 65 in the French version of the same document. This notification also has some impacts on the proposed statement of OUV. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Please, ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you Chair. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found on page 23 of the English version and page 22 of the French version of document 43 COM/INF.8B1.Add.

This nomination was first examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session. The nomination was referred back to allow the State Party to redefine the rationale for a series that might have the potential to justify Outstanding Universal Value, enhance management, and to revise boundaries and buffer zones to provide enhanced protection. At the request of the State Party, an ICOMOS Advisory Process was carried out in two phases: in 2016-2017 and in 2018. The outcomes of this process and ICOMOS recommendations have been taken into account by the State Party and incorporated in the revised version of the nomination dossier.

The nominated property focuses upon the influence of the work of the American architect, Frank Lloyd Wright. The qualities of what is known as “organic architecture” developed by Wright, including the open plan, the blurring between exterior and interior, the new uses of materials and technologies, and the explicit responses to the suburban and natural settings of the various buildings, have been acknowledged as pivotal in the development of modern architectural design in the 20th century. The nominated property includes a series of eight buildings designed and built over the first half of the 20th century. Each component has specific characteristics, representing new solutions to the needs for housing, worship, work, education and leisure. The diversity of functions, scale and setting of the components fully illustrate the architectural principles of “organic architecture”.

ICOMOS considers that the methodology for the comparative analysis is adequate, so too the selected movements and bodies of work corresponding to the same period as the nominated series. ICOMOS considers that the State Party succeeds in demonstrating how the nominated

series is exceptional related to the influence of Wright's work over the first decade of the century. ICOMOS is satisfied regarding the justification of the selection of components for the series, and encourages the possible future extension of the series.

ICOMOS considers that the property satisfies criterion (ii) regarding the influence of Wright's architecture in the USA and other countries that changed architecture on a global scale during the first half of the 20th century. The eight components illustrate different aspects of Wright's new approach to architecture consciously developed for an American context. The resulting buildings, however, were in fact suited to modern life in many countries, and in their fusion of spirit and form they evoked emotional responses that were universal in their appeal. Reacting against prevailing styles in the United States, this approach took advantage of new materials and technologies, but was also inspired by principles of the natural world and was nurtured by other cultures and eras. These innovative ideas and the resulting unified architectural works were noted in European architectural and critical circles early in the century and influenced several of the trends and architects of the European Modern Movement in architecture. Wright's work's influence is also noticeable in the work of some architects outside of Europe.

The boundaries and buffer zones for each of the components are generally adequate, but the State Party should consider extending the boundary of Taliesin and the buffer zone of the Robie House. Despite some issues related to the authenticity of materials and substance, ICOMOS considers that the requirements of integrity and authenticity have been met for the whole series.

The overall state of conservation of the components of the series is very good. The main factors affecting the property are development pressures and natural disasters. The protective instruments are adequate for each of the components of the serial property. ICOMOS considers that the coordinated management of the serial property through the existing Council is acceptable, but its advisory functions should be reinforced. For individual components, the elaboration of management plans, summarizing existing conservation and management instruments and including risk management, could contribute to a more appropriate approach to management. The current monitoring indicators are adequate but do not clearly relate to the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value, and accordingly they should be augmented.

ICOMOS therefore recommends the property for inscription on the World Heritage List on the grounds of criterion (ii), and the draft decision with additional recommendations can be found on page 3 of the working document WHC/19/43.COM.8B.Add. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for this presentation. May I ask honorable delegates for their comments? Tunisia, please, then Uganda.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie voudrait tout d'abord remercier l'ICOMOS pour le rapport et l'État partie de nous avoir fourni un très beau dossier, qui est au cœur de la dynamique de l'évolution des villes au XX^e siècle et à travers l'œuvre d'un architecte internationalement reconnu. Je crois que la recommandation d'inscription est tout à fait la bienvenue, en tout état de cause la Tunisie la soutient, et que par cette inscription on vient étoffer un aspect extrêmement intéressant de notre Liste ; après Le Corbusier, après Gaudi, voici une autre grande page de l'histoire de l'architecture moderne qui prend sa place et avec une reconnaissance internationale. On souhaite renouveler nos remerciements pour l'État partie d'avoir proposé un dossier de cette qualité, et dire à nos amis des États-Unis qu'ils sont bien entendu chez eux et qu'on souhaite qu'ils reviennent très tôt dans la grande famille de l'UNESCO. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. This serial nomination of eight architectural masterpieces spread out in six States across the United States of America exemplifies human ingenuity born of the much-celebrated architect Frank Lloyd Wright. This great architect, who would have been 152 years old this year, bequeathed to the world not only pieces of phenomenal architecture but also poetry in stone. As customary as it was for him to adopt inspiration from nature and varied global cultures, Frank Lloyd Wright designed these buildings to break free from traditional forms and to facilitate modern life. It is no wonder that the composition of these serial buildings for this nomination selected from an even larger number of these buildings have over the years greatly influenced the field of architecture and design throughout the world and continues to do so to this day. Mr Chairperson, in the eyes of the Ugandan delegation there is not a better way of celebrating such phenomenal human achievement than enlisting this set of buildings on the World Heritage List. I congratulate the State Party of the USA. I also thank ICOMOS for their wonderful presentation and recommendations of this nomination. I rest my case, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. We already have Le Corbusier, Olgiati, Gaudí and other architects on the World Heritage List with the best, most prestigious 20th century architecture; we thank the United States for also adding the works of Frank Lloyd Wright to the List. We need to continue to spread the message regarding the work of this great American master. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We remember when we referred this nomination back in 2016 to do more justice to the outstanding work of Frank Lloyd Wright. We believe that this moment has just come. I personally remember one of the team members who worked on this nomination and told me that she got exhausted and put all of her efforts and energy into this file but today we shall tell her that we are celebrating the fruits of her exhaustion and efforts and thus we would like to congratulate the State Party for this commendable progress and the flourishing achievement. Welcome to the World Heritage List.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Having the work of Frank Lloyd Wright on the World Heritage List is giving a new dimension to this beautiful architecture, what it represents, the fundamentals of our architectural education in schools all over the world. We congratulate the United States with this file. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. First of all, I would like to say thank you to ICOMOS for the evaluation report and thanks to the State Party for preparing this beautiful nomination this year and thanks for the preservation of the Wright designs and constructions up to now. It is really a great design and buildings. Personally, I am growing up as a student with Wright's design and maybe in the first part of the 20th century, it was quite a brave design and construction and believe me, even now it is a brave construction. I would like again to express my thanks to the State Party. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any other interventions? Maybe there are some objections to the draft decision proposed by ICOMOS? No objections. Rapporteur, do we have any amendments?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. No amendments received.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I propose to approve the decision in whole. I therefore declare decision 43 COM 8B.38 adopted as amended [*applause*]. Our sincere congratulations to the State Party of the United States of America. And I gladly present the floor to the State Party. Please, Ambassador, you are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of the United States of America:

Thank you, Chairperson Garayev, Director Rössler, distinguished Members of the Committee, the United States is truly honored by the decision today to inscribe these masterworks of Frank Lloyd Wright. We thank ICOMOS, the World Heritage Committee and our Azerbaijani hosts. The work of Frank Lloyd Wright has been on our Tentative List in some form since 1982. Today's inscription is the culmination of many, many years of work by the stewards of these sites, the Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy and our National Park Service both of which are represented here today. We are particularly proud that this inscription is the first for modern architecture in the United States. This inscription underlines our commitment that these buildings will stand as treasured monuments for succeeding generations. We also look forward to continuing to work with partners and the international community in promoting the importance of World Heritage. It's now my pleasure to pass the microphone to Lynda Waggoner, Director Emerita of Falling Water, representing the Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy.

Ms Waggoner:

Thank you, Mr Ambassador. Chairperson Garayev, Director Rössler, distinguished Members of the Committee, I can't begin to express how delighted all of us are who worked on this nomination with this tremendous honor. We thank the World Heritage Committee for their favorable decision, ICOMOS for their thoughtful assistance in revising the nomination and our own National Park Service for their encouragement and guidance. It is our hope that the inclusion of these works by Frank Lloyd Wright on the World Heritage List will result in an even greater appreciation for Wright's work. I invite everyone to come and visit these remarkable sites because experiencing them in person is really the only way to truly understand them. Even the best photographs do not do them justice. I think that if you do visit you will come to share my conviction that without Frank Lloyd Wright architecture today would be very different, indeed. Thank you. [*Applause*]

Chairperson:

Thank you and on behalf of all the Members of the Committee cordially congratulates the United States for this achievement. Thank you very much.

Now we proceed to the next item on our agenda, Item 8B.39, the Sunken City of Port Royal—A Relict and Continuing Cultural Landscape, Jamaica. Mr Balsamo, can you give us clarification on this item?

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation for the Sunken City of Port Royal—A Relict and Continuing Cultural Landscape, and it is to be found on page 81 of both the English and French versions of document INF 8.B4. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you are welcome to give the presentation.

ICOMOS:

Port Royal was established in 1656, shortly after the occupation of Jamaica by England. Within a few years, it became one of the wealthiest and most significant port cities of the British Empire. But less than 50 years later, in 1692, a severe earthquake left part of the town submerged under water. What survives are the underwater remains of the sunken portion of the town, and, on the surviving terrestrial portion, sites and structures that testify to later periods of its evolution.

The World Heritage Committee examined the nomination of Port Royal, Jamaica, at its 12th session in 1988. At that time, the nomination consisted of the terrestrial area of the property only. In its evaluation report, ICOMOS recommended that the property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List and the Committee agreed. This is thus a new nomination that covers both the terrestrial part and the submerged part of the town. Located on a long sand spit that marks the entrance to Kingston Bay, a large natural harbor, the town is prone to severe natural disasters, which have played a significant role in its evolution. Although from the 18th century until 1905, Port Royal was an English naval base and one of the richest cities of the region, little has survived above ground to reflect this wealth and influence, as in 1951 Hurricane Charlie swept through, leaving only a few buildings.

The nominated site encompasses the submerged part of the city together with what remains of the terrestrial part within the 17th century boundaries of the town. As you can see, the site is enclosed by a large buffer zone. This shaded area in this map represents the submerged part of the city. The sites marked in red are protected structures; those in pink are of modern construction. The earthquake of 1692 not only submerged part of the city but also re-shaped and extended the coastline to the south and east. Remarkably the submerged part of the city seems to have sunk gently leaving its structure intact with amazingly little distortion.

So far, two sections of the submerged site have been excavated, revealing besides the street pattern, remains of pavements, numerous houses, three forts, a tavern, a warehouse, markets and walls. These archaeological investigations have provided a remarkably complete illustration of part of a 17th century English urban settlement. Documentation reveals that the urban layout was established by Firemaster Nicholas Keen and its plan corresponds closely to the London post-fire building regulations of 1667. The numerous artefacts recovered further illuminate the town's wealth and its trading connections.

Additional information provided by the State Party has allowed a more complete understanding of what survives above ground from the 17th century such as the street pattern which aligns

with what survives in the sunken part of the town, as well as brick and stone walls around the historic district. The following slides illustrate what has survived above ground in the town. Fort Charles was constructed in 1655 as part of a network of forts but only it was still standing after the 1692 earthquake. The former jail on the left, St Peter's church and the Coal wharf in the buffer zone are 18th century structures. And these are 19th century buildings--Admiralty Houses built from the 1880s and above it the Naval Hospital.

The historical importance of Port Royal within the region is unquestionable but the limited number of structures that remain to reflect that history are not exceptional. Of much more significance are the consequences of the 1692 earthquake for the way it produced an exceptional situation, where part of the town was submerged, constituting a valuable testimony of a significant part of a 17th century English colonial town in the Americas at the first stage of its evolution, and where the 17th plan also survives above ground. ICOMOS considers that the nomination should be re-focused on these 17th century aspects as a relict landscape within the original town boundaries. Within the buffer zone next to the property there is a proposal to construct floating pier and cruise ship terminal on the site of the Coal Wharf. The impact assessments so far undertaken have not adequately assessed the potential impacts on the property, and particularly the full impact of cruise ship movements.

ICOMOS does not consider that the property in its current form justifies Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of a combination of underwater archaeology and a continuing cultural landscape of military and naval importance that is said to constitute 17th century maritime exploits, an 18th century dockyard and a 19th century coaling wharf. We do not consider that criteria (iii) and (v) can be justified nor (vi) which was put forward to reflect the transatlantic slave trade connections. But we do consider that the property could have the potential to meet criterion (iv) in relation to the pre-1692 archaeological remains only and as a relict landscape. Protection needs to be strengthened for the above ground archaeological deposits. And the management plan needs to be fully implemented, as do necessary conservation measures.

In conclusion, Chairperson, ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the nomination of The Sunken City of Port Royal--A Relict and Continuing Cultural Landscape, Jamaica, to the World Heritage List should be deferred in order to allow the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to consider the site as a single entity and a relict archaeological landscape which includes all the attributes related to 17th century archaeological vestiges, both underwater and terrestrial, of the town destroyed by the 1692 earthquake, and to revise the justification of Outstanding Universal Value accordingly, and clearly define the attributes, particularly in the terrestrial part. We have also made further recommendations which are set out in your papers but would like to highlight the request to suspend work on the proposed cruise ship pier until a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment has been undertaken and submitted for review. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis, please.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Chairperson. Saint Kitts and Nevis recognizes the outstanding value of the Sunken City of Port Royal--A Relict and Continuing Cultural Landscape. The site was devastated by an earthquake in 1692, which reduced the archaeological vestiges of Port Royal that is known today. The 17th century property located on the land and water is the only of its kind in the Caribbean and an excellently preserved testament to an English settlement in the Americas over this period. We note that ICOMOS considers the terrestrial and submerged portions of the site to be an unrivalled illustration of an English port town, which has the potential to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value and we commend Jamaica for the submission of this very significant site. We however note the concerns raised by ICOMOS on boundaries,

unjustified OUV and the fulsome expansion of an HIA for the proposed development of the site. The State Party has indicated their acceptance of the recommendation of ICOMOS and their commitment to work through the deferral to adequately address the concerns raised and to resubmit a stronger nomination in future.

Saint Kitts and Nevis therefore commends Jamaica for willingly engaging in the process to facilitate the preparation of a nomination that once in line with the recommendations of ICOMOS has the potential to be inscribed. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. With Saint Kitts and Nevis we also consider that the archeological vestiges at the site to be an extraordinary and internationally significant example of underwater cultural heritage. There are currently very few underwater heritage places on the World Heritage List. Port Royal with its famous history and its outstanding preservation of the submerged pre-1692 town clearly has great potential to demonstrate OUV under criterion (iv) and a successful nomination will address several gaps on the World Heritage List, not only in underwater heritage but also in the representation of the Caribbean region and the SIDS on the World Heritage List.

We consider that the ICOMOS recommendation for deferral is appropriate given that the potential OUV under criterion (iv) has not been clearly defined and the attributes that hold the potential OUV need to be clarified and included in revised boundaries. We agree with ICOMOS that refocusing the nomination as a relict archeological landscape from the pre-1692 town is appropriate. The underwater heritage is extremely fragile and the complex heritage impact assessment is required for the site prior to the development of the proposed floating pier and use of the adjacent area by cruise ships and other large vessels.

In our discussions with the State Party they have indicated that in this regard they would like advice in relation to the requirements for heritage impact assessment for underwater cultural heritage and in response when we come to it we would like to propose a small amendment to the draft decision. And finally, Chairperson, there is considerable expert work that has been recommended to the State Party of Jamaica for revision of the nomination dossier and we would like to hear from the State Party in relation to their capacities to implement these recommendations. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The delegation that spoke before me justified the value and specificity of this site in the Caribbean. We consider it to be unique. We also appreciate the assessment made by the Advisory Body with respect to the potentialities in terms of OUV as well as the recommendations on how the dossier could be improved for future analysis. Nonetheless, we think that the State Party has taken the initiatives very seriously and has put up a solid dossier and has been working so we would like the State Party to be given the floor in order to explain the actions that it has been implementing on the site, a site which fully fits in with the objectives of this Convention and that of the underwater cultural heritage. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway supports the draft decision and commends the State Party of Jamaica for accepting the deferral. Norway expects the State Party to follow up on the given recommendations and we do hope to see a revised evaluated nomination during our time in this Committee. We also, Mr Chairperson would like to hear from the State Party a statement on their further work with the nomination. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. For Guatemala it's important to evaluate the effort made by the State Party in preparing this application. We would also like to thank the Advisory Bodies for their analysis. There are several circumstances regarding the nomination, the property and the management system so therefore we would like to urge the State Party to evaluate the nomination in line with ICOMOS in order to present it once again to the Committee. Once we've had the recommendations in the draft decision we hope that in the near future, and I hope that Guatemala will be still a Member of the Committee, we can examine the revised nomination in order to enrich the World heritage List with this important site. It's important for Jamaican history but it's also important for the global history of the 17th century.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] We should point out that thematically and geographically that this site is located in one of the least represented parts on the List. Therefore it would be important to inscribe it as soon as possible in order to implement the Global Strategy. We also support the request made other Members of the Committee to give the floor to the State Party. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China appreciates that the State Party submitted a very special heritage, which combines the aboveground and underwater, remains of two different historical periods. China agrees with the ICOMOS expert opinion that the existing urban planning and the archeological remains have the potential for Outstanding Universal Value as a witness to an important stage in the history of Jamaica as a British colony and justifies criterion (iv). At the same time China is aware of the difficulties in protecting, managing and presenting the underwater heritage. China supports the State Party to strengthen research on this complex heritage in accordance with the professional recommendations of ICOMOS for better protection and management. China appreciates the State Party accepts the recommendation of ICOMOS. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, China. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Spain cannot but express its satisfaction over this application. This is the first candidacy for underwater cultural heritage here and it is a symbol of the relation that we always speak about between all the Conventions. We know that the World Heritage Convention, the tangible and intangible heritage as we've seen in many applications that we study, but here the relations between the underwater cultural heritage and the standard cultural heritage reflected in this handsome candidacy. It's really been a challenge for the State Party. We know that underwater cultural heritage is particularly vulnerable and therefore we encourage the State Party to follow the advice of the Advisory Body and for the Advisory Body to continue to assist the State Party to make it possible for us to approve this candidacy. Therefore, we approve of the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Spain. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Brazil would like to commend Jamaica for proposing this property and the way it redefines the nominated property compared to the original nomination back in 1988. We also would like to strongly commend Jamaica for not challenging ICOMOS' recommendations and its position to accept deferral and work in collaboration with ICOMOS to present a revised dossier with the recommendations that were proposed. We join the concern with regard to the developments in the property's area and we encourage the State Party to take the proper heritage impact assessment of the development they have in mind. And to conclude, Mr Chairperson, we would like to also encourage the State Party not to drop criterion (vi) from this nomination and to further develop research concerning its relation to the slave trade. We would be most willing to cooperate in that regard. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. There are no other proposals from the Committee Members and as far as I know—are there any? Please. Welcome.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As flagged, from the floor by Australia, there is a small amendment, an additional amendment to the decision that's for a new paragraph 5, requesting a mission. And I think we will be perhaps just taking that from the floor or typing the very last-minute text message I got. It might be recommends the State Party rather than requests. And I'll just read that one out. Proposed by Australia to read, recommends the State Party invite an ICOMOS advisory mission to the property to provide advice in relation to Heritage Impact Assessments for underwater cultural heritage.

Chairperson:

Are there any other amendments or objections against this amendment? I don't see any. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Chairperson, would we be able to hear from the State Party as requested by several of the Committee Members?

Chairperson:

Of course we are going to give the floor to the State Party. Now welcome, the State Party, Jamaica.

The Observer Delegation of Jamaica:

Thank you, Chairperson for allowing Jamaica the floor. First, as Jamaica is taking the floor for the first time, let me congratulate you on your leadership of the session and Jamaica also expresses our sincere thanks to the Republic of Azerbaijan for its wonderful hospitality during this meeting. Jamaica thanks the World Heritage Secretariat and ICOMOS for the opportunities provided for dialogue as we strive towards adding our cherished Port Royal to the World Heritage List. The Government of Jamaica believes that the site of the Sunken City of Port Royal—A Relict and Continuing Cultural Landscape, has Outstanding Universal Value, a belief held also by ICOMOS and recognizes that this terrestrial and marine 17th century site must be protected for all humanity. Jamaica is therefore fully committed to the preservation of this site and we will continue to work assiduously in this regard.

Mr Chairperson, Jamaica notes and accepts the recommendations of a deferred nomination. The guidance provided by ICOMOS, which will result in a stronger nomination file that will have a better opportunity at being inscribed in the future. Activities related to an expanded Heritage Impact Assessment will be addressed through dialogue with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. We express our appreciation to the Committee Members for their encouraging words and in particular, sister island Saint Kitts and Nevis and Cuba. Special thanks to Australia who have offered advice towards our next steps and to Brazil as well. Jamaica reaffirms its commitment to the preservation of our cultural and natural heritage and will work with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre towards a nomination file that effectively represents the significant attributes of the Sunken City of Port Royal. Thank you. *[Applause]*

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for such an approach and we believe that soon this file will be reconsidered and we will gladly have better news. So, if the Committee Members don't mind we will approve the decision as proposed in this last version with the amendment from Australia. No objections?

Chairperson:

Therefore I declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.39 adopted as amended.

Now we move to Item 8B.40, connected with Panama. May I ask ICOMOS to make a presentation of the site?

ICOMOS:

The ICOMOS evaluation of this nomination can be found in document INF.8B1 on page 374 in the English version and page 76 in the French version.

This is the first of three proposed stages to extend and connect two existing World Heritage properties: the Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and the Historic District of Panamá on the Pacific coast; and the Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo. The staged proposal adds two historical routes that crossed the isthmus of Panamá: the Camino de Cruces and the Camino Real, which provided interchange between the Caribbean and the Pacific Ocean. The route was a significant part of the Intercontinental Royal Road, and the Spanish colonial system in the Americas from the 16th century. This nomination has a complex background, which is summarized in the ICOMOS report.

State of conservation reports for the Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and the Historic District of Panamá have been considered by the World Heritage Committee between 2008 and 2017. A High-Level Reactive Monitoring Mission took place in 2013. In 2013 and 2016, the World Heritage Committee requested that the State Party submit a significant boundary modification by 1 February 2018, and that an absence of the implementation of this request

would result in the property being deleted from the World Heritage List at this current session. A different proposed boundary modification to the Historic District of Panamá was not approved by the World Heritage Committee in 2016. In 2017, the State Party submitted the Colonial Transisthmian Route of Panamá in its Tentative List, and an ICOMOS advisory process was completed.

The current proposal includes significant modifications to the boundary, rationale for inscription, criteria and name of the Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá, in accordance with Paragraphs 165, 166 and 167 of the Operational Guidelines. According to Paragraph 139, serial nominations may be submitted for evaluation over several nomination cycles, provided that the first property nominated is of Outstanding Universal Value in its own right. The two routes cross the isthmus between the Caribbean and the Pacific Ocean: the Camino de Cruces (which is focus of the current stage) and the Camino Real (which is planned for Stage 2). Stage 3 will include the two fortifications on the Caribbean side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo once they are able to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger (according to Decision 43 COM 7A.50 taken at this session). This first stage has five components: three sections of the Camino de Cruces and two components which are the already inscribed World Heritage property of the Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and the Historic District of Panamá, both on the Pacific coast. The three-stage proposal includes evidence of the routes (through fluvial and terrestrial environments), historic towns, archaeological sites, and the defences needed to protect the route and the immense multi-directional flows of goods and people.

The archaeological site of Panama Viejo was the earliest settlement on the Pacific coast, which was moved to present-day Panama City in the 17th century. Panama City's historic district is the oldest continuously occupied European city on the Pacific Coast of the Americas. The fluvial section of the Camino de Cruces includes the water route from the Caribbean coast to the start of the terrestrial route at Venta de Cruces. The main terrestrial section of the Camino de Cruces is over 20km long, passing through mountain areas and thick vegetation. There is one final section of the route, which nears the semi-urban outskirts of Panama City. This slide shows the water section of the Camino de Cruces and the next two slides show some of the physical evidence of the terrestrial route. The two routes were used by Spain until the mid-18th century. The Camino de Cruces is the direct antecedent of the 19th century Panama railroad and the Panama Canal, which opened in 1914.

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis supports the proposal to nominate Panama's transisthmian routes. The proposed heritage route has potential to demonstrate criteria (ii) and (iv) once a number of key issues with integrity and authenticity, protection and management have been addressed. ICOMOS does not see potential for the other criteria proposed by the State Party, namely (v) and (vi). As detailed in the state of conservation reports, new developments and deterioration of elements have affected the authenticity and integrity of the two existing inscribed components, which are considered still vulnerable and are continuing to be addressed by the State Party.

The proposed component boundaries are potentially appropriate, although ICOMOS has questioned several aspects warranting further research. There are proposed arrangements for protection and the management system that seem promising. However, they have yet to be effectively implemented and the needed coordination is just beginning. There are many open questions, which have been left to future stages. The State Party has responded to the decisions of the World Heritage Committee, the options proposed by the 2013 High-Level Reactive Monitoring Mission, and the 2017 ICOMOS Advisory process. The proposal presents an entirely different rationale for inscription oriented around the heritage routes that crossed the isthmus. ICOMOS considers this to be a promising way forward. However, in a staged nomination process, the first stage must meet the requirements for Outstanding Universal Value. In the view of ICOMOS, this has clearly not yet been achieved.

ICOMOS also has concerns about the ambitious timeframe outlined by the State Party, especially given that the two existing World Heritage properties involved also need attention and resources. Accordingly, ICOMOS recommends that the proposed extension (including changes to the boundary, rationale for inscription, criteria and name of the property) be deferred. This will enable the State Party to present a revised Stage 1 that can meet the requirements for Outstanding Universal Value, and to establish an effective management system for the serial property. Deferral will also enable the State Party to continue to improve the state of conservation of the two existing World Heritage properties, as outlined in previous Committee decisions. Because of the need to maintain momentum, a suggested timeframe for the resubmission of Stage 1 is proposed in the draft decision.

A number of further recommendations have been provided to assist the long-term conservation of the property. These should be seen as complementing the decisions this Committee has already taken at this session in 43 COM 7A.50 and 43 COM 7B.101. That's the end of the presentation. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on this matter? Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway supports the draft decision, as there are still many questions to be answered and processes to be completed in this complex case. Further, we would like to commend Panama for accepting the nomination being deferred back to them and thus for taking into serious consideration the tasks identified in the draft decision as well as respecting the World Heritage Convention. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We would like to thank Panama for the nomination presented and ICOMOS' analysis thereof. This is one of the few nominations in Latin American and the Caribbean that we'd like to congratulate the State Party for the efforts it has made but particularly for giving us the opportunity to examine this interesting file, which will enrich the historical treasure of the colonial routes of Latin America. The passages of human beings through Panama began with prehistoric movements followed by the colonial routes and the trans-oceanic railroad in the 19th century and then afterwards by the Panama Canal. This nomination has to do with global dynamics at a specific time in history. We are sure that with the help of ICOMOS and the efforts made by the State Party this property will be inscribed on the World Heritage List in the near future. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any other comments? If there are no other comments maybe we will proceed to the adoption of the document. Do we have any amendments or changes?

Rapporteur:

No amendments, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We can proceed to the approval of the document in whole. I don't see any objections so we declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.40 adopted as amended. Thank you very much. Now I would like to give the floor to the State Party of Panama. You are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Panama:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would just like to tell you something about Panama. This work began in 2012 and throughout time there were conflicts and discussions but once Dr Rössler visited Panama and evaluated and made recommendations the situation changed dramatically and the State Party began to have a complete and direct relation with ICOMOS in order to build up the file that we are looking at today. I would like to make this point because it's the question of the state of conservation and the Operational Guidelines is important. We are working on this file and this is something we have been working on together. But there is still something lacking and as you can see in the comments, what is lacking has to do with something that UNESCO should consider, both the IUCN and ICOMOS, which is, not all the States Parties have equal conditions to implement recommendations in a short space of time. Panama doesn't have the same resources that some of the other countries have in order to do so much in so little time. This is something that should be considered if we are to implement all the recommendations and fulfill all the requirements for nomination, particularly to ensure the state of conservation.

I would like to thank Dr Rössler and the whole IUCN team because this is the last dossier that we are looking at and it's also my last day in UNESCO. I will conclude after working with UNESCO for seven years representing my country and I can see how a complex file and other files too regarding natural heritage that are complex have achieved a much better state of conservation today so I think that we will be able to continue with the future leaders. So let me thank all the staff and all the people—you know who you are—I'd like to thank you all and I'll see you soon in Panama. Thank you. *[Applause]*

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ambassador. And on behalf of the Committee Members we wish you good luck and success in your new position. Thank you very much for your involvement and active work in the UNESCO framework. Thank you.

Now we move to the examination the file we decided to postpone until the working group will come to the solution with the draft decision. This is document 8B.5 concerning the Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex and I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur to present to us the new draft amendment.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have received quite an amended decision from the drafting group. The first two paragraphs would remain un-amended. The third paragraph would read, Noting the efforts of the State Party to address the matters identified by the Committee at its 39th and 40th sessions. The fourth paragraph reads, Taking note of the technical agreement reached by the States Parties of Thailand and Myanmar on the delineation of the boundary of the nominated area based on the Technical Meeting between the two concerned States Parties held in Bangkok on 25 and 26 April 2019.

Paragraph 5, Taking note of the progress made by the State Party on the adoption of legislation aimed at addressing the concerns of the rights and livelihoods of the local communities including the Karen within the Kaeng Krachan National Park. Paragraph 6 then is referring so, Refers the nomination of Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex, Thailand, back to the State Party in order to allow it to: a) revise the boundaries of the property based on agreement between the States Parties of Thailand and Myanmar; b) prepare and submit a revised comparative analysis demonstrating that the reduced area of the nominated property would be sufficient to meet criterion (x), including the related conditions of integrity, protection and management; c) demonstrate that all concerns have been resolved, in full consultation with the local communities, in accordance with paragraph 123 of the Operational Guidelines.

Paragraph 7, Encourages the ongoing dialogue between the State Party and the Advisory Body and recommends that the State Party invites an IUCN Advisory mission to assist in the preparation of the additional information requested under paragraph 6.

Paragraph 8, Encourages the States Parties of Thailand and Myanmar to work in partnership on future biological connectivity opportunities and collaborative efforts on conservation between the nominated property and the proposed protected area in Myanmar, in accordance with paragraph 6 above. And as you can the previous decision has been deleted. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As you know, this document is the result of consultation over two days between members of the working group and they agreed to find such a consensus, which is presented in this draft decision. I think there is no need for any further comments because it is the work of... Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Ce n'est pas un commentaire du texte qui est devant nous mais, la Tunisie ayant fait partie du groupe de rédaction, nous sommes très heureux d'arriver à ce résultat, et je voudrais à l'occasion souligner l'esprit dans lequel cette rédaction a eu lieu, et surtout la coopération et la compréhension qu'on a trouvées auprès de l'État partie. Je voulais à l'occasion les saluer et les en remercier.

Chairperson:

We greatly appreciate the spirit of the working group and the understanding and common work done by the committee members in favor of the common decision. If there are no other comments, I propose to approve the document 8B.5 as delivered to the screen Approved. Thank you. We have not finished the examination of all—we have now finished, sorry, finished, sorry all nominations. I suppose we still have something. We will now proceed with the examination of 13 minor modifications to the boundaries of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. You will find the documents for consideration in document 8B.Add.

We will first examine the minor boundary modifications of cultural properties. The alphabetical list is in front of you. These are Bolivia (Plurinational State of), City of Potosí; Chile, Churches of Chiloé; Chile, Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works; France, Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments; Germany Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz; Germany, Maulbronn Monastery Complex; Honduras Maya Site of Copan; Italy, Venice and its Lagoon; Norway, Bryggen; Portugal, University of Coimbra—Alta and Sofia; and Sweden, Royal Domain of Drottningholm. So these are the sites that we will consider. Mr Balsamo, the floor is yours.

The Secretariat:

We have a factual error notification concerning the first minor boundary notification, which we are examining concerning Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments and this notification is to be found on page 126 in both the English, and French versions of document INF.8B.4.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, you have the floor.

ICOMOS:

The ICOMOS evaluation of the minor boundary notification for Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments can be found on p. 46 in the English version and page 58 in the French version of document INF.8B.1.Add.

The property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981, on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) as a good example of the adaptation of an ancient city to medieval European civilization. It contains some impressive Roman monuments: the arena, the Roman theatre and the cryptoporticus as well as Romanesque monuments. In 2006, the State Party proposed the name to be changed to its actual name and in 2011, as part of the retrospective inventory; the perimeter of the property was slightly modified.

The present minor boundary notification concerns the establishment of the buffer zone, which was approved by the French state in 2018. A brief account of the rationale for the buffer zone mentions the archaeological context, the urban development, project areas and the preservation of OUV, as well as landscape considerations and consolidated historic viewpoints. The buffer zone is expected to be managed according to the Local Urban Plan, which was approved in 2017, as well as an architectural and heritage enhancement plan, which will be annexed to the urban plan. In the proposed buffer zone, in the immediate vicinity of the inscribed property, it is currently being built a 56m high tower, designed by the architect Frank Gehry. The proportions of the structure, its new materials and dynamic forms, according to ICOMOS, interfere with the visual integrity of the historical skyline of the property, which as underlined by the State Party has not changed since the 17th century. The construction of the tower was not mentioned in the minor boundary notification proposal and, unfortunately, ICOMOS did not receive earlier information about this project.

ICOMOS observes that criteria for establishing the boundaries of the buffer zone remain unclear as a robust justification for their delineation were not provided. ICOMOS considers that the buffer zone should include areas with high potential in terms of archaeological deposits and should ensure that the historical skyline of Arles is maintained, preventing real estate large-scale developments too close to the property.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed buffer zone be referred back to the State Party, in order to provide a clear rationale regarding the delineation of the buffer zone; provide specific documentation and details regarding building regulations, provide the Heritage Impact Assessment undertaken for the Luma Arles tower, and deliver a visual impact analysis of this tower on the property and its Outstanding Universal Value. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the modifications? Can we approve the decision?

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

No amendments. So item 8B.43 can be adopted. Thank you very much. Now item 8B.44. Please, ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found on page 38 in the English version and page 50 of the French version of document 43 COM/8B1.Add.

The Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz is an exceptional example of landscape design and planning from the Age of the Enlightenment. The serial property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2000 but no buffer zone was defined for one component. The proposal involves minor changes to the property boundary to better align with the historic layout of the property,

a correction to the size of the area of the property based on the latest available geographic information system and the identification of a buffer zone for one component. The State Party proposes to reduce the area of the property by 514 hectares to 11,891 hectares and to increase the buffer zone by 2,784 hectares. The proposed buffer zone surrounds the component on all sides, and was defined in order to provide effective protection.

The boundary change will not affect management of the property, and existing management arrangements will apply to the proposed buffer zone. The boundary change will have no impact regarding the legal protection of the property, and the proposed buffer zone also shares this protection. ICOMOS considers that the proposed modifications will contribute to the protection and management of the property.

ICOMOS recommends that the proposed minor modification to the boundary and creation of a buffer zone for one component be approved. Thank you Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on this item? No amendments?

Rapporteur:

We've received no amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Can we approve as it is submitted? Okay, then we approve item 8B.44 as amended. Thank you very much. Next one, 8B.45. Please, ICOMOS.

ICOMOS:

Thank you again, Mr Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found on page 40 in the English version and page 52 in the French version of document 43 COM/8B1.Add.

Founded in 1147, the Cistercian Maulbronn Monastery is considered the most complete and best-preserved medieval monastic complex north of the Alps. The property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1993 but no buffer zone was defined. The water-management system at Maulbronn is an element of Outstanding Universal Value. However, at the time of inscription there was some uncertainty about which features were actually part of the monastery. The minor boundary modification relates to changes to the property boundaries and the creation of a buffer zone. The State Party proposes to add a net additional area of 2.5 hectares to the property and create a buffer zone of 1,568.47 hectares.

The proposed changes to the boundaries are the addition or the removal of water management features consistent with their being attributes or not attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value, and all of this is based on a detailed survey that has been undertaken. The proposed buffer zone comprises the river valley where the monastery is situated. Existing management arrangements will continue to operate with the modified boundaries. Existing legal protection will extend to the modified boundary and a range of statutory rules and regulations will apply to the proposed buffer zone. ICOMOS considers that the proposed modifications will contribute to the protection and management of the property.

ICOMOS recommends that the proposed minor modification to the boundary and creation of a buffer zone be approved. An additional recommendation is also offered. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on this item? No amendments?

Rapporteur:

We have no amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we can approve the decision as it is submitted, 8B.45. Thank you.

Now we come to 8B.46, Venice and its Lagoon, Italy. ICOMOS, the floor is yours.

ICOMOS:

Thank you again, Chairperson. The ICOMOS evaluation can be found on page 48 in the English version and page 60 in the French version of document 43 COM/8B1.Add.

Venice and its Lagoon includes the whole city which is an extraordinary architectural masterpiece and the property illustrates the interaction between people and the ecosystem of their natural environment. The property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1987 but no buffer zone was defined. The issue of a buffer zone has been subject to several state of conservation reports and decisions by the World Heritage Committee since 2014, as well as a reactive monitoring mission. The State Party proposes a buffer zone of 511,028.21 hectares.

The size and function of the buffer zone were determined by analyzing the pressures and threats on the Outstanding Universal Value arising from outside the property. The management of the proposed buffer zone is closely related to the coordinated management of the property, and the Management Plan is being updated to address the buffer zone. The buffer zone has several area-based protection systems based in specific legal instruments reflecting thematic levels of the buffer zone, these being: environmental protection, historical-landscape protection, and coordinated management of territory from a strategic/metropolitan perspective.

ICOMOS notes the reason for the large proposed buffer zone is founded on the necessity to add protection not only to the cultural heritage and its visual appreciation, but also to the natural environment preserving the lagoon, the quality of its water and the balance of its sand features. ICOMOS considers that the proposed buffer zone will reinforce the integrity of the property and contribute to its coordinated management. However, ICOMOS recommends that the proposed minor modification to create a buffer zone be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to: clarify why one water body has been excluded from the proposed buffer zone and reconsider the exclusion of this part of the southern coastal strip from the proposed buffer zone, and sign a programme agreement regarding the governance system for the buffer zone. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Can we proceed with the decision without any changes and amendments? No amendments?

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Then we declare 8B.46 adopted. Now we are coming to 8B.47. ICOMOS, the floor is yours.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. This is the presentation concerns the ICOMOS evaluation of the proposal for minor boundary modification to Bryggen in Norway. Bryggen was inscribed in the

World Heritage List in 1979 on the basis of criterion (iii). At that time, there was no requirement for a buffer zone. The local area plan was adopted by local authorities in 2006 to protect the property, and provides a legal basis for a buffer zone. This has now been submitted for formal adoption by the World Heritage Committee.

The map provided by the State Party shows an area of 27 hectares surrounding the inscribed World Heritage property. The plan protects important sight lines and the visual integrity of Bryggen. ICOMOS considers that in general, the proposed buffer zone is well justified and notes that protection mechanisms are already functioning. However, the northeastern edge of the proposed buffer zone provides an extremely narrow buffer and should be extended. ICOMOS also notes that the delineation of the buffer zone crosses through the middle of some buildings, rather than aligning with the extent of buildings and allotments. ICOMOS is also concerned about a planned tram track that would pass through the buffer zone. This could have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of Bryggen and needs careful assessment.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends that the proposed minor modification to add the buffer zone for Bryggen in Norway be referred back to the State Party to allow consideration of the possibilities to further extend the buffer zone in the northeast. ICOMOS also recommends that the proposed tram track alignment be subject to Heritage Impact Assessment. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any additions or comments on this proposed draft? No comments.

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we declare document 8B.47 adopted. Thank you. Document 8B.48, Portugal, University of Coimbra–Alta and Sofia. Please, ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. This is the concerns the ICOMOS evaluation of the proposal for minor boundary modification to the University of Coimbra in Portugal. The University of Coimbra--Alta and Sofia was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2013 on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi).

The State Party proposes to include the Machado de Castro National Museum (an area of 0.7 hectares) within the property boundary. This is currently included in the buffer zone. The proposal does not require any modification to the outer delineation of the buffer zone. The map provided by the State Party shows the proposed change to the Alta component at its southern and western edges. The State Party considers that adding this element will strengthen the integrity of the inscribed property. Machado de Castro National Museum is in the former bishop's palace and there is a new building also included in the complex. The museum was established in 1911 and has been recently renovated. It houses collections related to the history of the Coimbra region. The Museum has a long association with the university, and some collections are jointly managed.

ICOMOS considers that the proposed modification will contribute to the strengthened integrity, management and visitor presentation of the World Heritage property. Accordingly, ICOMOS recommends that the proposed minor modification to the boundary of the property of University

of Coimbra (Portugal) be approved. Several additional recommendations have been included. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. No comments? No changes.

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Then we proceed to the approval of document 8B.48. We consider it adopted. Thank you very much. Document 8B.49, Sweden, Royal Domain of Drottningholm. ICOMOS, the floor is yours.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson, the ICOMOS evaluation of the minor boundary modification for Royal Domain of Drottningholm can be found on page 44 in the English version and on page 56 in the French version of document INF.8B1 The Royal Domain of Drottningholm was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991 on the basis of criterion (iv) as one of the finest examples of an 18th century north European royal residence inspired by the Palace of Versailles.

The present minor boundary modification is proposed to provide the property with a buffer zone. Although this was not required at the time of inscription its need was regularly highlighted, including by the periodic report submitted by the State Party in 2006 as well as by ICOMOS reports prepared in the process of the remodeling of the Ekerö road and the construction of the Stockholm bypass. The proposed buffer zone covers more than 3,200 hectares and corresponds to the boundaries of the Lovö Nature Reserve. The area has strong cultural character linked with the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property, and therefore its boundaries have been delineated with participation of both nature and culture specialists. The proposal for the buffer zone was developed jointly by the Stockholm County Administrative Board, the National Property Board of Sweden and Ekerö Municipality with the participation of local residents and landowners.

The proposed buffer zone allows better understanding of the value and significance of the World Heritage property, ensuring longterm preservation of the agricultural landscape, which has been owned by the Crown and serving its need for supplies for centuries. In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends that the proposed buffer zone for the Royal Domain of Drottningholm, Sweden, be approved.

ICOMOS proposes one ancillary recommendation concerning the development of an integrated management plan for the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, including a Spatial Development Plan. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any comments on behalf of the Members of the Committee? We have an additional draft decision on this item. May I apply to the Rapporteur to give us information, please?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Yes, we have one small amendment proposed for this decision in paragraph 3 which would now read, Recommends that the State Party develop a new

integrated management plan for the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, including a Spatial Development Plan, in cooperation with the County Administrative Board and Ekerö municipality, as well as a comprehensive mobility plan.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Are there any objections on the addition of this item to the draft decision? I don't see any comments. So can we approve the decision as proposed in the last version? Fine. We declare item 8B.49 adopted in the last version. We come to draft decision 8B.50, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, City of Potosí. ICOMOS, the floor is yours.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The City of Potosí was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1987 on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi), but without a buffer zone. The collapse of a portion of the summit of Cerro Rico in February 2011 led to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2014. In this context the Committee requested the official submission of a buffer zone to protect the visually sensitive areas around the property. The clarification of the limits of the property and a final proposal of the buffer zone are part of the desired corrective measures for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS provided technical assistance during a mission in 2017. The minor boundary modification now submitted comprises a property of close to 2,211 hectares, surrounded by a buffer zone of 4,428 hectares. However, despite the clarity of this geo-referenced map, information provided in other sections of this request for a minor boundary modification raises questions as to the exact legal and factual boundary definition in some areas.

ICOMOS therefore recommends that the examination of the proposed minor modification to the boundary, and the proposed buffer zone of the City of Potosí, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to clarify these aspects as well as provide additional information on the rationale for this delineation, provide explicit information on the legal and management aspects and the different regulations applicable. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. The proposal is clear. We have amendments?

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

So can we approve the proposal proposed by ICOMOS document? I don't see any objections. Thank you very much. So we approve document 8B.50 as proposed. Thank you. 8B.51, Churches of Chiloé from Chile. ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The serial property was inscribed in December 2000 on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii). The original buffer zones consisted, in some cases, of narrow areas that did not completely surround the components. A joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2013 advised on a number of issues including the review of the buffer

zones and regulatory measures for the protection of the setting of the Churches of Chiloé and requested to submit a minor boundary modification for the property to establish a final proposal for the buffer zones and wider setting for each of the components of the serial nomination. Since then, the State Party has worked on a comprehensive plan for the protection of the surroundings of the churches in a participatory process, which included local communities associated to the churches. In 2016 and 2018, ICOMOS elaborated technical reviews on the proposed preliminary protection areas.

While a number of buffer zones now proposed are fully adequate, ICOMOS considers that the buffer zone proposed for the component of Quinchao could be extended to include a wider selection of the landscape and vegetation behind the church. For the components of Nuestra Señora de Gracia de Nercón shown here, Natividad de María de Ichuac church, Santiago Apóstol de Detif church and San Antonio de Vilupulli church, the proposed buffer zones are adequate. The buffer zone proposed for San Carlos Borromeo de Chonchi church could be extended to include a larger part of the surrounding landscape, which provides the setting of this component. The same applies to the Nuestra Señora del Patrocinio de Tenaún component, which should hence be revised. The buffer zone proposed for San Antonio de Colo is adequate. However, the buffer zone proposed for San Juan Bautista de San Juan should be extended to include a larger area of the surrounding landscape as proposed in the preliminary protection plan. Lastly, the buffer zone proposed for Nuestra Señora del Rosario de Chelín is adequate.

ICOMOS therefore recommends to approve the buffer zones proposed for all components except four previously highlighted churches, for which it is necessary to include larger areas to adequately protect the setting of these properties. ICOMOS further recommends the State Party to provide the exact extent of each component part of the property and to finalize the identification of buffer zones for the remaining churches of Castro and Caguach and to conclude the process for the churches of Achao, Rilán, Aldachildo and Dalcachue, as well as urgently establish a management plan for the property. Thank you Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. No comments. No additions?

Rapporteur:

We have no amendments.

Chairperson:

We approve item 8B.51 as amended. Item 8B.52, please. Chile. ICOMOS, the floor is yours.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. This is the minor boundary modification for Humberstone and Santa Laura in Chile. The property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2005 on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). At the time of inscription the surface of the property was 285 hectares, with a buffer zone of 11,470 hectares. In 2011, the State Party submitted a request for a minor modification to the boundaries of the property, which was approved. The Committee requested that also a buffer zone be established and approved in line with the revised boundaries.

Since 2017, a proposed buffer zone had been established and work was carried out for its legal protection as a typical zone, being approved by the National Monuments Council on January 2018. This draft buffer zone was already welcomed by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session and has now been formally submitted as a minor boundary modification request. ICOMOS recommends that the proposed creation of a buffer zone for Humberstone and Santa Laura Salpeter Works, Chile, be approved. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any comments? Any additions?

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We can proceed and approve document 8B.52 as amended. Thank you very much. We proceed to document 8B.53, Honduras, Maya Site of Copan. ICOMOS, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. At the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, no precise limits of the property and no buffer zone were defined. In the framework of the retrospective inventory, the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to officially submit the limits of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone. The boundary of the World Heritage property was then approved by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session. A buffer zone, larger than the one under review in this present submission, has been proposed in the Management Plan 2014-2020 but was not approved by the responsible government authorities.

The now proposed buffer zone seems adequate. However, ICOMOS notes that the map of the proposed buffer zone delineation does not include the designated area of influence mentioned, nor the location of the 11 protected enclaves. Therefore, ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed buffer zone for the Maya Site of Copan, Honduras, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to complete the map by including the area of influence and the 11 protective enclaves as well as provide more information of its legal protection and enforcement. Thank you Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. No comments. No amendments?

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We can proceed and approve document 8B.53 to be adopted like amended. Thank you very much. Now we come to the natural sites. So I think we have to give the floor to IUCN. They are ready to proceed with document 8B.41, Denmark, Ilulissat Icefjord. You are welcome, IUCN.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Good afternoon. This is for the Ilulissat Icefjord, Denmark. IUCN's evaluation of the minor boundary modification of Ilulissat Icefjord is on page 13 of both the English and French versions of the .Add IUCN evaluation report. The property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2004.

IUCN notes that this minor boundary modification request entails two parts: Firstly, a correction to the area of the property, due to adoption of digital mapping technology, but not to change the boundaries. The previous measurement was 402,400 hectares, while the corrected figure is 399,800 hectares, a difference of less than 1%; and secondly, the creation of a "local" and "recreational" buffer zone surrounding the property. The correction of the area of the property

has no impact on its OUV, and it is not in fact a boundary modification. The retrospective statement of OUV for the property refers to the proposal to create a buffer zone, so this is already anticipated.

IUCN welcomes the proposal, which represents an improvement in the overall protection and management system for the property. However, IUCN notes that the documentation is not fully clear regarding the intended operation of the buffer zones. In particular, in regards to what activities and/or developments are permitted in the “local” and the “recreational” buffer zones. It would be important that the State Party clarifies this matter in terms of general management provisions, and that appropriate environmental and social impact assessments, as well as assessment of potential impact on OUV, are undertaken for any proposed developments.

The draft decision, Mr Chairperson, recommending approval of the proposed minor boundary modification for this property is set out on page 7 in the English version and page 8 in the French version of working document 8B.Add. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I consider there are no objections or amendments.

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we can approve this document 8B.41 adopted as proposed. Thank you very much. And now 8B.42. Brazil, Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks. IUCN, the floor is yours. Welcome.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and good afternoon everybody. IUCN’s evaluation of this property is on page 19 in both the English and French versions of .Add IUCN Evaluation Report. The property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2001.

In 2010, information was received by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN that the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park component of the property had been reduced following a ruling that the Federal decree which expanded the National Park was void as the expansion process in 2001 did not meet the required public consultation standards. This resulted in a significant part of the World Heritage property not benefitting anymore from any legal protection and the World Heritage Committee in a number of its decisions had expressed concerns over this situation and the lack of legal protection. The State Party has since been working on restoring the legal protection of the property through a new expansion of the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park and consideration of additional measures.

The proposal now made by the State Party presents a new boundary of the property, which would expand its overall area by more than 3.5%. Overall the new proposed boundaries largely follow the current boundaries of the property with some areas excluded and some areas added along the border. IUCN concludes that overall the proposed revised boundaries would provide adequate protection for the OUV of the property as inscribed and can mostly be accepted as meeting the relevant integrity requirements. However, IUCN notes one exception to this advice, which is that the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park component of the property was clearly inscribed as a coherent area but the proposal includes one area near the centre of the component that is proposed for excision creating therefore a hole within this component.

The status of this area requires clarification with the State Party, which was not possible in the minor boundary modification process in that it does not provide for evaluation missions and was not possible here at this Committee session. IUCN considers that it would be problematic from a management perspective to excise this area from the World Heritage property and therefore recommends that this area not be removed from the property via the minor boundary modification process under consideration.

The draft decision recommending approval of the property's minor boundary modification for this property with exception for the excision of the area at the centre of the Chapada dos Veadeiros component of the property is set out on page 7 in the English version and on page 8 in the French version of working document 8B.Add. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, IUCN. Are there any comments? Any amendments?

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Rapporteur. So we proceed to adoption of document 8B.42 as amended. Approved.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have now finished the examination of minor boundary modifications. We will now continue with our Agenda item 8B and proceed with adoption of 10 statements of Outstanding Universal Value of properties inscribed at previous sessions of the Committee. You will find the 10 statements in document 8B.Add. I now invite Mr Balsamo to present this point. You are welcome.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We are dealing here with 10 statements of Outstanding Universal Value that were provisionally adopted at previous sessions of the Committee. The 10 statements concern the following properties: China, Fanjingshan; Germany, Naumburg Cathedral; Iran, Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region; Iraq, the Ahwar of Southern Iraq: Refuge of Biodiversity and the Relict Landscape of the Mesopotamian Cities; Italy, Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century; Mexico, Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica; Oman, Ancient City of Qalhat; Republic of Korea, Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea; Turkey, Aphrodisias; and Turkey, Göbekli Tepe. These statements have been refined with the cooperation of the Advisory Bodies and the concern States Parties and they are now ready for adoption and draft decision 43 COM 8B.54 can be found on page 11 in the English version and page 12 in the French version of document 8B.Add. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any other opinions? Any amendments?

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we can proceed to approve document 8B.54 to be adopted as amended. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

The last decision on item 8B concerns the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the transboundary property Maloti-Drakensberg Park, Lesotho/South Africa. The draft decision is included in document 8B.Add. Please, Mr Balsamo, give us some explanation. Thank you.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. In its decision 41 COM 7B.38, the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in Krakow, 2017 requested the State Party of Lesotho and South Africa to present an updated Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the Maloti-Drakensberg Park World Heritage property by incorporating the findings of the recent studies related to the cultural attributes of the property as mentioned in that decision. The statement shows the slight amendments made to the text not touching at all the criteria statement. The statement and related draft decision 43 COM 8B.55 is on page 28 in the English version of 8B.Add and on page 31 in the French version of the same document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. No objections? Any amendments?

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we declare draft decision 43 COM 8B.55 adopted as amended. Thank you very much. Now we have finished the consideration of this huge document and I have an apply from the delegation of Iran to give a short presentation of the poetry considered with the inscription of the site.

The Observer Delegation of Iran:

Thank you, sir. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Our dear WHC continued its journey of the recognition of one another's heritage, values, thoughts and traditions. The miracle of the World Heritage is making a channel through history to uncover from the dust of ages, what has been cloaked in the mystery. A chorus sings when you inscribe a precious nomination, birds in flight together to ensure this treasure's full conservation. Let our appreciation blossom if I can count on your consent to all those ensuring the success of this shining event, on the wings of history you have given consideration to the fortunate sites now accorded designation. Oh, we have overcome wars and borders to fly free, hugging the magical passport offered by WHC! Heritage is transcendental, above the orbit of its nation and it is UNESCO that joins all of us in the creation. Of this new language, rather than keeping us apart we now all feel united in the heritage of the heart. To such a variety of lands we now feel we belong, that joyfully we raise our voice in harmonious song, what a world it may be if the logic of this session becomes the melody behind our daily expression so that far from seeing foreign lands and other, we tend towards them as towards a true brother. The wondrous treasures would welcome with delight to visit them as the newly inscribed World Heritage site. Dear friends, this session of the World Heritage Committee has been embraced in Baku, has been embraced by Baku, such a heart inspiring city, dear neighboring Republic of Azerbaijan, shall I mention that we are eagerly awaiting the Hyrcanian extension? Thank you. *[Applause and laughter]*

Chairperson:

We consider this intervention like an action plan. We are already moving towards that. Thank you very much for this poetic moment.

Now I would like to announce that we had considered all these nominations and now we have 29 new properties and one extension inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List and the total number of sites is 1,121. I congratulate all of us with this achievement. *[Applause]*

Now we still have time and as agreed by the schedule we would like to proceed to agenda Item 8A devoted to the Tentative List. Please note, that a revised document 8A was issued recently and distributed to you. Mr Balsamo can you briefly present document?

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Document 43 COM 8A.Rev was published and distributed earlier today presents the Tentative Lists of all States Parties submitted in conformity with the Operational Guidelines as of 15 April 2019. In particular, Annex 1 presents the overall situation relative to Tentative Lists. Annex 2 presents all the new Tentative Lists or additions to existing Tentative Lists, which have been submitted by States Parties since the last session of the World Heritage Committee in Manama. Annex 3 presents a list of all sites on Tentative Lists received from States Parties in alphabetical and regional order. As of 15 April 2019 of the 193 States Parties that ratified the Convention, 184 have submitted Tentative Lists in accordance with the requirements specified in the Operational Guidelines. Nine States Parties have not submitted any Tentative Lists and all the nominations submitted for examination in this section are included on the Tentative Lists of the States Parties concerned. Since the preparation of 8A for the 42nd session of the Committee in 2018 until 15 April 2019, 37 States Parties have submitted new Tentative Lists or modified existing Lists. The number of new properties added to existing Tentative Lists is 58 and currently there are 1,731 sites on the Tentative Lists. Decision 43 COM 8A is on page 2 in both the English and French versions of document 8A. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I would like to invite you to adopt the draft decision 43 COM 8A, if we don't have any comments or other amendments to the draft?

Rapporteur:

We have no amendments.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Then we declare draft decision 43 COM 8A adopted as amended and item 8A closed. We move to Agenda Item 8D devoted to the issue of the clarifications of property boundaries and areas by States Parties. Please refer to document 8D. Mr Balsamo, can you move to the item?

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. In front of you, you have document 8D, which presents cartographic and geographic information provided by States Parties on boundary clarifications of nine World Heritage properties. And as you know in the framework of the retrospective inventory project initiated in 2004, the World Heritage Centre has worked to determine which properties inscribed before 1998 have missing or inadequate boundary information. The Centre has then encouraged States Parties to submit cartographic and geographic information about the boundaries of these World Heritage properties as inscribed. In addition, States Parties have also provided technically improved maps as a follow up to the second cycle of the periodic reporting. Satisfactory boundary clarifications have been submitted for seven World Heritage properties all of which are included in document 8D to be considered adequate boundary clarifications must be consistent with the nomination dossier, the evaluation conducted by the Advisory Body and the decision of the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription. Maps also must meet the current technical requirements. Great progress continues to be made

in clarifying the boundaries of World Heritage properties but many remain imprecise or unclear. The World Heritage Centre provides continuous support to all States Parties in the preparation of boundaries clarification. The draft decision is included on page 3 in both the English and French versions of document 8D. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Mr Balsamo. Before proceeding to the adoption I would like to inform you that we have one amendment as far as I now. Madam Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have one amendment proposed by Uganda to paragraph 6 of this draft decision. Requests the States Parties which have not yet answered the questions raised in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory to provide all clarifications and documents as soon as possible, by 1 December 2019 at the latest, for their subsequent examination by the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2020, if such clarifications and documentations meet the technical requirements. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So can we approve the document as proposed in the new version? No objections? I don't see any. Thank you very much. So we approve document 43 COM 8D as proposed in the last version. Approved. Thank you very much. Now we close this item and we move to agenda Item 8E, the Adoption of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value. Please refer to documents 8E and 8E.Add. Mr Balsamo, the floor is yours again.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. Documents 8E and 8E.Add concern the adoption of 20 retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value. Document 8E presents 17 draft retrospective statements for which the review process has been finalized since the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee and document 8E.Add contains three retrospective statements that were received according to the deadline but delayed for technical reasons.

Out of the 20 retrospective statements six are from the Asia Pacific region and 14 from Europe and North America. Since 2009, the World Heritage Committee adopted 715 retrospective statements and 78 retrospective statements including those presented this year are still to be finalized and presented to the Committee: two in Africa, 14 in the Arab States, 15 in Asia Pacific, 45 in Europe and North America and two in the Latin America and Caribbean region.

These are properties for which draft retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value are proposed for adoption and are included in the draft decision and the text of each draft statement in the language in which it was submitted can be found in the Annex of the document.

A small technical error occurred in the Annex of the English version of the document where the last words of the statement for Plitvice Lakes National Park, Croatia are missing and the full statement is included in the French version of the document. With the agreement of the Committee the properties, the Cathedral of Notre Dame, Former Abbey of Saint-Rémi and Palace of Tau, Reims, Provins, Town of Medieval Fairs and Vézelay, Church and Hill all three in France, for which the draft retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value are presented in document 8E.Add will be integrated into the list of those being adopted in decision 43 Com 8E.

Once adopted, the retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value will be translated by the World Heritage Centre and made available on its website subject to availability of funds.

Please find the draft decision on page 1 in both the English and French versions of this document. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I don't see any comments or information about amendments.

Rapporteur:

No amendments.

Chairperson:

We are free to proceed with adoption. Document 43 COM 8E adopted. Thank you very much. Now as I understand we are finalizing the agenda for today. We are moving at a good tempo and following the proposal we had from the beginning so now I think it is time to finalize the meeting and I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler for announcements.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We have at 6:30 p.m. the World Heritage Policy Compendium organized by the World Heritage Centre with support by the Australian Government and the Government of the Republic of Korea and this will take place in Room A7. You know that we look at this document tomorrow so today you have an opportunity to exchange with the experts who are here so that will be quite lively. Then at 6:30 p.m. an event on the celebration of the inscription of Budj Bim Cultural Landscape, Australia on the balcony. And at 6:10 p.m. there is the Arab version of the thematic study, the cultural heritage of water in the Middle East and Maghreb by ICOMOS and ARC-WH in Room B3. That is all for today, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Our programme is going on, so thank you for a very effective discussion today. Have a nice time this evening and proceed tomorrow at 10 a.m. to start our next session. Thank you very much. The Bureau meeting will be at 9:30 a.m. as usual. Thank you very much. Have a nice evening.

The meeting rose at 5.50 pm

EIGHTH DAY – Monday 8 July 2019

FIFTEENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev

Chairperson:

Good morning to everyone. I would like to inform you about the matters discussed today this morning in the Bureau meeting. We have finalized the work done during these days. Now as we note we have inscribed 29 properties on the World Heritage List and one was extended. The total number of sites inscribed on the List is now 1,121. Today it is proposed to close Item 7B, which is still open, to examine the state of conservation of Lamu Old Town (Kenya), draft decision 7B.107 which has been discussed by a drafting group. Then we will have to examine draft decision 7.2 and 7.3 under general Item 7 and after that we will come to Item 8C and resume our discussion on general Item 8. We will try to proceed today also paragraphs 6 10A, 10B and in the afternoon Items 9A, 9B and 11B. I call upon your cooperation once again to help us in facilitating the debates and interventions to avoid any delay in our schedule to day. So of course everyone has a right to make interventions but according to the schedule we have to move as planned.

So if you don't mind we will start the discussion. You will recall that it was decided to examine the general decisions 43 COM 7.2 and 7.3 on the state of conservation on World Heritage properties at the end of the debates on Items 7A and 7B. This agenda item was introduced on Tuesday morning by the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Before we move to the second pending draft decision I would like to know whether there are any comments on this matter? I don't see any.

Now I invite you to adopt draft decision 43 COM 7.2 but may I ask the Rapporteur about additions to that? May some amendments.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. A working group was formed to deal with this property but only paragraph 7 and we do have some previously proposed and I think later proposed amendments to this decision. Paragraphs 1 and 2 remain the same.

Paragraph 3, the amendment reads, Regrets that the State Party provides only limited information on the state of conservation of the property, and reiterates its requests to the State Party, as a matter of urgency, to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies: a) an updated clearly delineated map of the property and its enlarged buffer zone, which should be formalized through a request for minor boundary modification in line with paragraph 164 of the Operational Guidelines. So you can see the proposed deleted text there. Then it remains un-amended I think until paragraph 7 b). This is what the drafting group was formed to look at. So, Further requests the State Party to revise the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the LAPSET project by, and then point b) would read, Urgently implementing the decisions of the National Environmental Tribunal of 26 June 2019, No. NET 196 of 2016, in respect to the development of Lamu Coal Project that requires the State Party to conduct a fresh Environmental Impact Assessment. And I would just note there that I have highlighted that it was proposed to annex the 50-page decision. That's not a practical solution for the Secretariat nor a good precedent to set but what the Secretariat or myself is proposing is that we reference with a footnote the exact web link to that complete annex. So I'll let them team note that that is the proposal to have the exact web link footnoted.

Then paragraph 8 is proposed for deletion. I think that is not by the drafting group--that was just for 7. Then I understand we have a new paragraph 8 proposed which might come off the floor for us. But other than that there are no more amendments. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

So this draft was the result of the work of the working group and I think there is certain agreement between the members of the group to give this version. But we need also some comments if there are any. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. And I'm sorry for taking the floor for this but there might have been a little bit of confusion because of the complexity and the different layers of impact assessments here with the SEA, HIA and EIA. I don't know if it would be helpful to ask ICOMOS if we manage to capture the essence of what the intention was and there is also a very short notice and I am, please accept my pardon for that, been sent potential wording for a new paragraph 8 to try to encapsulate what we tried to agree on in the drafting group. So I'm sorry for this very last minute confusion. But possible it would be helpful if ICOMOS could try to explain if we managed to capture the essence of what we tried. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Any other comments? ICOMOS, please, you are welcome.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. Just trying to explain the background—an SEA was undertaken for the main LAPSET project and earlier an HIA, also for the main project. But the main project did not include the coal plant or the airport so an EIA was undertaken for the coal plant and an HIA for the airport. One of the difficulties we've had throughout this process is to get some linkage between the impact assessments and Outstanding Universal Value. That is why in the original draft there was a request for the revision of the LAPSET SEA in paragraph 8 because this doesn't address OUV or cultural heritage adequately. At the moment what is proposed is an environmental impact assessment for the coal plant and that leaves open the question as to how the impact on OUV might be assessed if it is only an environmental impact assessment. So I put forward this information to try and elucidate the complexities of the situation but I think underpinning all that is somehow the need for the Committee to understand the impact on OUV of these various projects.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, again, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Maybe we could ask the Rapporteur if the text was received and if not I can try to read it out? So the proposed new paragraph 8 would read, Requests furthermore that the State Party submit a revised LAPSET SEA, a Heritage Impact Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment of the Lamu Coal plant that considers the impacts on the OUV of Lamu Old Town, and other requested documents above, to the World Heritage Centre for review, before proceeding with the Lamu Coal plant. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Let's have it on the screen. Please, you are welcome.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I'll just read that through slowly and it might give our French colleagues to catch up. Requests furthermore that the State Party submit a revised LAPSET SEA, a Heritage Impact Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment of the Lamu Coal plant that considers the impacts on the OUV of Lamu Old Town, and other requested documents above, to the World Heritage Centre for review, before proceeding with the Lamu Coal plant. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Good morning, Chairperson. I just wondered whether it shouldn't be in the third line there an Environmental Impact Assessment of the proposal for a Lamu Coal plant because it doesn't actually exist at the moment. So it kind of makes the last part of the sentence strange if we don't have the proposal for or proposed coal plant.

Chairperson:

I think that is reasonable. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I might not have heard the Advisory Body, but please correct me if I'm wrong. I think I heard that they said they needed a Heritage Impact Assessment for the airport, not for the airport and the coal plant. Is that right? According to what I heard from the Advisory Body. If not, my apologies.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

What I said was that HIA had already been requested for the Manda airport but I also raised the issue of how we understand impact on OUV for the coal plant. So ideally, the EIA for the coal plant should either include an HIA or an HIA should be undertaken separately.

Chairperson:

Okay? Australia...

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. I'm not sure where we are—I'm not sure it's a proposal for the Lamu Coal plant we suggested or the plans for or—I'm not sure where we are in relation to the previous paragraph about the decision that we had, under paragraph 7. We have in respect to the development of the Lamu Coal project. It just needs that the language be clear that we are talking about the same thing.

Chairperson:

Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

So I think if we refer to the Lamu Coal Project rather than plant that would be consistent. I'll just read that. Yes, I think that if say Lamu Coal Project—the proposal for the Lamu Coal

Project. That considers the impacts on the OUV of Lamu Old Town, etc. before proceeding with the Lamu Coal—might as well say Project there, too.

Chairperson:

Australia, please? Satisfied? Norway, is it okay with this wording? Fine. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. If we are inserting that paragraph from the distinguished delegate from Norway, then paragraph 9, I would suggest that where we are saying that we wanted to invite a monitoring mission with a view to assess because all of these things that have to be done. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Any other opinions? Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

I think if I understand correctly what the distinguished delegate from the United Republic of Tanzania is suggesting is removing from paragraph 9, from with a view to assessing perhaps to the end of the paragraph.

Chairperson:

Can we agree to such wording? Australia?

The Delegation of Australia:

Mr Chairperson, this isn't an amendment that we could agree with. We've talked a lot about the importance of consistency of decision-making over the course of this meeting and we certainly hold the view that because of the ongoing dialogue we've had about the need to address these particular issues that we are at the point where it's appropriate for the Committee to be signaling its expectations through the inclusion of these words.

Chairperson:

Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

The Delegation of Hungary:

And I wish a good morning to all colleagues. I would just like to echo what my colleague from Australia has just said. We would rather keep that word and we don't really see how the proposal from Norway would somehow imply that this part should be deleted. So we would rather keep it. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. We also wish to echo what was proposed by the colleagues from Australia and Hungary. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Can we find a consensus if Tanzania is not insisting on the deletion of this matter so we can approve like that? Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Chairperson, thank you. Throughout these Committee decisions we have been deleting that type of wording in the decision on some of the other properties that had such problems. Looking at the intensity and the number of recommendations the decisions that we are putting to the State Party I don't think a monitoring mission will be able to see the implementation of all these decisions, to be able to come to the that conclusion. So to my understanding we would rather wait for those things to be done—the mission can go but without having that objective in there mentioned. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Mr Chairperson, we have been considering these on a case-by-case basis so I think it is appropriate we do it on those terms. My colleagues just pointed out to me that if we scroll down to item 11, there is a second reference there to this exact thing so I think it is actually correct to delete it from paragraph 9 and it is better placed at the bottom where it is now, where it is repeated because it is a matter for the Committee to consider.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I don't want to insist on keeping in that paragraph if the Committee doesn't wish to but I still think that there would be no problem with leaving that part in paragraph 9 since what we are talking about is what the reactive monitoring mission's aim would be. As I said, of course, provided that we still have it in paragraph 11 and I really don't wish to insist. We can delete it but I just wish to say for the record that I think that it was appropriate to have that part in paragraph 9. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thanks, Chairperson. In regard to paragraph 9 and the deletion of the proposed maintenance or deletion, I think the reason we get these missions on site is just not to go and prejudge—it should be for the purpose of proper enhancement of the management of the sites and so it would be wrong for the missions to go with prejudgments and go and list the sites on the Danger list because we have a proposal, we have a procedure on how sites are put on the Danger List but basically I think the mission should be going to actually enhance the assessment for better management of the World Heritage site.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson for understanding the sentiments of the previous speakers and we also tend to echo what was just said by our colleague from Hungary but in the spirit of trying to reach a consensus on a decision here we can also agree with Australia that we can delete it from this paragraph because the language is already retained in paragraph 11. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Burkina Faso.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. En effet, nous avons écouté les explications qui ont été fournies par l'ICOMOS, et également la proposition que l'Australie a faite. Dans la mesure où cette idée est reflétée au niveau du paragraphe 11, nous ne pensons pas qu'il soit opportun de le maintenir deux fois dans le même texte, donc nous soutenons l'idée de biffer, comme l'a proposé la Tanzanie, cette idée au niveau du paragraphe 9. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have common consensus that we are deleting this part from paragraph 9 because we have similar wording in paragraph 11. And we leave it there. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Chairperson, I'm just suggesting that just the section of that paragraph in line in paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines could go into the sentence in paragraph 11 that we are discussing.

Chairperson:

Tanzania.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. If you put in that paragraph, yes if you put up that sentence we just go as paragraph 183-189, then we get out in view to consider in the case of confirmation, it is not necessary anymore.

Chairperson:

We are coming to quite a situation because there is no sense in deleting it from 11...Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

I think if we just scroll up I'll confirm what paragraph 9 now says. Following the security clearance by the United Nations Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS), requests moreover the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to review the process and conclusions of the various environmental and heritage impact assessments, the stakeholder engagement processes and the state of conservation of the property.

And then paragraph 11, Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2020, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020, with a view to considering, in the case of confirmation of the ascertained or potential danger to OUV, and in line with Paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines, the

possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Can we approve this wording? Thank you very much. I don't see any objections and thank you for consensus so we can move to the approval of decision 43 COM 7B.107, adopted as proposed in the last version. Thank you very much.

Now we move to Items 7.2 and 7.3. There are some amendments. If there are no comments I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur to submit the drafts.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Sorry, I'll read the proposed amendments for 7.2. Paragraphs 1-4 are as previously. Paragraph 5, there is a proposed amendment by Burkina Faso, Angola, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda. Thanks the State Party of Mali for the urgent actions that have been put in place to ensure the safety of communities in and around the property and encourages the State Party to also take into account in its actions the protection of the property in its rich cultural heritage and to do so in collaboration with the stakeholders involved in the establishment of longterm peace in Mali.

Former paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8 these are un-amended until we get to paragraph 12 where we have a new 12 proposed by Azerbaijan. Thanks the State Party of Poland for the efforts to widely disseminate the Warsaw Recommendation on Recovery and Reconstruction of Cultural Heritage, as well as the proceedings of the international conference "The Challenges of World Heritage Recovery" held in Warsaw in of May 2018.

Former paragraph 12 remains the same. Paragraph 14 also proposed by Azerbaijan, Requests the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM and the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to continue the reflection on the recovery and reconstruction of World Heritage properties and asks the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to report back to the World Heritage Committee on the progress made in improving advice in this regard. And I don't believe we have any more amendments proposed for this decision. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le Burkina Faso, tout en appuyant le projet de décision 43 COM 7.2, se félicite des paragraphes 4 et 5 qui sont consacrés au Mali. Nous avons suivi lundi dernier la déclaration de l'honorable Ministre de la culture du Mali, dans laquelle elle a informé le Comité des nombreuses pertes en vies humaines ainsi que des dégradations des biens culturels observées dans les villages maliens, qui sont le résultat de manœuvres en vue de créer des conflits intercommunautaires par des groupes terroristes.

Aussi, pour mieux sensibiliser et polariser l'attention des partenaires et des experts internationaux en vue de soutenir le Mali dans ces efforts de conservation du patrimoine culturel des falaises de Bandiagara, et également ses efforts de construction d'une paix durable, le Burkina Faso ainsi que d'autres pays ont proposé ce léger amendement au paragraphe 5 du projet de décision. Ce projet d'amendement est également soutenu par plusieurs pays, notamment la Tunisie, le Brésil, l'Azerbaïdjan, l'Espagne, la Norvège et la Bosnie-Herzégovine. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Mr Chairperson, earlier in this session Australia outlined its view on the substance of what we think should be addressed in the revision of the Committee's climate change policy. But we need more than a policy. We also need action and action needs resources and we all know too well the sorry state of the World Heritage Fund and the reluctance of States Parties to make larger contributions to it with a few notable exceptions. This is why the Australian government has taken the decision to invest in a very important initiative with the World Heritage Centre aimed at changing this funding reality.

We are investing US\$375,000 in seed funding to engage professional expertise to design and implement a strategy to secure funding to build climate change resilience in World Heritage properties inscribed to further natural values. This strategy will seek public, business and philanthropic support by demonstrating the value of investing in securing the common heritage of humankind in a changing climate. The objective of this initiative is to establish a sustainable funding source to improve the capacity of World Heritage property managers in developing countries to prepare measures to adapt to climate change within their properties and to build resilience. When making this investment because we recognize the sort of expertise to develop and deliver such strategies doesn't exist naturally in UNESCO or within government; it's not our core business.

We have tried everything we can to try to convince States Parties to increase their contribution to the World Heritage Fund as you know but little has materialized. So just as we need a whole new way of thinking about adaptation and resilience so we need to shift and adapt how we approach funding World Heritage. We need more partners willing to make climate change resilience action in World Heritage properties an essential element of any social impact investment portfolio. We hope that through this seed funding we can stimulate more States Parties to invest in this critical initiative and turn it into a full-blown fundraising campaign to deliver substantial new funding for World Heritage.

Mr Chairperson, last year in Decision 42 COM 7 the Committee requested that the World Heritage Centre develop a proposal to share in the World Heritage Marketplace funds to support a workshop to assist States Parties with sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger to develop and implement prioritized, staged and costed actions plans and the Committee noted that these plans could then be linked to requests for International Assistance and shared on the Marketplace. Today we want to reiterate the importance of the Centre developing this proposal and ask that it be done as a matter of priority. We had an excellent discussion last week about the reactive monitoring mission review, a review that underlines the importance of developing exactly these sorts of action plans that the Committee asked for. So our decision last year was made with the strong support of the African Members of the Committee as part of their emerging focus on Priority Africa and we see it as being essential that this work be done. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. First of all I would like to briefly mention that Azerbaijan supports the amendments presented by Burkina Faso and the other countries to paragraph of the concerned draft decision and also we would like to briefly explain the rationale for our amendments to paragraphs 11 and 13. First of all we had a consultation with the State Party

of Poland and with this mind we just proposed the correction of the exact name of the Warsaw Recommendation which is the Recommendation on the Recovery and Reconstruction of Cultural Heritage as well as the name of the international conference which is “The Challenges of World Heritage Recovery” and regarding paragraph 13 which is now I see new paragraph 14, the rationale is just to be more inclusive and add the States Parties to the process and also in the second part to add the terminology recovery because as an outcome of the conference in Warsaw it was mentioned that reconstruction is part of recovery so with this in mind we proposed this amendment. Thank you so much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Netherlands has the floor.

The Observer Delegation of the Netherlands:

Thank you, Chairperson. Since it's the first time the Netherlands takes the floor, we first wish to express our gratitude to the government of Azerbaijan for hosting this meeting. We express our appreciation to the Chairperson for chairing this meeting so efficiently and on time. On behalf of the Netherlands, the delegations of Denmark, Ireland, New Zealand, Sweden and Switzerland, we take the floor.

Over the past week we have experienced moments of joy as well as concerns. We've seen the inscription of many outstanding and universally important sites onto the World Heritage List. We have seen how multiple State Parties have followed the recommendations by the Advisory Bodies. The discussions showed the need to align decisions with the agreements and principles as set out in the Operational Guidelines with regard to inscription. The Operational Guidelines form the basis for the implementation and interpretation of the Convention, also with regard to the inscription of sites. The system of deferral and referral, especially, allows for the proper steps, procedures and timeframes to fulfil the requirements as outlined in the Operational Guidelines.

This year's session illustrated the responsibility that the Committee has to work and decide in line with the overall agreed guidelines, which we agreed upon. The Committee should avoid making decisions at one meeting, which leads to complications in the decision-making process at subsequent meetings. We States Parties, and the Committee in particular, should keep in sight the essence of our presence here to implement the Convention and to safeguard our world natural and cultural heritage. However, we've yet again seen a discrepancy between the recommendations put forward by the Advisory Bodies and the final decisions of the Committee. Inscription on the World Heritage List is first and foremost an instrument to succeed in the preservation of our world heritage. It should be a means rather than an end. To avoid discrepancies in decision-making and to ensure longterm proper conservation, working in line with the guidelines is indispensable. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have one NGO that wants to make an intervention. Please, you are welcome.

Observer NGO (World Heritage Watch):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. On behalf of World Heritage Watch let me convey the statement on Notre Dame Cathedral of Tournai, Belgium. Currently, several renovations, new constructions and demolition happened in the buffer zone of the Cathedral and belfry. Three of them deserve our attention. The first one: the extension project of the Museum of Fine Arts. The restoration of this building is planned. The Museum will be removed. The works of art will be removed and the spaces will be used as a cafeteria and place of leisure. A new building will be attached to the museum building and a tower will be constructed.

The second one: the rehabilitation and extension of the *Hôtel des Anciens Prêtres*. Located at the foot of the Cathedral the building of the Old Priests will be rehabilitated in the next six years. In its courtyard a tower structure will be built extended over the height of the existing buildings. Moreover, this tower will be about 25m from the main façade of the Cathedral. No impact study on the OUV has been done. The third one: the project of the demolition and reconstruction of the Pont des Trous, water gate. In line with the building permit of 6 July 2019 the demolition will start on 2 August. The Pont des Trous is one of the rare examples of medieval water gate built in the 13th century. No survey, no documentation has been prepared for the restoration and rebuilding. The bridge is a national monument. No study on the negative impacts on OUV has been prepared.

We are extremely alarmed about the impending loss of our world heritage in front of our eyes. We call upon the Committee as a matter of emergency to take immediate steps to ascertain the information provided and in case of confirmation to take whatever steps necessary to prevent the loss of this World Heritage property. Thank you for your attention and thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Ms Rössler, do you have a comment to make?

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Just to inform the World Heritage Committee that this was not one of the items on our agenda. As you know we had 166 reports on the state of conservation and this is not one of them. We deal with these matters as per our usual procedures. If we get any information from NGOs we process it according to the Operational Guidelines. Many thanks.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now can we proceed and return back to Item 7.2 of our agenda, for the approval of these documents. Kuwait wanted something to say?

Chairperson:

Please, you are welcome.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

We would like to add a comment to the discussion. Kuwait recognizes the importance of developing management funds for the World Heritage sites that are closely integrated with the city development fund and Master Plans. Having observed cases during the review of the state of conservation reports and previous discussions at the Committee where such integration of sustainable development components lacks synergy, we recognize the need for the dissemination of a better, informed approach to this reoccurring issue.

Kuwait has been committed to the Historic Urban Landscape approach since 2014 having implemented several capacity-building activities and the regional Conference on the Urban Modernities in the Arab region and more recently in integrating the HUL approach in Kuwait 2014 Master Plan as a result of a collaboration between Kuwait municipality and the National Council on Culture and Art. Kuwait would like to support activities in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre towards the implementation of the 2011 recommendations on the Historic Urban Landscape and in particular in the Arab States region over the next three years and we look forward to sharing the outcome of these activities with other regions. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will take note. Can we proceed? There are no objections against the newly proposed additions, drafts so I declare document 43 COM 7.2 approved. Thank you very much. Now we move to document 7.3. There are some amendments. Rapporteur, please. You have information about that?

Rapporteur:

Thank you. Again, we have received several amendments for this portion of the decision. The first paragraphs as you can see are un-amended. The first proposal is for new paragraph 7 proposed by Azerbaijan. Notes with appreciation the International Union of Architects forum on mass tourism in historic cities which was held in Baku, Azerbaijan on 7-9 June 2019 and welcomes the proposal of the UIA to prepare in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, the guidelines for architectural competitions in and around World Heritage urban properties that will recognized the Outstanding Universal Value.

And new paragraph 8 proposed by the Republic of Tanzania. Welcomes the offer from the government of Japan to host an international experts meeting in January 2020 to provide further guidelines for the integration of the assessment of the impacts of interventions in the wider processes of urban management by applying—yes, the 2011 Historic Urban Landscape recommendation is probably better described as by the recommendation of the which is the correct name—Historic Urban Landscape to address the challenges of increased urbanization in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre as well as ICOMOS and other Advisory Bodies.

New paragraph 9 proposed by Saint Kitts and Nevis. Calls on UNESCO Secretariat to develop measures to address the inherently limited nature of institutional capacity in SIDS, acting as an impediment in identifying, inventorying and proposing potential heritage sites of historical, natural and cultural nature for listing. In the tourism section, again we have a new paragraph proposed by Saint Kitts and Nevis. Calls on UNESCO Secretariat to recognize opportunities for forging synergies between core horizontal UNESCO activities that could be harnessed to strengthen heritage sites: youth, heritage tourism training, sustainable heritage tourism and biodiversity, and relate it directly to SIDS. And then if we continue...oh, that's it. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Ms Rössler, you are welcome.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much. Just one brief comment on the addition--I think it comes from Azerbaijan under item 7 if I'm not mistaken. UNESCO gave patronage to this meeting but so far we have not received the results of the meeting. We are very happy to work together but we have actually not received the results of this meeting. I just wanted to have this on record. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Just to note in paragraph 8, the wording under the Historic Urban Landscape should be the 2011 recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape is the proper name of the recommendation.

Chairperson:

Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Following the statement made by the Director of the World Heritage Centre we would also like to know if it's possible to get the viewpoint of the Advisory Bodies on this sort of cooperation as a, again we are not aware much of the outcomes of that meeting referred to. Thank you.

Chairperson:

ICOMOS, can you give your opinion about this matter?

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. In relation to paragraph 8 and the offer by the Government of Japan to host an international expert meeting this is just to say that...

Chairperson:

Item 7, please. The question was connected to the amendment by Azerbaijan concerning mass tourism in historical sites conference forum and the question was how are we justifying the cooperation of...

ICOMOS:

Thank you, apologies, Chairperson. We certainly welcome the recommendation put forward and under item 7. I think this could be very valuable for providing guidelines for architectural competitions in relation to Outstanding Universal Value.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Can we ask Azerbaijan for the results of this conference, documents or whatever?

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. So a few days ago we heard the statement by the International Union of Architects proposing to prepare such guidelines for architectural competitions. And now this proposal is to welcome this proposal and of course it's mentioned if it's done it's done in close cooperation with the Centre and Advisory Bodies, that's clear. And having heard from ICOMOS, they also seem in favour of welcoming such a proposal and just to mention that this issue was also widely discussed in the forum, which is mentioned in the first part of this paragraph. And regarding the comment of Director of the Centre, I think we can assist in communication between the International Union of Architects and the Centre so that we can convey the outcome of this forum as soon as possible to the World Heritage Centre. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Chairperson, as we know we are now in the centre of urban development in the world. And we have seen in the last four days most issues were related to the state of conservation on management and they were related to urban issues—most recommendations of UNESCO were related to urban issues. For that reason my delegation welcomes this proposal from the government of Japan to organize this international expert meeting to come up with recommendations that will help States Parties how to implement the conservation and

protection issues so with that we propose and hope the Committee will approve this proposal. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I have a comment about paragraph 8 which I would like to thank the Republic of Tanzania for suggesting this paragraph. Just reading the end, it says in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre as well as ICOMOS and other Advisory Bodies. I think it would be maybe more appropriate to just say in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies. I don't really understand why ICOMOS is the only one named when I'm sure that the other two Advisory Bodies will also need to work on this. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Some other opinions? So we change the wording there.

Rapporteur:

Mr Chairperson, if I could just read what I understand that to be.

Chairperson:

Yes, you are welcome.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. In close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. No other comments? I don't see any so can we proceed to the approval of document 7.3 with the amendments? Thank you very much. It's approved.

Now we move to Item 6, Follow-up to the World Heritage capacity building strategy and progress report on the World Heritage-related category 2 centres. The relevant working document is document 6. Considering their close links, these two reports are presented together within the same document. Dear colleagues, I would like to give the floor first to the representative of ICCROM for what concerns the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy. Please, the floor is yours, Mr King. You are welcome.

ICCROM:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson for allowing me to take the floor on this Item 6. As you all know this Item deals with the follow-up to the World Heritage capacity-building strategy and also a progress report on the World Heritage-related category 2 centres.

Just to recall the World Heritage capacity-building strategy was approved in 2011 at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee and it replaced a previous existing World Heritage training strategy and in that document, the document identified a series of key issues that had not been treated in the past such as urban conservation, impact assessment, areas such as that. It also recognized a larger group of target audiences for capacity building, not just professionals as it had been in the past but also institutions, communities and networks. The third important thing that the capacity-building strategy did was it recognized the need for much stronger links between the conservation of natural heritage and conservation of cultural heritage.

The strategy was designed to have activities at the international level, at the regional level and also for the first time it recommended activities at the national level. At the international level we have been working primarily on a programme called World Heritage Leadership which is a programme of ICCROM and IUCN working with the support of the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment but also working very closely with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and with ICOMOS. I am also happy to say that in the last year or so we've had support also from the government of Switzerland and we are starting a new cooperation now with the government of the Republic of Korea.

World Heritage Leadership has essentially five different modules, which we are working on. The first includes effective management of nature and culture and in particular, in relation to people and communities. The second is improving issues related to resilience, always in relation to culture and nature. The third module is on impact assessment and again, looking at culture and nature links and we are also trying to develop a series of networks of learning sites and also we call it a leadership network of professionals and other people involved in world heritage management.

Over the past year, the main activity, if I can say that, was a regional course in Africa on people, culture and nature, which took place last year in August 2018 at the Victoria Falls World Heritage property in Zambia. Actually, the property is a cross-border site between Zambia and Zimbabwe. We had 20 participants from 18 countries at that course. The more important thing that we are working on at this point and time is an online platform of heritage management resources.

This is something that we are in the process of working on; it will still take us some time to develop it and actually get it up and running but the idea is to have place online where heritage managers, where other people involved in the management of sites in one way or another can come and look and find resource materials in relation to management of World Heritage sites, in relation to management effectiveness of World Heritage sites, in relation to disaster risk management and climate change and in relation to impact assessment. This work is currently ongoing and we foresee that it will probably be up and running, I would say probably within the next year or so.

To break that down a little bit more, one of the things we are trying to focus on is management effectiveness. A tool was created for natural heritage called Enhancing our Heritage and there was a toolkit developed and is published within the World Heritage papers series. The issue with that, however, was that it was really only tailored towards natural heritage sites so one of the things we have been trying to do is we've been trying to look at that in its relationship to implementation on cultural heritage sites. So we have had a number of activities, thanks to the Swiss government for example. We've had a testing on cultural heritage sites and that testing goes on. I think the most recent one was actually in Chile if I'm not mistaken. We are trying to continue to develop and adapt this tool to ensure that it takes into account or is useful let's say at both natural sites and cultural sites.

In the area of resilience we are in the process of doing a revision of the manual on managing disaster risks. This was the first World Heritage resource manual that was completed probably about 10 years ago or so, I guess. In that period there have been many new issues that have come up that have called for the need to do a revision of that manual. We are also adding again climate change and I was very interested to hear Australia's intervention previously. I think it is something maybe that we can discuss a little bit more. This year we did a scoping study looking at literature on climate change and impact on heritage and this is something that we very much want to move forward with within World Heritage Leadership. And finally on the area of impact assessment—I have to say listening to the state of conservation reports over the course of this week, this issue of impact assessment, environmental impact assessment, heritage impact assessment, strategic environmental assessment—when do we need them,

when are they appropriate? I think there is a need for us to really try to look at this in an integrated manner to be able to look at cultural heritage and natural heritage and specifically Outstanding Universal Value so we are trying to work very closely with partners on this.

We have carried out some courses. A couple of these pictures are from a course we did on heritage impact assessment in collaboration the category 2 centre in Shanghai. But the other important thing I want to mention here is you see we have the logo of IAIA that is the International Association of Impact Assessment and one of the things we are trying to do is reach out to them because they are not heritage professionals specifically so what we are trying to do is to move outside our realm of just talking to ourselves and these are impact assessment professionals who maybe don't know about how to assess Outstanding Universal Value and so by reaching out to them and working closely with them we can disseminate these methodologies for looking at world heritage and impacts on OUV to a wider range of professionals.

The final thing in terms of World Heritage Leadership that I would like to mention and this has been mentioned already several times during this meeting is the Site Managers Forums. Within World Heritage Leadership we've taken on a role working with the World Heritage Centre and the host country and we have carried out now three Site Managers Forums and I would actually like to take the opportunity to express my really extreme gratitude to Azerbaijan for working with us on the implementation of the Site Managers Forum this year. This is a forum, which brings together not just the professionals as individuals, but also the site managers are representing their sites and their institutions so this is really a way to bring together the networking at an institutional level. I'm happy to say that the results of the three forums that the network is actually quite strong and getting stronger and the site managers are communicating with each other and helping each other when they have problems and helping them to find solutions. I think that is something very positive.

And finally this is just a slide to show you some of the organizations, places and people that have been involved in the programme over the last few years. So our network is increasingly growing. In addition to the activities that we are doing at the international level, there are also a number of activities at the regional level which are being carried out and these activities are being carried out by the World Heritage Centre for one--and you can find information on those not only in document 6 but also in 5A which is their report to the Committee--and also by the category 2 centres in the various regions and I think it is important to point out that there are a variety of partners in capacity building at regional and national levels that are taking part in the implementation of the strategy. I won't read these slides for you obviously and you can find more information in document 6 but just to point out in Asia and the Pacific for example, they are tackling a number of key issues such as nomination dossiers, sustainable management, Historic Urban Landscapes and risk reduction strategies.

In Latin America the one I really wanted to point out here was an a national seminar for site managers that took place in Argentina and I think that is also something very important. I'll come back to that at the end but it's important at the national level for countries to begin to think about capacity building for their professionals. In Europe and North America a number of activities, again particularly on heritage impact assessment. That is something that is obviously of great importance but the other one that I would want to point out is workshops addressing threats, specifically posed by renewable energy and particularly wind farms. I think we usually consider renewable energy as a positive aspect for conservation of at least our natural resources but the question becomes how does that infrastructure actually affect Outstanding Universal Value and I think that is something we have to look at more closely.

In Africa, primarily with cooperation of the Africa World Heritage Fund there have been again a number of activities, nomination courses, activities on Tentative Lists and sustainable development. And in the Arab States region, again impact assessment. As you can see this is

something that is important really in all regions of the world but also activities related to urban heritage, Historic Urban Landscapes and the development of Tentative Lists and again, this is in collaboration with ARC-WH the category 2 centre in Bahrain and also ICCROM's regional centre in Sharjah. In addition to these regional activities there are also a series of activities you'll find in document 6 which are sort of other capacity-building activities.

Here you'll see just a list of some of those activities that have taken place and again, I won't take the time to read through them specifically. This just gives you a range of the kinds of capacity-building activities that are taking place in some cases at a thematic level. So for example, the first one on this list is Buddhist Heritage Route for Sustainable Tourism on these heritage routes. I think that is something quite interesting. And then I would also like to point out for example, the thematic network of marine managers, which is part of the World Heritage Centre's marine programme, which is actually something that has been very successful over time.

To conclude this part of the presentation, before I give the floor back to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to talk about the category 2 centres, I just want to bring out a couple of points. I think that one of the things—what I've done is outlined a series of activities at the international level and at the regional level but what I think we are missing up to this point is a robust mechanism for capturing capacity-building activities wherever they occur and by whomever they occur that benefit world heritage. So one of the things that ICCROM would like to do for the future is to develop a stronger system of collecting information and being able to analyse that information in a more synthetic way to be able to give to you the Committee Members so that you can actually get a real sense of not just the individual activities that have been going on but sort of how they fit together to create stronger capacity building around the world. And the second point that I would want to make also is I think as I mentioned at the beginning of the presentation, the capacity-building strategy was meant to look at things at the international, regional and national levels.

I presented activities to you at the international level and the regional level but to be honest with you I'm not sure how many States Parties are actually developing capacity-building activities or capacity-building strategies I would say at the national level and I think that is something that we have to encourage much, to have individual countries really assess what their needs are for capacity building and who is in the country to be able to supply the capacity building to meet those needs and develop those kinds of strategies. So that is something that ICCROM and our other capacity building partners—also the category 2 centres—I think would be very willing to work with individual States Parties if they wish to develop capacity-building strategies at the national level. So that is also something that we need to strengthen in the coming years. So with that I would like to thank you all for listening to me on this issue of capacity building and I would like to give the floor back to the Director of the World Heritage Centre who will, I believe report on category 2 centres and their progress over the last year. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Mr King. Now I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler who will present to us the second part of this report, which concerns the progress report on the World Heritage-related category 2 centres. Please, you are welcome.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. So very briefly I would to present the report on the category 2 centres. As you know we have currently a total of nine category 2 centres related to World Heritage and agreements have been signed with seven centres which are listed in the document in front of you and Mr Chairperson, I would also like to recognize that a number of directors of these category 2 centres have joined us here at this session. Agreements have

not been signed yet for two centres: the International Centre for Rock Art and the World Heritage Convention (Spain) which was approved by UNESCO's General Conference in 2011, and the Regional Centre for Human Evolution, Adaptations and Dispersals in South East Asia (CHEADSEA) (Indonesia) which was approved by UNESCO's General Conference in 2017.

A new proposal for a category 2 centre related to World Heritage, the International Centre for the Interpretation and Presentation of World Heritage Sites, was submitted by the Republic of Korea in December 2018 and a feasibility study is currently underway. The outcome of this study is scheduled to be presented at the 207th session of the Executive Board of UNESCO in October 2019, and for subsequent review by the General Conference. This would be the first category 2 centre dedicated to interpretation topics.

The agreement for the category 2 centre for World Natural Heritage Management and Training for Asia and the Pacific Region at the Wildlife Institute of India at Dehradun in India, officially entered into force on 17 October 2018. Throughout the year the centre has made efforts to strengthen its international outreach by cooperating with the Ecosystem Services Partnership (ESP) Asia Regional Office. On 1 July this year, the centre's residential Master's Degree course in Heritage Conservation and Management accepted their first student intake.

The final approval of the Regional World Heritage Institute in Zacatecas in Mexico is expected for the end of the year, 2019. Whereas, the biannual work plan for Regional Heritage Management Training Centre Lucio Costa in Brazil was adopted in mid-2018.

In 2019, ARC-WHC announced the culmination of its regional training programme on the implementation of the Enhancing Our Heritage toolkit and this was already covered by Mr King. The seventh Annual Meeting of our UNESCO World Heritage-related category 2 centres and institutes took place in Manama in Bahrain on 22-23 April. We had category 2 centres and ICCROM and the World Heritage Centre and a number of heritage professionals from the Bahrain Authority for Culture and Antiquities who attended the meeting in order to discuss topics related to the mandates of regional centres and their fields of work.

This year's meeting looked specifically on the periodic reporting cycle in which category 2 centres have a major role and I should say, an increasing role to play, following the experience of ARC-WH in the Arab region and the potential role of the category 2 centres in this regard and I would like to mention specifically our African World Heritage Fund which is already much involved in the periodic reporting preparations for the African region.

The Centre has also looked at the Resource Mobilization and Communication Strategy, which was Decision 42 COM 14 that requested us to look with other stakeholders into resource mobilization. The need to develop synergies with other normative instruments and programmes in order to ensure a better implementation of the Convention especially in the context of urban heritage was also highlighted, and the meeting dedicated a whole session to discuss the approach of the 2011 Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation (HUL) and the role that category 2 centres can play in this regard and with this I give the floor back to you, Mr Chairperson. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, are there any comments or observations on this subject? Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous aimerions, avant d'entrer dans le vif du sujet, féliciter le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organes consultatifs, notamment l'ICCROM pour l'élaboration de la présentation de cet important rapport d'avancement sur la mise en œuvre

de la stratégie du patrimoine mondial pour le renforcement des capacités et les activités des centres de catégorie 2 associés au patrimoine mondial. Toutefois, nous aimerions faire quelques remarques concernant le contenu de ce rapport. Pour une question de suivi et d'évaluation des résultats, nous souhaiterions que le rapport soit présenté sous forme d'approches basées sur des résultats et des performances. Le rapport devrait faire ressortir clairement comment les résultats produits sur le terrain en renforçant les capacités impactent la mise en œuvre de la stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial représentative, équilibrée et crédible. Parce qu'en analysant le nombre d'activités de renforcement des capacités réalisées au niveau du continent africain, par exemple, la stratégie devrait en principe améliorer la représentation de l'Afrique sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Mais, malheureusement, l'Afrique continue à être sous-représentée.

Une deuxième remarque est que les activités menées par les centres de catégorie 2 dans toutes les régions du monde montrent clairement qu'il y a beaucoup d'approches et d'expertises intéressantes qui se développent et qui ont besoin d'être partagées. À cet effet, nous encourageons les centres de catégorie 2 à commencer à développer des programmes communs de renforcement des capacités en collaboration avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les organes consultatifs et les États parties intéressés, comme le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain et le WHITR-AP souhaitent le faire dans le cadre de la coopération Afrique/UNESCO/Chine. Et, sur la base de nos remarques, nous avons proposé, Monsieur le Président, quelques amendements au projet de décision. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Thank you, Chairperson. Bosnia and Herzegovina would like to thank the Secretariat and ICCROM for the preparation of the progress report. The document states and there is good evidence that enormous capacity-building activities related to the development of conservation and management practices for culture and nature to the development of regional capacity building strategies and to category 2 centres have been undertaken. However, we believe that this report in addition to the activities outlined should also contain an analytical part. The capacity-building strategy was adopted in 2011. We believe it is time to compare the list of activities with the nine goals and 47 actions defined in Decision 35 COM 9B. In this way States Parties would be given an opportunity to easily monitor which goals are in good progress which are lagging behind. Such information would enable a better-informed decision-making process in the capacity-building strategy objective of the Convention. In this regard we suggest that the next report on achieving a capacity-building strategy contain an analysis in relation to the defined goals. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we have Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

I thank you, Chairperson. The Zimbabwe delegation would like to commend the World Heritage Centre for the work that it is doing in effort to capacitate States Parties in the area of world heritage. We also commend the three Advisory Bodies for the crucial roles that they play in capacitating States Parties through training programmes such as ICCROM's World Heritage Leadership. We are encouraged, Mr Chairperson, that the last edition of the World Heritage Programme was held in Africa at the transboundary World Heritage property of Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls on the Zambia side and we are hopeful that this initiative will bring positive developments in the way in which World Heritage is managed on the African continent. We also want to acknowledge the immense role that the African World Heritage Fund plays in the

capacitating of the States Parties and site managers on the African continent. We are appreciative of the cordial working relationship that the African World Heritage Fund has with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, which has seen successful initiatives such as the two-week African regional course on people, nature and culture conducted in August 2018. Mr Chairperson, we would like to acknowledge the efforts of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies together with the host country of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee in the organization of the 2018 Site Managers Forum. This is an important capacity-building initiative for site managers. We however request the Centre, if possible, to provide additional funding to enable more site managers from the African region to participate in the Site Managers Forum in the future. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Chairperson, Tanzania also commends the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and category 2 centres for their efforts to implement the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy. We are of the firm belief that it would be difficult to achieve our objective of 5Cs without capacity. Mobilization of experts, local government and community all depend on our capacity to engage the stakeholders and community. My delegation acknowledges the efforts that have been done particularly in Africa on this subject. We also note that there have been extrabudgetary efforts to diversify and support the strategy. We thank those countries that have supported those programmes. Chairperson, my delegation thinks that it is the time to evaluate our strategy now, if we have been doing a best practice to implement our strategy. As such my delegation recommends to Committee Members to accept the proposal to request that ICCROM in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and other Advisory Bodies to carry a results-based evaluation on how to implement the strategy for reinforcement of our capacity. Chairperson, in line with the above, Tanzania supports the proposal of the distinguished delegate of Angola in proposing an amendment to the draft decision to underline our proposal. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Chairperson. We would like to thank the presenters for the report on the capacity-building strategy and category 2 centres. Capacity building can enhance opportunities for conservation and better management of sites. Over the years we have seen the results of these efforts with new sites being included on the list in different regions. However, we do see that there is still an underrepresentation of certain types of centres perhaps due to a lack of capacity building. We have a centre in Mexico and as it says in the report an action plan was developed and some important activities are going to be set up in terms of for example updating Tentative Lists in our different subregions and also looking at the issues of management and risk preparedness. We believe it is important to continue pushing capacity building and to carry out a strategic analysis so that we can clearly identify the regions that need the most support so that we can try and achieve a more balanced World Heritage List. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like to commend UNESCO for organizing this important seminar here relating to the activities of category 2 centres and institutes. I would like to highlight the role of Lucio Costa, the category 2 centre of UNESCO especially in the translation of UNESCO guidelines to the Portuguese language that are made available also to all the English-speaking countries in Africa. The centre is now also working in the translation the UNESCO document, Tourism and World Heritage with the same spirit of making this information available for Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa and also to Timor. The Lucio Costa centre is also very active in other activities of capacity building. I would like to mention at this point that a capacity-building course is being organized in Cape Verde in March next year conducted entirely by the Lucio Costa centre. Those activities are also very important in Brazil including through scholarships that are granted by our National Institute of World Heritage. Another aspect that I would like to bring to your attention is the fact that our National Institute for Cultural and Artistic Heritage is now promoting an MBA on all aspects of heritage conservation and management giving also scholarships not only to Brazilian students from universities all over the country but also to other countries. I thank you very much for your consideration.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le Burkina Faso félicite le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives pour le rapport portant sur le suivi de la stratégie du patrimoine mondial pour le renforcement des capacités et le rapport d'avancement sur les centres de catégorie 2 associés au patrimoine mondial. Nous reconnaissons et remercions les centres de catégorie 2, en collaboration avec les organisations consultatives, pour les efforts fournis dans le cadre du renforcement des capacités par la tenue d'ateliers qui visent à outiller les États parties pour la préparation des dossiers d'inscription sur des bases solides. Durant les trois dernières années, plusieurs ateliers et forums ont été organisés à l'endroit des jeunes et des gestionnaires des sites de patrimoine mondial sur le patrimoine mondial en relation avec la nature et la culture, portant sur les aspects du changement climatique et les impacts du développement. C'est le cas pour le module intitulé « Gestion efficace nature, culture et communautés » qui est un cours régional africain organisé en août 2018 sur le site du patrimoine mondial des Chutes Victoria, en collaboration avec le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain et la Commission de conservation du patrimoine mondial de Zambie. La réussite de ces activités demande la participation et la collaboration des États parties et, comme l'a relevé l'ICOMOS, les pays devraient élaborer des stratégies nationales dans ce cadre. En outre, il serait indiqué de mettre en place un système de recueil d'informations plus solide sur le renforcement des capacités ainsi que l'analyse de l'étape des activités à l'en-tête des objectifs. Pour ce faire, notre pays soutient l'amendement qui a été soumis par l'Angola. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. First of all we wish to commend the World Heritage Centre for its efforts in capacity building. We also wish to continue—last June we had cooperation already with the World Heritage Centre and Africa group in connection with Priority Africa to organize capacity building in relation to World Heritage. China wishes to continue these kinds of efforts perhaps in terms of training programmes being established in the near future. We will be in close discussion with Africa group and the World Heritage Centre and we have the support of

our National Cultural Heritage Administration and they are willing to participate and perhaps we can establish some detailed training arrangement in this connection. And of course as I mentioned in the beginning of our session, China also welcomes other countries to join this enormously important effort. We support the amendment by Angola. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask Mr King to give us some comments? Sorry, Mr King we have one speaker. This is the Centre for Zacatecas from Mexico.

Observer NGO (Regional World Heritage Institute in Zacatecas):

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving me the floor. This is first time the Regional Institute of Zacatecas is taking the floor so let me thank the Republic of Azerbaijan for the success of this 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee which has already yielded very excellent results. Honorable participants, I would like to say that in June the Board of the Institute approved the working plan drafted on the basis of the Action Plan for World Heritage for Mexico and Central America, 2018-2023. That programme was adopted by the participating states and the idea is to apply this strategy of capacity building in order to meet the challenges facing the region when it comes to implementing the Convention. I would like to mention other activities. This year there will be two major workshops for the region and we will soon make programme activities for next year. We are working with the authorities in charge of World Heritage in each country in order to learn what their challenges are in sustainable use both through modern technology and physical meetings; we will be able to make headway and this will help. I would like to express my recognition to the valuable support provided by the World Heritage Centre at all times to our Institute in order to achieve our current state. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. My delegation thanks the Secretariat for this report and ICCROM for the presentation. Indeed, it is one of the most important tasks that the Centre and the Advisory Bodies and of course, with the cooperation of the States Parties, should do and I believe that the capacity building is another contribution to the Global Strategy which will make the List more balanced and more credible. In that sense we fully support the activities of the Secretariat as well as the States Parties, the contributions of the States Parties are more than commendable. But we believe that we need to redouble our efforts and invest more in capacity building especially in Africa. Here I would like to mention that there are several ways we can look at this process.

The first is the nomination and capacity building in the nomination process as we are observing there are a limited number of sites from Africa and second, is capacity building for site managers in Africa that are under threat or on the List of World Heritage in Danger and I would like to quote the representative from ICCROM on the importance of the World Heritage Site Managers Forum. It is already the third experience and the practice we have started in Krakow continued in Bahrain and now in Azerbaijan. We are very happy and honoured to organize the third edition of this Site Managers Forum. Listening to site managers and getting feed back from this meeting we can see that it is one of the, I would say, strongest ways to promote networking among the site managers but also to learn from each other and to increase their capacities. We are very happy that among those 77 site managers, my country funded a considerable number of site managers from Africa and we are very proud of this.

Another cooperation that we believe may be useful is to work with the African World Heritage Fund. This is another pan-African organization that helps countries in Africa to upgrade their capacities and to help them in all the processes starting from the nominations and also capacity building for the site managers. I join the Chinese Ambassador in calling the States Parties to be engaged on a bilateral level also with African countries and Azerbaijan is committed to do this also in the future. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would like to express our gratitude and thanks to both ICCROM--Mr King and Dr Rössler from the World Heritage Centre for their support on behalf of Bahrain and the Arab Regional Centre hosted by Bahrain. We value their input and support and that of the other Advisory Bodies like ICOMOS and IUCN in following up the mandate that we have to implement including capacity building. I would like to express our support to the amendment from Angola and Tanzania regarding the impact assessment. The Arab Regional Centre has plans to start from next year to carry out impact assessment in both training for natural and cultural heritage components. We have so far since 2012 involved about 1,000 participants from various Arab countries in the region in our training programmes—there are many and I don't want to get into the details but it is time for us now to take stock in what has been achieved, what happened and what was the impact on the various countries and various institutions. We will need the support from the Arab unit, which is always available within the World Heritage Centre, and from our partners, the Advisory Bodies. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now, may I ask Mr King to give us some report?

ICCROM:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Let me first thank all the Members of the Committee who intervened. It makes me very happy when there is a discussion on capacity building bringing out various key aspects. I think this is, I speak for ICCROM and you know that ICCROM is capacity building but I think this is an important part of how we can ensure our sites not only get on the World Heritage List but stay in a good state of conservation so that we can pass them down to the next generation. In regard to perhaps the biggest issue that's been discussed by a number of States Parties—I'll mention Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Tanzania but also many others who have supported it.

I would say that we welcome very much the idea of an evaluation of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy. We are going on eight years now and it actually makes a lot of sense for us to be able to take a step back, take stock, figure out what we've actually been able to do and what we have not been able to accomplish yet and I think that is actually something that would be welcomed very much certainly by ICCROM and I suspect by the World Heritage Centre and by the other Advisory Bodies. My hope would be that that would lead then to a revision of the strategy because obviously things have changed over the last eight years. So I'm assuming that such an evaluation would be the first step to the idea of a revised capacity-building strategy that we could present to the World Heritage Committee at a future session and I note that in the amendment it actually mentions that.

The third thing that I will mention that I'm also happy to see in the amendment but it's important to me to at least flag this to you all is that clearly there is actually no budget for carrying out this evaluation. As you know the pressure on the World Heritage Fund is what it is and there was no consideration of this when the budgets were actually made for 2020-2021 so I think it

will be very important for us to ask you, Members of the Committee and you, States Parties, in a larger sense if there is a possibility for us to get some extrabudgetary funds to be able to fund both, and I would mention again, both the evaluation of the current strategy but also the development of the revised strategy for the future. So I think that is something that I would like to point out.

In regard to some of the smaller issues, we had interventions from China and Bahrain and the Zacatecas Centre and they are indeed in all cases important partners in capacity building through their category 2 centres. WHITRAP has been one of the crucial Asian partners in capacity building over this period of time. The Bahrain centre absolutely has been doing a fantastic job and we are very pleased to be partnering with them and pleased to be continuing in strengthening I would say our partnership as time is going on. Also with the Zacatecas centre we have carried out a course there and have been involved in some of the planning of activities in the Zacatecas centre. Just quickly in regard to Zimbabwe's intervention and I did mention the course that took place on the Zambia side of Victoria Falls but that does not mean that Zimbabwe was not involved in it. We had professionals from Zimbabwe who were a part of that and we thank Zimbabwe very much for that and look forward to continuing to work with them.

Two other quick points—Brazil mentioned specifically the Portuguese language and I think that is something that is very important and something that we need to look at but in fact I would like to put that in a larger framework—it's not just the need to have more translations in Portuguese but it's the need to have more translations in many, many different local languages. The truth of the matter is when you get down to the site level and when you are talking about site managers, very often the only effective way to be able to manage the site is using local languages and that may be Portuguese in some places, it may be other languages so those translations are much appreciated from Brazil but I would really also like to encourage all States Parties to actually think about translating resource materials into local languages so that they are useful for the people on the ground, for communities, for site managers, etc.

And finally, on the issue of Africa as many of you know ICCROM has certainly been very much involved in capacity building in Africa over the last 20-some odd years. We are actually in the process with the Africa World Heritage Fund in developing a new programme for capacity building in Africa not just touching on World Heritage but actually looking at World Heritage and beyond, let's say and focusing specifically on the issue of youth and how to bring youth into the conservation and heritage process. We think that the youth are the next generation and we need to be focusing now on bringing the young generation into heritage and conservation protection in Africa, not just sub-Saharan Africa but Africa and we would be very happy to talk to Azerbaijan and with China and other interested States Parties to try to carry that programme forward as we move forward so thank you all very much for your very rich and very useful comments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Ms Rössler, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I would also like to thank you for the very rich debate on this extremely important issue, which you have discussed throughout the World Heritage Committee session here. A couple of points, of course we need to have funds available to have such an evaluation. I also noted very clearly from Angola that we need to present a result-based report and to see actually the impacts of capacity building on the ground. I also would like to say to Bosnia and Herzegovina, a very important point that you raised about the SDGs and what we try to do is streamline the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy throughout all processes including capacity building and we had actually yesterday in the

Operational Guidelines group a discussion specifically on the changes to capacity building to align it with the SDGs.

Also very important mentioned by several of you the funding for site managers and the Ambassador of Azerbaijan clearly pointed out that this is very crucial because the Site Managers Forum became in itself a capacity-building exercise and I think this is very much welcome. Funding is limited. We will of course talk to China and I am looking at the Ambassador of China for the next Forum, but there is also a very easy thing to do if States Parties would take site managers on their delegations and maybe help them to finance a ticket to come to the next World Heritage Committee session. That would be a way out.

And finally, I think what is very much welcome is that we are now moving into a phase where there are linkages between the different category 2 centres and China mentions the new MOU, with the African World Heritage Fund and WHITRAP so this is also a way forward. So thank you very much for all the points raised.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We have an amendment to the draft decision. Please, Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. As flagged we have an amendment from Angola and the United Republic of Tanzania. It's a new paragraph 4, Requests ICCROM, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS, to carry out a results-based evaluation of the implementation of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy, consulting category 2 centres and other capacity-building partners, for examination by the Committee at its 45th session in 2021.

Also a new paragraph 5, Further requests ICCROM, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, IUCN, ICOMOS, category 2 centres, and other capacity-building partners, based on the above-mentioned evaluation, to review progress and outcomes of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 46th session in 2022. New paragraph 6, Invites States Parties to contribute extrabudgetary resources for the evaluation of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy and its revision.

And then we have one additional new paragraph, 11. Encourages the Advisory Bodies and the category 2 centres to establish joint regional capacity-building programmes, which facilitate and promote knowledge and experience exchanges among professionals, institutions and other stakeholders. And there is also an amendment to the final paragraph. Requests the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM to submit an progress report on the implementation of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy by improving the quality of its content by emphasizing concrete outcomes and the activities of the category 2 centres related to World Heritage for examination by the Committee at its 44th session in 2020. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I think that we don't have any comments...Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We have a minor problem with paragraph 5 where talks about developing a revision of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy. I think we could improve the language and probably say to review the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy. The justification for proposing this is that we already have a strategy in place to be reviewed. But to say develop a revision of that strategy maybe connotes that you don't have the strategy in place.

Chairperson:

Thank you.

Chairperson:

So should we proceed?

Rapporteur:

Yes, I can just read that for you. Further requests ICCROM, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, IUCN, ICOMOS, the category 2 centres, and other capacity building partners, based on the above-mentioned evaluation, to review the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 46th session in 2022.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So now can we adopt this version? Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Thank you, Chairperson. After hearing all this comments in the room I would like to ask the Rapporteur to see the new paragraph 12. I think according to the comments it would make more sense to request the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to submit an in-depth report and not a progress report.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. If we can go back to the paragraph above that we were discussing previously just on adding on to Uganda's proposed amendment, review progress of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy for examination. Perhaps even progress and outcomes.

Chairperson:

Any objections?

Chairperson:

Okay, I don't see any now, at last. So we can move to adoption with the last version? In this case I declare document 43 COM 6 adopted. Thank you very much.

Now we move to document 8C, please--Update of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. I now invite Mr Balsamo from the World Heritage Centre to present the updated List, taking into account the decisions taken during the examination of the State of conservation reports as well as the nominations of properties on the World Heritage List. Mr Balsamo, you are welcome.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. Following the closing of Items 7 and 8B, document 8C was freshly produced and distributed to you shortly before this presentation.

The Committee at its 43rd session in Baku, Republic of Azerbaijan between 30 June-10 July 2019 inscribed 2,000--Sorry-- inscribed only 29 new properties on the World Heritage List, four of which are natural, one mixed and 24 cultural and approved the extension of one property already inscribed on the List. Among the newly inscribed properties there are seven cultural landscapes and with this addition we now have 1,121 properties officially recognized as such

on the World Heritage List. Sorry. With this addition we now have 112 properties recognized as cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List, which represents 10% of the List.

The new overall figures of the World Heritage List are now 1,121 properties of which 869 are cultural, 213 are natural and 39 are mixed. The breakdown by region of the new properties inscribed on the World Heritage Committee session here in Baku is one from Africa, two from the Arab region, 10 properties from the Asia Pacific region, 15 properties from Europe and North America region and one property from Latin America and Caribbean region.

Out of the 30 successful nominations 9, which is 30%, are situated on the territory of Committee Members. Following the debates on Item 8B, two nominations were referred and three deferred. At this session in eight cases the Committee did not follow the Advisory Bodies' recommendations which were presented in draft decisions and four referrals became inscriptions, two deferrals became inscriptions, one deferral became referral and one non-inscription became inscription.

The Committee allocated approximately 17 hours of discussion to examine the 35 nominations and this results in roughly an average of 29 minutes for the discussion of each nomination. As a result of the decision relating to the status of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and the decision on nominations of properties to the World Heritage List at this session the Committee decided to inscribe one property on the List of World Heritage in Danger which is the Island and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California in Mexico and at the same time two properties were removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works in Chile and the Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem in Palestine. According to this decision there are now 53 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and draft decisions 43 COM 8C.1, 43 COM 8C.2 and 43 COM 8C.3 are on pages 1, 2 and 3 in document 8C. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Ms Rössler, the floor is yours.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. As Secretary of this Convention I also would like to add some comments in terms of consequences and workload for this Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. In Baku the Committee examined 166 state of conservation reports included 54 sites inscribed on the Danger List out of 112 reports under 7B, so our 7B SOC reports--96 were requested from the previous session of the World Heritage Committee in 2018 in Bahrain and five were requested from nomination decisions adopted at the 41st and 42nd sessions which means the two previous sessions.

Next year, meaning 2020 as of today the Committee will examine 161 state of conservation reports including on the 53 sites included on the Danger List. Out of the 108 7B SOC reports, which we envisage for next year, 38 were requested by you here at this session in Baku and 70 were requested from previous sessions mainly the 41st and 42nd sessions, the last two sessions of the World Heritage Committee.

I also would like to let you know that for the 44th session out of the 108 7B state of conservation reports already in the pipeline, 13 were requested from nomination decisions adopted at the 41st, 42nd and 43rd sessions of the Committee. This represents 10% of all the state of conservation reports emanating from decisions on nominations to report back as you know. We strongly believe in this powerful legal instrument which is the World Heritage Convention but I would also like you to help in this critical situation and not only with assistance to the World Heritage Centre and our Advisory Bodies but assisting countries in need of effective

management plans, visit use plans, operational policies and legal provisions to protect the heritage and to help with this overloaded system of 1,121 sites.

I would like to thank especially those countries that just in this morning's debate provided information on strategic funding they wish to give like Australia just did this morning or Kuwait also in terms of another project. Furthermore, you had already a debate on the desired state of conservation for the removal of properties from the Danger List, which are paragraphs 183 and 184 of the Operational Guidelines. Please note that this provision exists only since 2013, as you know, when it was adopted by the World Heritage Committee but it's really a critical tool for the site managers and States Parties and it is directly related to Article 11.4 of the Convention, as you know.

So your support in this regard would be essential and I think it will help us all to have these provisions in place to assist also for a better understanding of the List of World Heritage in Danger. I wrote my notes up a couple of days ago but actually I saw that Spain is providing also an amendment under 8C.3, which goes into this direction, Mr Chairperson. And with this I close. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. Just one question--it's always interesting to have these summaries but there was also one referral that isn't actually included in the information that was provided to us.

Chairperson:

Mr Balsamo, please.

The Secretariat:

If I understood the question, there is a referral missing? Yes, of course, one inscription that became a referral was not mentioned in this list of let's say recommendations that have been changed in the decision. We can add it, of course.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania has been following the issue of Danger listing with great interest. Tanzania has an experience of having several properties on the Danger List. We are highly experienced on how to get financial and material support from other States Parties. We do appreciate the support that was extended to Tanzania from our friends. Once again we thank these States Parties. Danger listing is not objected by Tanzania. Tanzania's concern is the procedure on how the properties are put on the Danger List.

Tanzania as said above is experienced and knows what Danger listing can do in terms of funds mobilization. Chairperson, Tanzania clearly understands that paragraphs 179 and 180 of the Operational Guidelines put conditions that qualify properties to be on the Danger List. And paragraph 183 to 189 puts up a procedure that should be followed by the Committee to list a property on the Danger List. In this presentation we see a proposal in the draft decision convincing States Parties not to view Danger listing negatively. We understand these sentiments and we do not say that Danger listing is bad, only that the procedure is not right

according to our own understanding. Maybe at this juncture, Chairperson, we request the Legal Adviser to enlighten us on this matter. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie souhaite remercier le Centre de nous avoir donné toutes ces informations qui, présentées ainsi, nous donne une vue générale et quelque part une vue globale de la situation dans laquelle cette session s'est déroulée, mais aussi dans la continuité des autres sessions. Je voudrais, à l'instar de l'honorable délégué de la Tanzanie, qui a tout à l'heure évoqué la question de la Liste en péril, dire que de cette session se dégage une situation de malaise par rapport à cette catégorie de notre Convention, et c'est de notre responsabilité de réfléchir quant à son évolution. Son évolution propre, parce que c'est un outil de protection et de mise des États parties devant leurs responsabilités une fois qu'ils inscrivent des biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, mais également, et cela a été évoqué dès l'ouverture de notre session, la question de sa propre perception. Continuer à la regarder comme un élément homogène ne correspond plus je crois à la réalité. Nous avons vu lors de cette session des États parties solliciter le Comité d'inscrire un bien sur cette liste. C'est une catégorie, c'est un état d'esprit.

Nous avons vus dans d'autres cas les organes consultatifs, le Centre et le Comité souhaiter inscrire des biens sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril, mais les États étaient quelque part mal à l'aise par rapport à la perception que cela dégagerait si cette décision était prise. Je crois que c'est notre responsabilité de réfléchir à l'évolution de cet élément important et de cet outil important de notre Comité, bien entendu en gardant à l'esprit la finalité protectrice que cette catégorie s'était donnée depuis l'écriture et l'adoption de cette Convention.

La Tunisie souhaite inviter les États parties à une réflexion, on conviendra du moment mais on est prêt à l'accueillir dès l'année prochaine, sur ce point précis, pour que, avant la prochaine session, on puisse mettre le fruit de cette réflexion sous forme de proposition. Je crois que nous ne devons plus continuer à éluder ce problème, c'est un problème réel et à nous d'avoir à la fois la responsabilité et le courage de le traiter de manière rapide et, j'espère, efficace.

Chairperson:

Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I will be very brief because I believe that during this session our views on the listing and what we mean by it was clearly expressed. We would like to say that we support the amendment that was put forward by Spain and since we are at this juncture we would like to say that as Members of the Committee we also need to be very careful with the language we are using. We have heard referenced several times during our debates Danger listing as punishment which when it comes on Members of the Committee, goes against the sense of what Danger listing actually is. And since we are going to give the floor to the Legal Adviser and we have just heard from the distinguished delegate from Tunisia reflecting on the List of World Heritage in Danger, if my understanding is correct the problem is that the Convention in its Article 4 provides only one List of World Heritage in Danger so were we to have different categories that would imply changing the Convention which is something we have discussed why it's difficult. But I do agree that maybe we need to have some kind of reflection but just to say we do not see how we could have different categories for the Danger listing. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China wishes to echo the distinguished Ambassador of Tunisia in this matter. In Danger listing is quite a sensitive issue for many countries. Of course, we fully recognize and really appreciate that some States Parties openly invite in Danger listing for their property, which we are very happy to see. However, we can also notice during this session that quite a number of our resolutions, China did not intend to oppose the wording eventually. But in the wording, in a number of cases where there was in Danger, in fact if you read it, it is used as a threat, sort of a warning to those properties or to the management conservation so it creates a dilemma. I think some sort of discussion or seminar, perhaps, is helpful in the coming months or next year sometime that we should seriously discuss the tool and also the terminology being used. There are cultural differences as I mentioned earlier at the beginning of our session, that there are cultural differences, as many countries perhaps will try their best to avoid at all costs this terminology being applied to their property. Although, we know the Committee's intention is good; it is not ill intended, labeling anyone. But in reality this term has been used at least in sort of, it can be perceived both as a positive encouragement for generating funding but on the other hand it is used as a threat or warning sign to States Parties so I think there needs to be some sort of understanding eventually to be reached. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. As far as I have information the Centre is already planning on having such an event in Romania and it will be a workshop to assist States Parties with properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. So this will be a special event, which will be giving explanations and assistance in understanding the matter. The next speaker is Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson. I think a few of us were caught a little by surprise with the change of agenda items today and we'd been expecting us to return to 7.2 and 7.3 this afternoon and it came on quickly this morning and some delegations may not have had the opportunity to contribute in the way they had wanted and are now. So firstly, let me say that to go back to the comments that we made very early in this session where we outlined our thoughts about needs for reforms, changes to the way the state of conservation process works so that it was more effective in engaging States Parties early and continuously in dialogue with the Advisory Bodies about the state of conservation of their properties.

And I recall also a comment made by one of the African delegations, and I apologize that I can't remember which it was, but made an observation that it would be a really good thing if by the time we got to the point where a place was being recommended for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger that the work had already been done to identify what those corrective measures were and that there was a properly costed and timed and sequenced action plan in place and ready to be adopted at the time the place was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger rather than that coming afterwards. That would be to our way of thinking a reform worth exploring.

The delegate from Uganda has raised a question about whether this agenda item here is the right place to be considering the amendment that has been proposed by Spain and perhaps it would have been best dealt with under 7 but I don't know if that can be returned to but we certainly do agree with the proposal that has been put by Spain and we will hear from the Legal Adviser shortly. The interventions from the distinguished delegates of Tunisia and China on reflecting on the need for further dialogue around the approach the Committee takes towards

the List of World Heritage in Danger and indeed to the state of conservation more broadly; that is a dialogue that Australia would warmly welcome and would very much like to participate in. we would suggest it could be a significant thing for discussion by the Committee in China next year. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I guess my colleague from Australia was reading my mind. Just to continue with that, we note that it's really important for dialogue so that was also the State Party of Kuwait has observed from the last few days and also the previous meeting. This is a very sensitive issue. It's like the glass of water that's half full, it's optimistic, and half empty, pessimistic. So with regard to that and the session in China, 44th session Kuwait would be happy to host a side event to have more discussion on this topic and hopefully the outcome of the meeting in Romania, as I heard from the Centre, we can discuss further so at least use that at the 44th session we have a lot of States Parties especially the ones with properties on the Danger List so we can hear their notes about it and the obstacles and what's been done. Again, Kuwait would be more than happy to host a side event in China. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for this proposal. Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like to express Bahrain's agreement with our distinguished speakers from Tunisia, Hungary, China, Australia and Kuwait. Furthermore, we would like to point out that in the Arab region we had until yesterday 84 sites, 86 now, but 22 of them are on the Danger List. That is quite a high percentage, actually, but what we find quite difficult is how to help the States Parties come off that List, especially if more than half of them are due to armed conflict. Although many of the States Parties try their best to protect their sites in spite of all the difficulties I don't think this will help them remove the site from the Danger List.

So as we have looked at the statistics that were provided by the World Heritage Centre about yesterday and today's decision regarding referral and deferral and others, we would also inquire if there is any analysis of the sites in Danger worldwide and what are the reasons behind it because a lot of people recently, within this Committee meeting, of course it's a stigma for many countries because they look and they understand and they hear that some of these sites have been on the list for 15 or 20 years. So what chance do they have to remove it? So there should be some kind of analysis before we have the meeting next year to understand what are the various categories and what are the reasons and if we can have a percentage of how many were removed and what was the cause of the Danger listing and when and how it was removed.

We need to learn more so we can help States Parties avoid this and if they have to, and as Spain has rightly included in the amendment that it is not a kind of judgment on the country. Sometimes it's the result of a natural disaster or war or whatever. But that should come this sentence or paragraph in the amendment, it should come as a result of an in-depth analysis of what are the causes and how long the sites on the Danger List—the 53 or whatever, maybe half of them are in Arabia—and that will give us at least a base to start thinking about how we can help the States Parties. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Having listened to the previous speakers we can only agree with the sentiments on this issue we have been facing for many years on this Committee and there are different interpretations of the World Heritage List in Danger. There are also different attitudes of States Parties concerning the sites put on the Danger List. We can maybe agree with some sentiments that the Danger listing will give some incentives for the States Parties to improve the conservation and management, etc. but I agree with what was said previously by my colleague from Bahrain that we have some cases where the sites have been on the Danger List for some 10-15 years and it doesn't give an impetus for the States Parties to remove it from the List. We need to understand that there are different approaches to this issue and the views raised here about we have to understand and take into account the social and psychological approaches to this issue and here we cannot apply a single standard to all cases. We need to understand that for some countries the listing could be encouraging for them to do something but for others it can be a discouragement. So in that sense my delegation supports the idea of having more reflection on this issue. We need to have more analysis to be done to understand the sentiments and the approach and tendencies and I concur with the idea and support the Ambassador of Tunisia to organize on an expert level a reflection and what I have heard also from the World Heritage Centre there are already some actions in this regard. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. Norway wishes to echo the wise words of our esteemed colleagues in this very room. We also take note of the concerns and reservations in relation to cultural perceptions and differences in how we understand Danger listing as an efficient tool for safeguarding a World Heritage property. We also support the idea proposed by our colleague from Tunisia and others on a reflection on this problematic issue and we welcome the initiative of the World Heritage Centre and Romania to work on this. And it's something about trying to land on a shared understanding of this Danger List more as a possibility list or opportunity list because in fact that is what it is. It is an international mechanism which is there for all of us to commit to help in a difficult situation and in that regard we also strongly support the amendment proposed by Spain and whether it fits better here or under 7, we don't know but we have asked for clarification from the Legal Adviser on that. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Rapporteur to deliver the draft decision.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. As proposed we have a new proposed paragraph. It would be paragraph 3, proposed by Spain and supported by others. Recalls that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, should not be viewed negatively by the State Party; its purpose is to marshal international support to help the State Party effectively address the challenges faced by the property by engaging with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to develop a program of corrective measures to achieve the desired state of conservation for the property as provided for under paragraph 183 of the Operational Guidelines. And I'll just note that we have added World Heritage Centre there, which was missing from the amendment you originally saw.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

This is not exactly related to the comments on the screen but the discussion what was developed this last hour, we would like to add to because many proposed expert meetings mentioned but at some point what should be discussed first is this regional imbalance when you look at a map of UNESCO Heritage sites in the world and then something that is most important from our point of view is how to build national capacity. In this aspect it will be interesting to see, for example for the World Heritage Committee, how they deal with national legislation and something else that is very important, this is player in this activities question about criteria for selection of the experts evaluating in this process and something that was mentioned before how much cost evaluation and time of evaluation because previous meetings and discussions were like a country doesn't have money or Advisory Bodies don't have money, how long to be on the site because some sites are for a few days some sites need one month to be studied and second how World Heritage Committee Member can support in their region with advice on analysis also done. Yesterday, Brazil and Portugal contributed for the inscription of the site. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, thank you very much. First of all I want to make clear that I am not opposed to this paragraph. But I wanted to use this paragraph to understand the application of the procedure of putting a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger because when you read the Operational Guidelines, you get the impression that there is some guidance, some activities that have to be done before this Committee makes a decision. That is the understanding of our delegation. So we wanted to clarify this from the Legal Adviser whether our understanding is the same or maybe we are understanding it in a different way. But I am not opposed to this paragraph; this paragraph can stay as it is. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Can I have a response from the Legal Adviser, please?

Legal Adviser:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. This is the first time that my advice has been requested during the meeting and I see it as a testament of your able conduct of the meeting that it's only on the eighth day of proceedings that this is done.

In response to the questions that have been asked—of course I won't take any position regarding the proposal that is on the table—but rather I will try to answer the questions that would be given. Maybe the first element to recall is that of course the Convention is for the protection of the world heritage and cultural heritage and the preamble of the Convention mentions the fact that the objective is to preserve the World Heritage and also makes reference to that fact there may be dangers, threats on that cultural heritage. So inclusion on the Danger List enters into that logic.

With regard to the question asked by the distinguished delegate of, I believe, Uganda, the process for inscription on the Danger List is provided for broadly from paragraphs 169 and following the Operational Guidelines and then more specifically with regard to procedure in paragraphs 183 and following. With regard to, if I may very quickly, recall what the process is. There is a process of reactive monitoring which implies that information may be received by the Committee from States Parties and other sources with regard to the state of conservation of a property on the World Heritage List. Under paragraph 176 of the Operational Guidelines the World Heritage Committee may make a decision which includes under subparagraph c)

that when the requirements and criteria set out in paragraphs 177-182 are met for the Committee to decide to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger—and I should point out that it adds, according to the procedures set out in paragraphs 183 and following so the procedure is indeed the one in paragraphs 183 and following.

When one turns to paragraph 183 and in response to the question asked, there are a number of steps that are foreseen by the Operational Guidelines. I will only focus on the text and I trust that my colleagues from the Secretariat may be able to provide information on how this is actually applied in practice. So when considering, says paragraph 183, that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it's possible the Committee shall develop and adopt as far as possible says paragraph 183, in consultation with the State Party concerned a desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and the programme for corrective measures.

Paragraph 184 then explains how that programme of corrective measures may be developed and then paragraph 185 explains that all of this is brought to the attention of the Committee and finally, 186 says the Committee shall examine the information available and take a decision concerning the inscription of the property.

This is as far as I understand the procedure for the inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. With your permission Mr Chairperson I would like to also take this opportunity to answer the question that was asked I believe by the distinguished delegate from Hungary regarding the List. I do confirm as she rightly pointed out Article 11, paragraph 4 of the Convention provides for the List of World Heritage in Danger; it refers to a list. Of course, that doesn't mean necessarily that the list may not have subcategories or maybe structured in a certain way in the same way as the List of World Heritage has certain categorizations. But of course there is a list provided for in the Convention. I hope this assists the Committee in its work. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for your explanations. We still have China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chair. Sorry to take the floor again, but this time with regard to the text. Like I said earlier I think there is no established view on the List of World Heritage in Danger, whether it's positive or negative. I think it's not necessarily helpful to put a clause here saying should not be viewed negatively by the State Party. It gives me—I mean if I am trying to draw an analogy it is as if you hold up a stick to a State Party and at the same time you want them to thank you.

So I think you know, the view on Danger listing is still very much—it's at least complex and in reality we have been using this danger term in the wording of our resolutions as a kind of warning or threat. Like I mentioned earlier China did not choose to oppose such wording with the understanding that there are different views. It might be necessary and that is why we suggest we should have discussions on this before they should actually be put in the resolution. So if you want to reflect it in the resolution that is very much in an ideal world and then you need to put something else, reflecting the other views, cultural differences or in reality, you know, more States view it negatively as not being viewed negatively. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. First of all I would like to express that from the point of view of Brazil this reflection on the List of World Heritage in Danger is most welcome. And I believe that in this reflection process we really need to address the question of sites that have been on the List of World Heritage in Danger for more than two decades. If countries should not view this negatively maybe we should think of ways of how to help the countries with financial resources and also capacity building. When it comes to the paragraph proposed by the distinguished delegation of Spain, I think that with your permission we cannot ask countries to like that their sites are on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

For some countries the sites are a very important source of tourism and therefore revenue for their country. And I address at this point specifically developing countries and least developed countries. So the way the paragraph is phrased it seems to address only the let's say the unwillingness of the country to have the site on the list but I think there are so many cases where the country has done nothing to deserve. The country was struck by a natural disaster and already has many challenges to cope with. So I believe that I fully agree with the intervention made by my colleague from China and that is the reason I requested the floor.

I believe that we could put this paragraph or reflect what Spain would like to see but in a more positive way. We can't ask countries not to view the list negatively but we should encourage international partners, the Committee, the World Heritage Center to engage more constructively in capacity building and also in allowing the country financial resources to preserve the sites of universal value. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please. Sorry, sorry, Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Alors je voudrais tout d'abord remercier la délégation de l'Espagne de nous avoir proposé cet ajout, parce qu'il est important et parce qu'il reflète une bonne partie de nos discussions, et de notre désarroi probablement, lors de cette session. La démarche est louable, mais je crains que la perception ne se décrète pas. On ne peut pas dans un texte dire « vous devez le lire et l'interpréter d'une certaine manière ». Par définition, le texte est un élément objectif, la perception est un fait subjectif, variable selon les personnes et les situations.

Donc nous appuyons l'idée, mais nous voudrions proposer une légère modification de ce paragraphe. Si vous pouvez me suivre, j'arrive à « ne doit pas être perçu négativement par l'État partie » ; on enlèverait cela et on aurait une phrase comme : « Rappelle que l'inscription d'un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril a pour but de mobiliser un soutien international pour aider l'État partie ». Je crois que c'est un rappel et que cela se fait l'écho de nos travaux et des dossiers qu'on a eu à traiter, parce qu'obliger un État partie à avoir une perception déterminée et surtout pas négative est une question qui me paraît hasardeuse. D'autant plus qu'on a eu entre les mains des projets de décision où il est spécifiquement indiqué à l'État partie que, si un certain nombre de choses ne sont pas faites, il sera mis sur la Liste ou en tous les cas une proposition de mise sur la Liste sera faite à une session ultérieure. Ça veut dire que la démarche est une démarche qui précisément est négative.

Donc voilà, je ne sais pas ce que les distingués représentants de l'Espagne pensent de notre proposition par rapport à leur paragraphe. Voici comment on pourrait faire acte ou rendre le fruit de nos discussions perceptibles au niveau de ce paragraphe sans arriver à imposer une interprétation déterminée.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I inform you that we are a little bit behind schedule so I will have three more interventions: Kuwait, Tanzania and Norway and that's it. After that we proceed to the text. Okay. Thank you. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Our intervention echoes the previous speakers. Our message shows the States Parties that bringing a site on the Danger List is a positive thing so that should be reflected in the wording of the draft decision. We suggested the word negatively to be removed and instead add, need to reinforce the positive outcomes of the mechanism of the List of World Heritage in Danger. So let me say it again, need to reinforce the positive outcomes of the mechanism of the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you very much, Chairperson. As a follow up to my question, we have heard from the Legal Adviser and it is exactly what Tanzania understood in those paragraphs. For the last four years we have been on this Committee we have been putting sites on the Danger List without following those procedures. We know we are conservators. Sometimes we have to act so that we save the sites. It's not our own making but it's the situation that comes into what we have been doing. So for that matter, Chairperson, I would go along with the other speakers who talked about reflection in looking into the Danger listing, how we can put it into different levels and also from the Centre they have agreed that they are taking it up. But also try to see these paragraphs in the case there is a problem, see if we can amend them so that they can be understood because what the States Parties see, once you put a site on the Danger List they would ask you why was the procedure not followed and nobody could be answering that question. So we are very happy to go along with those who said there should be a reflection to try to see how we can streamline the Danger listing even seeing how we can put the Danger list in a better way so that it can make it more understandable depending on the culture, attitude and education of different people. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much and Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson. We are having an extremely important discussion here now. We are at the very core of this Convention and we wish to thank the distinguished Ambassador of Tunisia for helping out a very tired head after many days and for his wise proposal to take out this sentence so we support the proposal from Tunisia. Thank you.

Chairperson:

I asked to not go further with the debates. If you insist it's okay but it will be the last one, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Chairperson and sorry for seeking the floor again. We are just now considering quite a complex recommendation and it can be improved with a little simplification but our delegation would be very comfortable with the proposal made by the distinguished delegate of Tunisia but I think that if that was accepted I think that perhaps we could ask our distinguished

colleague from Kuwait whether he would be happy also to support that amendment rather than the one he has proposed.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we can come to consensus. Rapporteur, please.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. So I will have a go at reading this. Recalls that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger—I think we've crossed out something we're not meant to there—needs to reinforce the positive outcomes of the mechanism of the World Heritage List in Danger. And I think, and aims to marshal international support would work. So we'll just let the typing catch up—with track changes it's difficult. So we will just delete the Tunisian proposal in its entirety. Recalls that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger,

Chairperson:

Wait. Kuwait's proposal. You have to delete Kuwait's proposal and to leave the Tunisia one.

Rapporteur:

Oh! Okay, sorry. So it aims at marshaling international support to help the State Party effectively address...

Chairperson:

We can adopt it like that. Thank you very much. I am proposing to approve this Item in whole so I invite you to declare decision 43 COM 8C.1, 43 COM 8C.2 and 43 COM 8C.3 to be approved as we agreed. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Are we moving to general 8 now? We still have 10 minutes left and I hope that we will manage to put it through. It was the decision done on Friday morning that we will proceed with the approval of draft decision 43 COM 8 at the end of the debates on Items on 8 a) through 8 e). Now we are approaching this matter so any other comments? Australia, you are welcome.

The Delegation of Australia:

Mr Chairperson, I intervene only to say that my understanding is that the International Indigenous People's Forum on World Heritage is looking for the opportunity to make an intervention on this Item and we would certainly welcome hearing from the Forum. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Are you ready? So you are ready. The floor is yours. Welcome.

Observer NGO (International Indigenous People's Forum on World Heritage):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I am speaking on behalf of the International Indigenous People's Forum on World Heritage. The Forum advocates on behalf of indigenous peoples across the globe, across all World Heritage sites. We are concerned about the number of interjections from indigenous peoples at consecutive World Heritage Committee meetings about the negative impacts on our human rights and livelihoods. We heard very strongly from speakers at the Forum side events calling for free, prior and informed consent and fallen effective participation of indigenous people's to be implemented across the process of the World Heritage Convention. Without this consent there are significant devastating impacts on our social, cultural, spiritual, emotional and economic wellbeing. These actions can sometimes end up in a loss of our food and water sources, our connection and access to our traditional lands

and waters and loss of our indigenous knowledge, languages and traditions, forced displacement and at the very worst a loss of lives.

We call on States Parties to work with us to continue to manage this balance so that we can pass on a healthy natural and cultural environment to our future generations. Therefore it is critically important that through consultation and free, prior, informed consent as properly implemented throughout all process of the World Heritage Convention from Tentative Listing to nomination, assessment, inscription, management and monitoring and that Parties ensure full effective participation of indigenous peoples before making any decision that would have direct and indirect impacts on our lands, territories and our rights. Free, prior, informed consent is a fundamental collective right for indigenous peoples' survival and for us to be able to continue our traditional lives and cultural practices we urge the World Heritage Committee and States Parties to respect our right to free, prior, informed consent in all the decision-making processes and implementation of it.

Finally, Mr Chairperson, on behalf of indigenous peoples I want to thank Canada and Australia for their generous donations that contributed to the participation of indigenous peoples from the regions to attend this important World Heritage meeting. We encourage other States Parties to contribute to the participation of indigenous peoples at future World Heritage meetings. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. *[Applause]* May I give the floor to Advisory Bodies to comment. ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. L'ICOMOS et l'UICN accueillent favorablement l'initiative du Comité d'introduire le point 8 à l'agenda de cette session. Celle-ci offre l'opportunité de mettre en lumière les tendances actuelles en matière d'évaluation des propositions d'inscription en général et d'engager la réflexion sur certains sujets plus spécifiques. Vous trouverez des éléments de réflexion proposés par l'ICOMOS dans l'introduction du volume d'évaluation ; ils portent notamment sur les zones tampons et les paysages culturels.

L'ICOMOS poursuit son travail sur les défis concernant l'évaluation des sites associés aux mémoires de conflits récents, et une consultation internationale d'experts provenant de disciplines variées, incluant le droit et l'anthropologie, et de toutes les régions vient d'être lancée. Les organisations consultatives notent que certains changements apportés par le Comité sur des décisions sont soutenus par des informations complémentaires soumises après la date limite statutaire du 28 février, lesquelles n'ont pu être évaluées. Le processus sur l'état de conservation peut être utilisé afin de s'assurer que les recommandations sont mises en œuvre, mais cela ne permet pas d'évaluer cette information complémentaire qui parfois touche à la valeur universelle exceptionnelle d'un bien. Une réflexion sur cette question serait bienvenue.

Les organisations consultatives ont concentré leurs efforts ces dernières années sur l'amélioration du dialogue, notamment au cours du processus d'évaluation, et ce dans un souci d'améliorer son efficacité et sa transparence. Toutefois, les contraintes financières et la pression du calendrier très serré du processus d'évaluation ne permettent pas d'aller aussi loin qu'il serait souhaitable en matière de dialogue. Dans cette perspective, l'ICOMOS et l'UICN renouvellent leur engagement dans la réflexion lancée par le Comité sur la réforme des processus de proposition d'inscription. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. IUCN, do you have any comments? No? Thank you very much. So I have an amendment to the text. Rapporteur, you are welcome.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We have received amendments proposed by Hungary, Norway and Australia. They would add an additional paragraph 2, Recalling Decision 42 COM 8 adopted at its 42nd session (Manama, 2018), former paragraph 2 amended to read, Notes the concerning trend whereby decisions are deviating from the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies.

Former paragraph 3 remains unchanged and then a new paragraph 5, Also recalling that the Operational Guidelines set out the conditions for inscription on the World Heritage List strongly reiterates that only meeting criteria is not enough to warrant inscription as to be deemed Outstanding Universal Value a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and authenticity in the case of cultural properties and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding as outlined in paragraph 78 in the Operational Guidelines.

And a new proposed 6 paragraph. Urges States Parties with nominations to be examined not to submit new information concerning the nominations after 28 February in the year in which the nomination is considered and requests that this deadline be rigorously enforced. And a new paragraph 7, Taking note of the discussions at the present session of the World Heritage Committee concerning the referral mechanism requests the review of the referral procedure and its application be including for examination in the framework of the ongoing reflection on the revision of the nomination process. And paragraph 8 remains unchanged. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I will be very brief. Actually, I have a question for the Secretariat. It is our understanding that this Item will become a standing Item so there is no more need to re-request every year that it be included on the Agenda of the next session. I just wanted to have a clarification on that to be sure. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Ms Rössler, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

That was my understanding but we are in the hands of the Committee. If they don't want to have it we won't bring it up but at the moment it is. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all, Kuwait is committed to the World Heritage Convention and its reform process to enhance the credibility of the Convention and transparency of the decision-making process. And to implement the previous statement I would like to mention two things. During this Convention Kuwait is committed to improve capacity building in the Africa

and Arab regions in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to increase the numbers and expertise in the Advisory Bodies and also before we became a Member of this Committee Kuwait was always holding before this Committee an expert meeting in Kuwait for three days from all Arab region, they are hosted in Kuwait to discuss all the files will be important at this Convention. An outcome of that expert meeting, they will give us a recommendation to help us and the decision-makers and their Convention. Since it is an established method of a practice to review the nomination cases put forward by States Parties on a case-by-case basis and considering that Committee Members propose an amendment that deviates from the recommendation delivered by the Advisory Bodies this year during our sessions in Baku. If we insist on labeling this deviation concerning a trend then we need to rethink the mission of the Committee in light of this concern. This is a question up for discussion. Should we redefine the role of the Committee in the deliberation and in taking decisions regarding inscription of the World Heritage List? We believe that deviation continues to occur due to discussion and dialogue. We have witnessed that deviation occurred not only at the Committee but also in the whole decision-making process. Hence, there is a need to approach the nomination process reform in a holistic and consistent manner. We would like to request clarification on which basis cases of deviation are positively encouraged and applauded as we witnessed during this meeting and in which cases of deviation are considered a direct threat to the credibility of this Convention? Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I propose the following. I will give the floor to Angola now and after that let us make a break and maybe during lunchtime you will have some other consultations between each other and we will come to the continuation of the discussion at the beginning of the afternoon session. So please know that the floor is going to Angola and then we make a break. Thank you very much.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je suis d'accord avec vous. Peut-être que l'on reviendra après le lunch pour apporter d'autres éléments après consultation, mais nous voulons juste réagir par rapport au paragraphe 7. Je pense que c'est une proposition que nous avons faite hier. Nous sommes tout à fait d'accord avec ce que la Hongrie, la Norvège et l'Australie proposent, mais nous voulons, au lieu de dire « la présente session », qu'on dise clairement « la 43^e session ». C'est beaucoup plus précis. Donc on remplace « présente » par « 43^e ». Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I see only one more intervention from Tunisia so you are welcome and that's it. Thank you. Then we go to break.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président, mais je crois qu'il y avait d'autres délégations qui avaient demandé la parole avant nous, donc on est prêt à attendre la pause déjeuner et on contribuera dans l'ordre chronologique de notre demande de parole. Merci pour votre proposition mais je crois qu'il y avait d'autres délégations. Ou bien je me trompe ? Je crois qu'il y a d'autres délégations qui ont demandé la parole, donc on attendra notre tour. Il n'y a pas de souci.

Chairperson:

Okay, okay, let's continue beginning with your intervention and then Cuba, China and Hungary. Thank you very much. At 3 p.m. Thank you. Have a nice time.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.

EIGHTH DAY – Monday 8 July 2019

SIXTEENTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 5.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Brazil)
later: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)

Chairperson:

Good afternoon to you all. I think we already have a quorum to resume our session for this afternoon. I would like then to continue with the analysis of Item 8. Before we had our lunch break some countries had requested the floor and I would at this stage pass the floor to the distinguished delegate of Tunisia who would continue with his intervention. Thank you very much. Ambassador, you have the floor.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci beaucoup, Madame la Présidente. Je souhaiterais avoir à l'écran le texte si c'est possible, parce que mes remarques sont en rapport avec les propositions d'amendement. Voilà, merci beaucoup. Je voudrais tout d'abord exprimer les remerciements de la Tunisie aux trois délégations qui ont fait l'effort de tenir compte de nos discussions et du déroulement de nos travaux, notamment lors de cette session.

Dans l'ensemble, nous sommes d'accord, notamment à partir des points 5 à 8, si mes souvenirs sont bons... 7 alors, oui, voilà. Nous sommes d'accord, par contre la phrase, la proposition du premier paragraphe me pose quelques problèmes de nature idéale, et je souhaite vous en faire part. Non, le premier paragraphe, s'il vous plaît, en français. Alors « Note la tendance préoccupante selon laquelle les décisions qui s'écartent des recommandations des organisations consultatives ; ». Alors sur le fond, s'agissant de l'idée en soi, nous en avons tous parlée d'une manière ou d'une autre. J'ai un problème de structure de ce texte. Qui se préoccupe, qui parle ici ? C'est le Comité. Et qui s'éloigne des décisions ou des recommandations des organisations consultatives ? À ma connaissance, c'est le Comité lui-même. Je crois, sans mauvais jeu de mots, que c'est une sorte de schizophrénie textuelle.

Si nous voulons dire par cela, en tous les cas c'est ce que la Tunisie veut comprendre dans cette proposition, que nous sommes conscients que nous devons œuvrer vers une plus grande convergence entre les décisions du Comité et les propositions des organisations consultatives, cela fait sens, d'abord parce qu'on est conscient d'un constat et nous nous astreignons ou nous nous assignons une finalité, auquel cas, je crois que le texte est cohérent, et si cette proposition vous agréée la Tunisie rejoindrait dans ce cas la Hongrie, la Norvège et l'Australie sur l'ensemble des amendements proposés. Mais si nous-mêmes allons parler de notre propre écart, je crois que cela pose un problème de cohérence du texte. Après, si vous êtes d'accord, je suis prêt à proposer la formulation d'un nouveau paragraphe 3, si les autres délégations le souhaitent.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Chairperson. First and foremost we would like to acknowledge the reflections of the delegation that went me regarding this paragraph 3. I'd like to go to paragraph 6. If we understand what this text wishes to express then we can understand

that there have been previous decisions that have rectified the situation but we believe that this could pave the way for new information that could be brought to the Committee's attention on an urgent basis, perhaps linked to conflict situations. The Advisory Bodies of course could still have some importance in this situation. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, you have the floor.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. First of all with regard to the deviation issue, China concurs with the view expressed by our distinguished Ambassadors of Kuwait and Tunisia. There is a problem. We were very happy to hear what the Ambassador from Tunisia has to offer as an alternative. The second point I wish to make concerning paragraph 6, also the distinguished colleague from Cuba just mentioned.

My concern is there seems to be a contradiction. It's about the deadline 28 February, which needs to be observed of course. But we in this session have been trying very hard to encourage dialogue between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies and of course in the process of dialogue there will be new information required and I was just wondering how we can reconcile that you have 28 February deadline to meet then once there are sort of proposed decisions out then additional materials for States Parties, they certainly wish to submit if they are going to dispute some of the issues. And therefore—my question to the Committee and also to the Advisory Bodies and Secretariat—how can we reconcile the more dialogue we engage in the more new information is going to be generated and if you feel that the information submitted after 28 February to be irrelevant then that is a waste of everything. And I shouldn't be encouraged. So I don't know. There should be some way. While we respect—I'm not proposing any new amendment, I'm just putting up a question that needs somehow to be addressed.

And of course, I also want to stress that additional information submitted by States Parties is important and the Advisory Bodies should take them seriously and not just, no we don't have resources to work on it. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much Madam Chairperson. Good afternoon to all colleagues. If I might start then from paragraph 6 just to explain a bit about the rationale behind this paragraph. Paragraph 148 of the Operational Guidelines lays down the principles that must guide the evaluations and presentations of ICOMOS and IUCN. Small i) actually sets the deadline that is mentioned in this paragraph and it says that it should not take into account or include any information submitted by the State Party after 28 February, in the year in which the nomination is considered.

I think it was already expressed by ICOMOS during the presentation on this Item that in our view their evaluations could have been different if they would have had access to the information that was submitted later on but the Operational Guidelines do not allow them to take into consideration that additional information while the Committee does. So this is why we have suggested including this paragraph here. You will also notice that we had a little consultation during lunch so now it's a little bit changed and we have removed the latter part of the paragraph which I would just like to say that it actually came straight from the Operational Guidelines. Now if we can just scroll up to paragraph 3. Here I would just like to say that noting

with concern the deviation was the original draft decision. In the report itself the deviation is acknowledged as a problem and this is not the first time we've seen deviations from the Advisory Bodies' recommendations acknowledged as a problem. We had the IOS study and actually the Tunis meeting and the ad hoc working group's work was also a possible measure to address these deviations. So I also would very much like to hear the proposal from the distinguished Ambassador of Tunisia because from my side I'm willing to of course revert back to the original draft decision that was proposed to us with regard to paragraph 3.

But I must confess that I'm a little bit surprised that the deviation which has been acknowledged as a problem and even here in paragraph 4, well not in the draft decision but in the report it actually says that this not only impacts the amount of the Committee's work but more importantly it is extremely detrimental for the credibility of the World Heritage system that now somehow the deviations are not concerning. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Uganda, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. Madam Chairperson, I set myself with the concerns expressed by the distinguished colleagues of Tunisia, Kuwait and China. On this Committee when we take decisions we do so consciously. So if the worry is that we are deviating, we certainly cannot blame ourselves for doing something that we do consciously. I do not think it is fair for anybody to think that we are obliged to agree in totality with recommendations by the Advisory Bodies. That is why they are called recommendations and that is why we are called upon to take decisions. Therefore, I am also very keen to listen to what Tunisia has provided in the form of amendments. Then we will accordingly take further decisions. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Australia, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We also would certainly like to see the alternative text that the distinguished delegate from Tunisia would like to suggest and we are open to considering an alternative. I make the observation perhaps because it is late in the meeting that it is a reality of human nature that even when we know sometimes we are doing things that aren't good for us we keep doing them and that applies to us individually and sometimes it applies to us working in groups. In response to the comments from the distinguished representative from China and others, we do see the challenge that we all face when we are presented very late in the piece voluminous amounts of additional information that States Parties who have nominations, let's put it in these terms, "on the line" are seeking to bring forward in order to convince the Committee to make a decision that differs from that which has been recommended to us.

We think that it is therefore very important that we have this deadline which is articulated in the Operational Guidelines because really with the volume of work that the Committee faces and with the huge resource requirements associated with doing the work that needs to be done to get us to a Committee meeting, there has to be some point in time where there is a cut-off and where the papers have to be finalized. Of course, in relation to nominations we have a process that allows Parties to receive an interim assessment and the purpose of that interim assessment which comes in December or January is to enable exactly the dialogue we're talking about and that is really the opportunity where the Advisory Bodies are saying to the States Parties identifying for them all the issues that they would like them to further address

with additional information so that they can complete their assessment and that to us is the appropriate place for the provision of additional information to be provided.

There are real resource constraints on this Committee and the Advisory Bodies—we ought to be realistic about that. We have to operate within a sensible framework, which is set out in the Operational Guidelines. So I just urge all Committee Members to recognize this reality and in closing also note that notwithstanding these observations about the challenges we face, nobody is actually suggesting that we amend that particular paragraph but rather we are collectively identifying a problem that we have and one that we think is well capable of being addressed through the reforms that we are going to have the opportunity to consider in relation to the nomination process itself. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Madam Chairperson, we just wanted to echo our support to the distinguished delegate of Tunisia on the issue on paragraph 3. Of course, we understand the concern and we are here but the way it is formulated now is as if we are—we tried to say that there is contradiction that there is kind of a conflict between the Advisory Bodies and the Committee and as our colleague from Uganda said, there is one Body advising another and the other is free to take advice or not to take it. We should not put much time on this contradiction or conflict because we are going for dialogue so we would be very happy to see our distinguished delegate of Tunisia's new proposal so we can go to that attitude of dialogue. That is what we are looking for. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I think actually the interventions from Hungary and Australia perfectly encapsulate what we wanted to say. I think it's all about the context of this amendment which is to actually to try to facilitate the work of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and then attempt to ensure that we are all on an equal footing when it comes to access of information and an appropriate amount of time to review significant amounts of information. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Please you have the floor.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Nous commencerons par réagir au paragraphe 3, au sujet duquel nous attendons également la proposition de la Tunisie. Nous avons également une proposition à faire, peut-être, après avoir vu ce que la Tunisie va proposer. Concernant le délai du 28 février, nous avons deux tendances ici : une tendance qui veut maintenir le 28 février, pour l'aligner avec les orientations, et une autre tendance qui veut étendre un peu le délai. Nous comprenons en fait que ça fait beaucoup de pression quand on reçoit les documents à la dernière minute.

Je suis tout à fait d'accord que les documents ou disons les informations additionnelles ne soient pas soumises aux membres du Comité à la dernière minute, parce qu'on n'a pas le temps de les regarder et de faire vraiment une analyse profonde et détaillée, pour pouvoir émettre des avis clairs. Donc il faudra peut-être là que le Conseil juridique puisse nous aider,

et le Secrétariat. Entre le 28 février et la session du Comité, où est-ce qu'on pourrait se situer pour avoir ces informations à temps et pouvoir les digérer avant que la session du Comité ne commence ?

Troisième chose, nous voulons faire une proposition, une nouvelle, qui n'est pas là ; on verra comment l'intégrer dans le texte. La proposition que nous aimerions faire est par rapport à un tableau récapitulatif. Donc nous allons demander au Secrétariat de préparer un tableau récapitulatif des décisions du Comité concernant les inscriptions. Je m'explique. Trop souvent, avant de commencer la session, on a un tableau récapitulatif qui nous montre les avis émis par les organes consultatifs. Par exemple, tel dossier est renvoyé. Mais après les discussions, le Comité prend une décision. Les organes émettent des avis et le Comité prend la décision.

La décision peut être différente de l'avis émis par l'organe, donc on a besoin d'un tableau récapitulatif qui nous montre les décisions prises par le Comité par rapport aux avis qui ont été émis, comme ça au moins c'est plus clair. Ça peut être un document annexe aux dernières décisions, je crois que c'est le document 18. Il peut faire partie des annexes. Ça nous aide très rapidement à voir les décisions qui ont été prises sur un certain nombre de dossiers, parce qu'on manque de temps, ce sont beaucoup de documents à vérifier et parfois on n'a pas le temps de prendre connaissance de tout ça. Mais un petit tableau résumé, très simple, qui montre l'avis qui a été mis et la décision prise, ça nous permettrait d'aller un peu plus vite dans nos discussions. Merci. C'est une proposition, nous attendons donc la proposition de la Tunisie pour rebondir.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, you have the floor.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente. La délégation du Burkina Faso s'interroge également sur le sens du paragraphe 3, avec lequel nous éprouvons des difficultés. Nous considérons le travail des organes consultatifs fondamental pour éclairer les décisions du Comité mais, ceci dit, il faudrait que nous gardions à l'esprit l'ordonnancement à la base de l'organisation de notre Comité, dans le rapport entre les organes consultatifs et le Comité. Concernant les paragraphes 5 et 6, je pense que l'Angola a déjà fait une première proposition qui mériterait d'être considérée, et nous restons persuadés que les propositions d'amendement qui seront communiquées incessamment par la Tunisie et l'Angola nous permettront de sortir avec des recommandations plus pertinentes, qui permettront à notre Comité d'avancer sur ces travaux. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Merci beaucoup. Maybe now we could listen to IUCN. Please, you have the floor. Thank you.

IUCN:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson and thank you for the debate going on. Just to respond to some of the points being raised and particularly from the honourable delegate from China who asked the question about how do we reconcile the additional information coming forward to us after 28 February. Just to make a couple of points and some of these have been made already but there are clearly very practical reasons, practical issues in terms of the timeframes and our ability to work within those time frames.

I think all of us within this system are definitely under pressure working in compressed timeframes. Some other points that I think are very pertinent to recall in terms of our ability as an Advisory Body to properly evaluated information and then to provide you as the Committee with information that allows you to make informed decisions is that our process involves

multiple inputs, peer review and it's not really my role as the head of the delegation to instantly evaluate information and try to provide in a sense an institutional view on a piece of information. It's also really important for us that we view this through a global framework often. We realize that information is brought forward at national level but our processes really seek to filter that through a global frame of reference which is often not possible in these compressed timeframes.

That said, the reality is we often do in the case of a referral for instance, we may have quite simple information that is easy to verify and comes forward and we realize that in that interim period before 28 February and the Committee meeting we do see things that happen and change and progress is made and it's very obvious and verifiable progress. However, there are increasingly much more significant changes being presented to us as Advisory Bodies which we are asked to evaluate and we have cases here where quite significant changes to boundaries were made available in maps on the very morning the item is being discussed and that is really a challenge for us and therefore a challenge to the Committee. We make every effort to work within the timeframes we have and where possible we actually look to stretch those timeframes.

An example is we write our letter of interim progress back to nominating States Parties by the end of the year when our actual deadline is the end of January. We try to provide an extra month within that process for further consideration and further dialogue. I think the perverse outcome here is that if we make decisions on uninformed evaluations we do sometimes present the Committee with problems later down the track. We know this issue well. And the only real answer here is to somehow find more time in the process for all of us, I think and this is why the work on upstream and including the ideas around preliminary assessment we think as Advisory Bodies are really critical to give us space and time for dialogue to really reach greater points of communication on a number of these issues. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I think we have two issues to be addressed. One is the presentation of information to the Advisory Bodies; I think that this presentation of information has according to the Guidelines already a deadline. Another issue is Members of the Committee using information on developments after this date established in the Guidelines in order to inform their decisions at this Committee. So I believe that perhaps the distinguished delegate of Tunisia with his amendment could help us in addressing this important issue. You have the floor, Ambassador. Thank you.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je reviendrai à la proposition de rédaction d'un paragraphe 3. Jusque-là, je ne me suis pas encore exprimé sur la question du 28 février ; si je pouvais avoir le paragraphe sous les yeux... Mon sentiment est que les deux parties disent une réalité incontestable et incontestée. La partie qui dit qu'il nous faut du temps pour étudier et que vous nous apportez des documents qui nécessitent une étude, qu'on ne peut pas les recevoir le jour même ou dans la semaine, c'est le bon sens même. Et il y a ceux qui disent qu'il y a des événements factuels qui pourraient éclairer la décision sans nécessiter une étude approfondie vers le 28.

Je donne un exemple : on a eu plusieurs cas de nécessité d'un cadre administratif ou normatif ; si la délégation vient ici pour dire que, la veille ou la semaine ou le mois précédent, il y a une loi qui a été adoptée, c'est un fait que le Comité peut prendre en considération sans nécessité d'une étude approfondie. Mais si on ramène un rapport, si on ramène une nouvelle délimitation, il est évident que le Comité ne peut pas se prononcer précipitamment sans avoir eu l'avis des instances consultatives sur cela. Je crois qu'il nous faudra marier ceci et cela et

parler des documents nécessitant une étude approfondie. Ceux-là, en tout état de cause, on ne pourra pas les accepter s'ils ne sont pas remis avant le 28 février. Voici ce qu'on pourrait éventuellement dire sur ce paragraphe. Je m'exprime pour la première fois sur ce point. Si vous le voulez bien, je suis maintenant prêt à vous proposer une rédaction proche mais qui tienne compte des différents avis du paragraphe 3.

Alors c'est toujours le Comité qui parle : « Conscient de la nécessité impérieuse de continuer à œuvrer en faveur d'un plus grand rapprochement entre la teneur des décisions du Comité et celle des recommandations des organisations consultatives ». Donc ma proposition s'arrête là ; je commente un peu si vous me le permettez. Nous avons ici les deux idées, à savoir que le Comité est conscient qu'aujourd'hui nous n'avons pas ce rapprochement optimal, et que donc il s'engage à œuvrer davantage. Cela, à mon avis, est plus cohérent du point de vue de l'idée que la proposition, toute valeureuse par ailleurs, faite par les honorables représentants de la Hongrie, de la Norvège et de l'Australie. Je pense que nous n'avons pas changé de substance. En tous les cas, voilà notre proposition.

Chairperson:

Merci infiniment. Comments? Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. I've carefully listened to the previous debates on paragraph 3 and we thank the Ambassador of Tunisia for this proposal. I think as he himself mentioned it's clear that there is the fact of deviation but the angle of the perspective from which we are looking at this issue is very important. The responsibility of such deviation lies on all stakeholders concerned. That is very important to mention. In this regard I think the proposal from Tunisia is acceptable and we would like to support this proposal. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Angola.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. On attendait la proposition de la Tunisie, mais je pense qu'il y a un problème encore qui se pose. Rendons peut-être les choses plus claires. Les recommandations des organes consultatifs font partie de la décision du Comité, il ne faut pas les séparer. Les décisions prises par le Comité incluent les recommandations. Donc si on dit la décision du Comité et les recommandations des organes consultatifs, c'est comme si on avait deux pôles. Il ne s'agit pas de deux pôles. Les recommandations sont intégrées dans la décision. Donc ça, c'est le point de départ pour la réflexion. À partir de là, maintenant, on peut retravailler le paragraphe. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We wanted thank the distinguished delegate of Tunisia for his proposal, which we would accept for the sake of moving on with our work and we would really like to thank him for proposing this alternative that still manages to capture the spirit. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Tanzania, you have the floor. Thank you. Thank you, Hungary.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We also want to echo our support for proposal from the distinguished delegate from Tunisia. What we like most about this proposal is inclusive. This is very, very important. We are a bit sensitive when we see that there is a proposal that tries to deviate, try to divide. I think it's the Committee that takes the decision so it's our responsibility. It's not others who take other, they have to take care, they have to see, they have to be concerned. *All* of us have to be concerned. So we like the suggestion that our decision should be inclusive. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Do you have any proposals for the text for this paragraph?

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

No, I think that the distinguished delegate from Tunisia, he's going in that direction. It's our responsibility together.

Chairperson:

Thank you.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

We all know we work together to go to this point.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Thank you very much. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Madam Chairperson, we are also thankful to the distinguished delegate of Tunisia for bringing this alternative form of words. We would suggest just a little streamlining to make it read a little bit more clearly. So we would suggest, aware of the overriding necessity to work in favor of a way and then we would say that brings greater convergence.

Chairperson:

Maybe instead in favor of a way towards greater convergence?

The Delegation of Australia:

That would be a better simplification. Then there is bringing...

Chairperson:

So, the Rapporteur will comment on this text. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Thank you. If we move to the new paragraph--we need something other than aware-- so the World Heritage Committee aware makes no sense. But perhaps the World Heritage Committee we can say be aware or be conscious of? Okay, being is okay. Being aware of the overriding necessity to work towards bringing greater convergence between the decisions taken by the Committee and the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies. If we are comfortable with being aware as a...

Chairperson:

Can we agree on this...

Chairperson:

...formulation? Angola. Thank you.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Madame la Présidente, j'insiste sur une chose. Tel que formulé, nous sommes devant deux pôles séparés : il y a la teneur des décisions du Comité, et il y a la teneur des recommandations des organes consultatifs. Nous insistons que les recommandations font partie des décisions. Ce n'est pas un document à part. Ce que nous voulions proposer, c'est une formule simple. Parce qu'on parle de déviation ici, et les déviations sont vérifiées à deux niveaux. Les déviations ne sont pas seulement faites par rapport aux décisions prises par le Comité, qui parfois ne sont pas mises en œuvre par les États parties ou par les organes consultatifs, mais il y a également des recommandations émises par les organes consultatifs qui ne sont pas respectées. Voilà, les déviations sont à deux niveaux. Nous voulions donc proposer une formule simple, si vous êtes d'accord avec nous. Pour nous, ça ne va plus suivre la logique qui est là, nous avons pensé à autre chose.

Nous avons pensé à ceci, je vous le lis : « Le Comité recommande aux États parties, au Secrétariat et aux organes consultatifs de respecter scrupuleusement toutes les décisions prises lors de ses sessions. » Ça c'est une autre formule. En fait c'est le Comité qui est l'organe délibératif. C'est le Comité qui décide et les décisions doivent être respectées. C'est notre position. On l'a proposé en fonction des discussions qu'on a eues ici ; on a vérifié les déviations et, je l'ai expliqué, c'est à deux niveaux. Donc l'organe qui décide doit statuer, voilà pourquoi on propose cette formule. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

I thank you very much. If you allow me, distinguished representative of Angola, I would like to make another proposition that may be would accommodate also what you have in mind. My proposition would be that we erase the first sentence. We start the second one, instead of being aware, by saying reaffirming the overriding necessity to continue to work towards bringing together and then we erase the first part and we erase also your new proposition. Would that accommodate what you have in mind? Thank you. Uganda.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Maybe I will seek the clarification later. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. It's easy that we get a little lost when we are drafting on the screen on the ninth day of the Committee but I would possibly, if I could be allowed, ask the Secretariat to clarify a little bit the context why this recommendation was proposed, why this decision was proposed by us in the first place because this deviation that we have been discussing is coming from a very specific evaluation. Just to give us a little update on the context, please. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Please, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. This specific point of draft decision 43 COM 8 actually as Norway mentioned it comes from the IOS study which is also mentioned in Decision 42 COM 12A of last year which is the decision on which is based all the work this year, ad hoc working group and the ongoing reform of the nomination process which works towards the Global Strategy and is trying to address the deviation between recommendations and final decisions of the Committee. So actually part of the decision comes directly from that study that basically described this situation. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Just to comment what on what the Secretariat said—if he means by the study, the online survey, which was handed to the Tunisian expert group? Is that what he means? This amendment came the outcome of that online survey then the Tunisian expert group meeting? I just wanted to know, is that what he meant?

The Secretariat:

Yes, in the mandate that was given last year for the new ad hoc working group then also for the Tunis meeting and basically the proposed reform of the nomination process which is to be found in last year's Decision 42 COM 12A. This study is mentioned and more precisely this part of deviations between recommendations and decisions.

Chairperson:

Thank you.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

I apologize for taking the floor for the third time. If that's the case then let's just point out from the report, from the online survey was very clear, question number one, in your opinion in which of the following areas should the reform of the nomination process focus on? The third highest of that online survey was 49% decision-making process of the World Heritage Committee. From that survey there is 54% saying evaluation by the Advisory Body. So from that online survey saying that the Evaluation Body should be more focused according to the online survey and Tunisian experts. Just for clarification. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

I am sorry again, sorry. And I wish to say since my dear colleagues from Norway said, in this amendment was taking based on that survey and that study it would reflect that draft amendment the highest you know problem that we've seen from that study. Thank you. I'm sorry for taking the floor for the fourth time. I promise it's the last one.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Just a very quick response to that and thank you, Madam Chairperson, for giving us the floor. I think there is also behind all this there is also an evaluation report from the Internal Oversight

Service from UNESCO, which gives very specific recommendations and that is where these discussions started. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Madam Chairperson, I'm not quite sure why we are confused beyond the observation from the distinguished delegate from Norway that we are nine days in to a 10-day meeting. The statistics that are being referred to here are the statistics that are in the Agenda paper no. 8 in paragraph 2 of that paper and it shows the number of times where there's been essentially a referral or deferral recommendation that is not been accepted by the Committee and the Committee has made another decision. In 2018 in those instances 87% of decisions varied from that which was recommended. In 2017 it was 87% and I'll note that based on my maths this year it's 70% so there are the statistics we are talking about as we have this discussion on my understanding. I'd like to suggest that there seems to be a consensus on the current version or near consensus in relation to paragraph 3 and it might be a good idea if we were able to consider it and move on to the other elements of this decision.

Chairperson:

Thank you all. Are there delegations against the proposed reading for this paragraph proposed by the presidency? No objections? So we approve this paragraph and we move on. Thank you very much. I would ask our Rapporteur to project the next paragraph. Thank you.

Rapporteur:

New paragraph 5 would read, Also recalling that the Operational Guidelines set out the conditions for inscription on the World Heritage List, strongly reiterates that only meeting criteria is not enough to warrant inscription, as to be deemed of Outstanding Universal Value a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding, as outlined in paragraph 78 of the Operational Guidelines.

Chairperson:

Any comments on this paragraph?

Chairperson:

No objections, so approved. Let's move on. Madam Rapporteur.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Requests States Parties with nominations to be examined not to submit new information concerning their nominations after 28 February in the year in which the nomination is considered.

Chairperson:

Any comments on this specific paragraph. China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. Again, it's basically it seems that if new information—according to the current wording it would mean that any new information submitted after 28 February would be invalid. Or is there another reading of it?

Chairperson:

If you allow me, I understand that one thing is one thing and another thing is another thing. One thing is that the State Parties should not present new information after 28 February. The other thing is that Members of this Committee can use information to base their judgment about one dossier on issues that happened after 28 February. This is my understanding of the issue. Thank you.

Chairperson:

I'll pass the floor to Tunisia and then we go back. Thank you. Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. Je reviens à ma proposition de tout à l'heure et on intervient sur le texte, si vous le permettez. Alors « doivent être examinées »... « de ne pas soumettre les nouvelles informations nécessitant un examen approfondi » – pardon, ce serait après « concernant leurs propositions d'inscription » – « après le 28 février ». Comme ça on distingue les éléments factuels. Je ne sais plus lequel des distingués délégués avait parlé d'événements qui risquent d'arriver, une guerre, un tremblement de terre, une inondation, une nouvelle loi ou alors un rapport, ou des données nécessitant une étude approfondie, auquel cas le temps qui sépare le 28 février de la session est nécessaire pour l'étudier et en informer le Comité.

Chairperson:

Merci infiniment. China.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I was contemplating perhaps to rephrase this clause. I'm not particularly against this idea of having this deadline but I feel that there appears to be a contradiction of what we are advocating and what we are practicing so perhaps what we could say, instead of requesting States Parties, perhaps change it to something like the State Parties with nominations should endeavour to submit their new information by 28 February. Something like that—not to make it absolute but sort of an effort for States Parties to submit something as early as possible in view of the need for time. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. We would like to say that the recommendation made by the Tunisian delegation really covers our concerns that we had about this paragraph.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

We would certainly prefer the formulation from the Tunisian delegation. We think that there are circumstances where things happen between the point in time where an evaluation is made but things happen after 28 February that actually are potentially influential in the decisions of the Committee. They would usually go to questions around protection and management such as evidence that a piece of legislation had been put in place to confirm the protection for a nominated property and it would seem a bad decision if we were not able to take account of

such simple and clear things. So for us the critical difference is if we are talking about new information that would require genuine evaluation by the Advisory Bodies that's a problem. But if it's new information that is readily understood and would essentially cause a tick to be made instead of a wiggly line in the evaluation then we are comfortable and therefore we are supportive of the Tunisian amendment.

Chairperson:

I thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Maybe before I pass the floor to two countries, Hungary and Norway and Spain, maybe it would be interesting on behalf of saving time that we listen to the Legal Adviser because I don't know at what point we can change a guideline already approved at this point by a decision here. If we conclude that we cannot maybe we just in this paragraph recall the importance of observing guideline number such and such 148. With this maybe we can advance faster so I pass the floor to the Legal Adviser and then Norway, those who have asked for the floor, if you still need it then we go back. Please, you have the floor.

Legal Adviser:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. I hope that it will help the Committee in thinking about how the process works. As you may know the Committee has established an orderly process for the consideration of the nominations, which includes the evaluation by the Advisory Bodies. That process follows a timetable, which is contained in section 168 of the Operational Guidelines and includes already the deadline of 28 February. So this, I believe and if understand this correctly that was the idea of the original proponents, this explains why the reference is made to the deadline of 28 February.

Now in order to understand that deadline one needs to refer as was pointed out by the distinguished delegate of Hungary, to paragraph 148, letter i), so paragraph i) of the Operational Guidelines, which says, and I'm quoting "The following principles must guide the evaluations and presentations of ICOMOS and IUCN. The evaluations and presentations should": and I jump to i) "not take into account or include any information submitted by the State Party after 28 February", and so on and so forth until it says "this deadline should be rigorously enforced". Now as you may note, paragraph 148 is actually addressed to the evaluating bodies; it's not addressed to States Parties. It says the evaluations may not take into account any information submitted by any State Party, which means that any information that comes after 28 February will not have been evaluated by the Advisory Bodies.

My understanding is that the text contained in paragraph 6 actually does not refer to that but is actually making a different request for Member States to abstain, to refrain from introducing new information after that deadline.

If I may say, there may be situations in which new information may take place after 28 February, which may be relevant for the purposes, as you rightly pointed out, Madam Chairperson, of the Committee's decision. There may be natural catastrophes that have taken place, legislation that has entered into force or even as provided for in paragraph 152 of the Operational Guidelines, a decision by the State Party to withdraw the nomination. These are examples of new information that may take place between 28 February and the moment in which the consideration is being made. So what is said here is that there is a request to States Parties to abstain from providing new information.

For example, there is information if I may make this distinction between new information that is actually new—in other words that has taken place after 28 February—and new information that is actually old, that is information that could have supported before the nomination process,

etc. If I may mention, there is actually a precedent in which the Committee has done something similar in the past, and I should point out that this is something that was drawn to my attention by my colleague Richard Veillon from the Secretariat.

In Decision 35 COM 12B, the Committee has and I'm quoting, "requests States Parties to consider refraining from providing additional information regarding nominations and/or state of conservation issues after the deadlines indicated in the Operational Guidelines as this information is not able to be evaluated by the Advisory Bodies". So as you can see this is something that has already been used in the past, in a different terminology. I hope that this will assist the Committee in its further considerations. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We would also like to thank the Legal Adviser for the comments he has made, which will facilitate our work when looking at this particular issue. This helps us to have an idea of the situation, in which we find ourselves in the direction in which we are moving. From our point of view this is a situation that already exists in the Operational Guidelines and we are not envisaging changing the Operational Guidelines and in any case this wouldn't be the moment to do so. The main objective of this amendment was to recall something that has already existed in the Operational Guidelines. And we believe that in keeping with the spirit of this amendment we have to recall the importance of what has been established in terms of deadlines so that we have a certain clarity when we are applying our working methods. We all have to respect the strict dates because it helps us in terms of our decision-making. With this in mind we believe that it is important to stress that we must respect these deadlines especially when it comes to us taking our decisions. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Hungary, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Actually, I was about to make the proposal that you made before giving the floor to the Legal Adviser which is just to refer back to the Operational Guidelines but since we have heard from the Legal Adviser that there was already a previous decision with similar text, well as you said Madam Chairperson, maybe we can just take that text that we used before or we can as you said simply alter this to refer to the Operational Guidelines and I think we can move quickly on from here. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Actually, I think our colleague from Hungary made exactly the point we wanted to raise. We also wish to thank the Legal Adviser for the pertinent advice given and the reminder of 35 COM 12B. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any proposals of changes for this paragraph? Does the suggestion that was made by the presidency was I don't remember now but I think I said something like

reaffirming the importance of observing—I think the Rapporteur has taken note of that so we could project it and perhaps work it according to your opinions.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. We've got 35 COM 12B. So it reads, Requests States Parties to consider refraining from providing additional information regarding nominations and/or state of conservation issues after the deadlines indicated in the Operational Guidelines, as this information is not able to be evaluated by the Advisory Bodies. Maybe the Committee might want to consider referencing the Decision. It could say, recalled Decision 35 COM 12B that requests if you wanted to recall that previous decision as well.

Chairperson:

Maybe recalling could be yes, at the beginning of the sentence.

Rapporteur:

It's Decision 35 COM 12B.

Chairperson:

Are there observations to this text? Hungary.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson and I apologize for taking the floor so often. Just a minor observation. Since the decision would like to make about nominations maybe we could strike out the and/or state of conservation issues just a suggestion so we are not confused later on why it was actually added to this. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Uganda.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Can I propose to delete the word consider and then the statement would read, Recalling Decision 35 COM 12B, requests States Parties to refrain instead of to consider refraining.

Chairperson:

Are there any more comments on this? Can we agree with this text? Rapporteur, would you please read it aloud? Thank you.

Rapporteur:

Okay, just because it's getting a little confusing now.

Rapporteur:

Recalling Decision 35 COM 12B, requests States Parties to refrain from providing additional information regarding nominations after the deadlines indicated in the Operational Guidelines, as this information is not able to be evaluated by the Advisory Bodies. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Do we have a deal? Thank you very much. Approved. Let's move ahead. Rapporteur, could you please show the next paragraph?

Rapporteur:

New paragraph 7 reads, Taking note of the discussions during the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee concerning the referral mechanism, requests the review of the referral procedure and its application be included for examination in the framework of the ongoing reflection on the revision of the nomination process.

Chairperson:

Are there any more comments on this? Burkina Faso, please, you have the floor.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente. Ce n'est pas un amendement que j'apporte sur ce paragraphe, mais je voudrais me référer à la proposition d'amendement de l'Angola sur le paragraphe 3, qui avait été biffée, concernant la considération des décisions du Comité, et insister sur la nécessité dans le cadre de l'exercice envisagé au paragraphe 7 que cet aspect de l'amendement, initialement proposé par l'Angola, soit pris en compte dans la réflexion. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you. We take note of your suggestion. On va prendre note de votre suggestion. Je vous remercie beaucoup. No more comments? Can we consider this paragraph adopted? Australia.

The Delegation of Australia:

Sorry, Madam Chairperson to intervene again but the distinguished delegate of Burkina Faso has suggested an addition here is what I understand which to me would be better as a stand alone clause in this decision and I think we need to have a discussion about whether what is now new 8 is something that the Committee wishes to agree to.

Chairperson:

So we consider paragraph 7 approved. Now we have new paragraph 8, which reads—
Rapporteur?

Rapporteur:

Recommends the States Parties, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to scrupulously respect all decisions taken during the sessions.

Chairperson:

Any comments on this paragraph. Norway.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. It might be useful—I think we all try to respect scrupulously the decisions we make but if we could ask the Legal Adviser for a clarification on what actually the impact of this decision may be. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Yes. Our Advisory Bodies also have comments. Please, you have the floor. Thank you.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Just to say that paragraph 8 in isolation for we as Advisory Bodies, we're not clear what the meaning of that is to be quite frank. It's not really our role to. The decisions of the Committee are the decisions of the Committee, which clearly we always

accept. It seems to me if I may suggest that having moved that paragraph from paragraph 3, it's in a sense changed the context of it. My understanding looking at paragraph 3 and there is an issue with the order of the sentiment there. Initially it was talking about affirming the importance of the principle of convergence should then be perhaps followed by also note concern that we have a divergence in that convergence and then perhaps closing with the point on scrupulously respecting those decisions. I think that was the logic of the sentiment in paragraph 3 and I would suggest that in isolation paragraph 8 doesn't make a lot of sense. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Burkina Faso, you have the floor, mon cher ami.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Madame la Présidente. En fait mon intervention n'avait pas pour objet d'ajouter un paragraphe supplémentaire, j'avais simplement indiqué la nécessité, dans le cadre de l'exercice qui est prévu au paragraphe 7, que l'on tienne compte de cette dimension de la question qui a été largement et longuement débattue lors de cette session, puisque la référence c'était la 43^e session. C'était juste ça le sens de mon intervention. Il fallait qu'on ajoute un nouveau paragraphe 8.

Chairperson:

Je vous remercie bien, j'ai bien compris votre proposition, c'est pour ça que je dis que nous prenons note de votre suggestion. I would like to ask Australia if you would be in agreement with deleting this second part because I believe our colleague from Angola agreed to delete it in the beginning when we analysed paragraph 3. So are we in agreement with this? Angola, you have the floor.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Madame la Présidente, nous ne voulons pas compliquer l'exercice ici. On soulevait un problème qui est évident. Depuis qu'on a commencé les inscriptions nous nous sommes rendu compte qu'il fallait que nous soyons cohérents. Nous sommes un Comité, nous devons assumer s'il y a des déviations des décisions prises par le Comité. Nous devons être conscients de ça et être cohérents. Donc quelque part il faut qu'on le reflète. Les décisions qui sont prises par le Comité parfois ne sont pas prises en compte, c'est évident, donc il ne faut pas que l'on reste ici en train de tourner, il faut qu'on le reflète quelque part. C'est sur ça que l'Angola insiste. Merci.

Chairperson:

Alors on va le refléter dans le groupe de réflexion. Maintenant, approuvons ce document. Can we approve this paragraph as it is? Merci infiniment, l'Angola, pour votre compréhension. Can you read, my dear friend Rapporteur?

Rapporteur:

Paragraph 7 reads, Taking note of the discussion at—in fact it should be its 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee concerning the referral mechanism, requests the review of the referral procedure and its application be included for examination in the framework of the ongoing reflection on the revision of the nomination process.

Chairperson:

No more comments. We consider this paragraph approved. Thank you.

Chairperson:

No changes I hope to the last paragraph and we consider the whole decision now approved. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

My dear colleagues we will now deal with the progress report on the follow-up to the second cycle of the periodic reporting. The relevant document is document 10A. As you have seen, follow-up activities in the five different regions: Asia and the Pacific (Section I), Africa (Section II), the Arab States (Section III), Latin America and the Caribbean (Section IV) and Europe and North America (Section V) are presented in this document. Consequently, five separate decisions will have to be taken. Allow me first of all to give the floor to Mr Jing, from the World Heritage Centre, who will present the follow-up of the second cycle of the periodic reporting for Asia and the Pacific region. Please Mr Jing, you have the floor. Thank you.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson, distinguished Committee Members, good afternoon to you all. Detailed information concerning this Item can be found in working document 43 COM 10A on pages 1-6 in the English language version and on pages 1-7 in the French language version.

Allow me to recall that in view of the culture and geographical diversity in Asia and the Pacific as well as the regions physical scale two distinct regional Action Plans were produced at the end of the second cycle of periodic reporting. This helped address the specific priorities, challenges and needs identified at the regional and subregional levels. So you have in front of you on the slides two subregional Action Plans. This presentation aims to provide you an overview of some clear activities undertaken in the region since the last report to the Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

One of the main outcomes of the second cycle of periodic reporting is the capacity-building strategy and associated programmes for Asia and the Pacific which were developed by our category 2 centre WHITRAP in China and adopted by the Committee at its 38th session in 2014. In this framework WHITRAP and ICCROM had already organized a course on Heritage Impact Assessment for Asia in the Philippines to address the specific needs in the Pacific Island States countries, another regional workshop on Heritage Impact Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment was organized in November 2017 in Suva and Levuka, Fiji. The capacities of heritage professionals involved in the management and monitoring of the World Heritage properties in the Pacific Islands States were enhanced through this workshop.

Technical support for the conservation and management of Nan Madol of World Heritage property in Micronesia was provided in conjunction with the reactive monitoring mission to the property in January 2018. The multidisciplinary reactive monitoring mission team was made possible thanks to the financial support from the UNESCO/Netherlands Funds-in-Trust within the framework of the World Heritage Programme for SIDS. Funding had also been secured from the U.S. Ambassador's Fund to conduct a LiDar survey of the Nan Madol in Danger site and the islands of Temwen. Support for the continuation of this work using the U.S. Ambassador's Fund we also include the assistance of U.S. Navy Seabees for the works.

In recent good news under the direction of the Assistant Director-General for Cultural and the Director of the World Heritage Centre the International Alliance for the Protection of Heritage in Conflict Areas already approved funding for a project put forward for the safeguarding of Minaret and Archeological remains of Jam in Afghanistan which is on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as you know. These projects were developed in close collaboration with the UNESCO office in Kabul in consultation with the Emergency and Preparedness unit and the Asia Pacific unit of the World Heritage Centre.

In June 2018 a detailed damage assessment of cultural heritage in Tonga was carried out following tropical cyclone Gita and reviewed during a meeting organized in Tonga by the UNESCO Office in Apia with funding from the UNESCO Heritage Emergency Fund. A new UNESCO Japanese Funds-in-Trust project was also approved in October 2018 to enhance the museums for World Heritage sites in Malaysia and the Philippines. In 2018 a UNESCO a technical assistance project on Maritime Trade Corridor Heritage was carried out in Indonesia. The project included a study tour for Indonesian experts to the Netherlands in September 2018 and the organization of an international workshop in Jakarta.

The World Heritage Centre provided training on the mechanisms of the World Heritage Convention, notably regarding the nomination, conservation and management processes, as part of the International Conference on the Management and Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage towards Sustainable Development. This meeting was organized in Bangkok, Thailand with the participation of 12 countries the ASEAN community. In 2017-2018 preparatory assistance was provided to support the preparation of the World Heritage nomination of Deer Stone Monuments and Related Sites, the Heart of Bronze Age Culture in Mongolia, thanks to support from the UNESCO/Netherlands Funds-in-Trust. A number of activities were organized in Asia in relation to the serial transnational World Heritage nomination of the Silk Roads.

The third workshop on the South Asian Silk Roads serial transnational World Heritage nomination process was organized on 12 November 2018 in Xi'an, China, by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, the State Administration of Cultural Heritage of China (SACH), the Xi'an Municipal People's Government and the ICOMOS International Conservation Centre in Xi'an (IICC Xi'an). The Fifth Meeting of the Coordinating Committee on Serial Transnational World Heritage Nomination of the Silk Roads was organized in December 2018 in Ashgabat, Turkmenistan, by the World Heritage Centre and the in collaboration with the Turkmenistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Coordinating Committee composed of 15 countries is co-chaired by experts from China and Kyrgyzstan, respectively Professor Lyu (Lu) Zhou, Director of the National Heritage Centre of Tsinghua University and Ms Baktygul Samaeva of the Kyrgyz National Academy of Sciences.

The final workshop on the UNESCO/Republic Korea Funds-in-Trust project, World Heritage, Sustainable Development and Community involvement was organized by the World Heritage Centre in November 2017. In Karachi, Pakistan—this project really enabled the involvement of women villagers around the World Heritage property and the second phase of this project was approved in April this year and activities will begin shortly in India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. The UNESCO subregional conference, World Heritage Global Strategy in the context of South Asia, took place in India, in February this year, as shown in the slide.

As the Director of the World Heritage Centre already mentioned during her presentation on Item 5A, the fourth phase of the UNESCO/Republic of Korea Funds-in-Trust project, Safeguarding of Koguryo Tombs in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was launched in 2019 through a UNESCO mission with the signing of the plan of operation in Pyongyang. This important peace building cooperation project, which has been ongoing since 2000 and involves both countries in the Korean Peninsula, marks a milestone in international cooperation around World Heritage. This new phase will provide further opportunities for capacity building and an exchange of knowledge between international experts and the specialists from DPRK's national expert team. More information on this project and the technical report on the outcomes of Phase III, published in November 2018 can be found on the World Heritage Centre's web page.

Two representatives from DPRK have been invited to attend the current Committee session as Observers thanks the earmarked voluntary contribution from China to the World Heritage Fund. Finally, let me take this opportunity to thank all national World Heritage focal points

across the Asia Pacific region, colleagues from the UNESCO field offices and the Advisory Bodies and other partner institutions such as the UNESCO category 2 centres who provided support to the follow-up activities.

I would also like to express our gratitude to the Governments of Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea and the United States of America who have provided financial support towards the follow-up activities in the region of Asia Pacific. I would like to announce that the Republic of Korea is supporting the training efforts of the World Heritage Centre across the region during the third cycle of the periodic reporting exercise. Yesterday a side event on the third cycle of periodic reporting was organized here in Baku to debrief the Asia Pacific representatives and other partner institutions on the process and future work plan. Mr Chairperson, distinguished Committee Members, the draft decision 43 COM 10A.1 can be found in working document 10A on page 6 in both language versions. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Should we have some debates, comments? Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Chairperson. First of all I'd like to express our appreciation for this comprehensive report. Indonesia would also like to express its gratitude to the Centre who has carried out a truly valuable action plan project in Indonesia. The project related to Maritime Trade Corridor Heritage will be an important stepping-stone in order to prepare the nomination of Maritime Trade Corridor Heritage for World Heritage. Other projects concerning our Tentative List also offered advice for setting up the order of priority of the properties on the List. Therefore, welcome the Centre to develop other activities for the Asia Pacific region including Indonesia dealing with the Suwon Action Plan. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

Chairperson:

Australia, no? Okay, we have an apply from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The Observer Delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson for giving me the opportunity to take the floor. Since it is the first for the DPRK delegation to take the floor, I would like to extend our deep gratitude to the warm hospitality of the government of the Republic of Azerbaijan for the excellent preparation and organization of this session. Mr Chairperson, the DPRK delegation believes that the periodic reporting of UNESCO is very meaningful in the sense to showcase the good practices of the States Parties to the Convention and also to regularly analyze the current status of heritage sites for strengthening the future international cooperation true to the purposes of the Convention.

My delegation would like to emphasize that the reporting should be based on consistent and common principles if you really want to get the right results out of it. Therefore, the training of national reporting teams of States Parties should be ensured well in advance of the reporting period, typically via the UNESCO category 2 centres in the regions. Furthermore, it should be taken into due consideration that the UNESCO reporting activities should be one of its contribution to the capacity building for the States Parties, especially developing countries in their efforts to the preservation of their heritage.

Mr Chairperson, taking this opportunity, the DPRK delegation would like to express its thanks to the continued support of UNESCO to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea especially

for the preservation of the Koguryo Tombs for the last 20 years of administrative concern of Director-General Audrey Azoulay, Assistant Director-General Mr Ernesto Ottone Ramirez and Director of World Heritage Centre, Ms Mechtild Rössler. It is the consistent policy of the DPRK Government to well preserve, maintain and transmit the national world heritage to the rising generation. The DPRK delegation would like to inform again that the DPRK Government will formally remain committed to the 1972 Convention and strengthen cooperation with other countries. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much.

H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan) resumes the Chair.

Chairperson:

Now can we proceed to the adoption of document 10A.1? There are no amendments as far as I know? No. So thank you very much. Approved. Now I give the floor to Mr Moukala, from the World Heritage Centre, who will present to us the follow-up activities concerning the Africa region. Please, the floor is yours.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. For time's sake I will try to go to the most salient and main activities we have implemented in the Africa region and in particular I would like to highlight that most of the projects and activities we have carried out in Africa region was done in close collaboration with the Africa World Heritage Fund which is a category 2 centre of UNESCO.

The action plan for the second cycle of periodic reporting focused on five elements: enhancing representation of African heritage sites on the World Heritage List; improving state of conservation at World Heritage properties; ensuring effective management of existing properties; developing and implementing strategies enabling States Parties to effectively address the challenge of balancing heritage conservation and development needs and establishing and implementing mechanisms for heritage conservation, protection and conflict management.

The main focus we carried out over the last six years focused particularly in increasing awareness on the Convention, the need for an effective heritage management and the importance of elaborating and implementing sustainable development SDGs with the full engagement of the local communities. We then launched on 5 May through the UNESCO General Conference and Executive Board, African World Heritage Day, which has really become a high-visibility instrument promoting the continent with regard to the importance of the Convention and the role of the public, communities and stakeholders into the safeguarding and promotion of cultural heritage. The second part that has also brought greater visibility to the Convention in the continent focuses on the Plan of Action of the Ngorongoro Declaration which has raised a high profile in the importance of safeguarding cultural heritage while pursuing the goal for sustainable development.

The World Heritage Centre also implemented in close cooperation with Africa World Heritage Fund activities with regard to improving the representation of African sites on the World Heritage List. We had the nomination training workshop that took place in Kigali, Rwanda. We also have six preparatory International Assistance project that are ongoing and thanks to the UNESCO/Flanders Funds-in-Trust cooperation, we have been able to organize technical assistance to States Parties nominating key natural sites and updating their Tentative Lists to include the exceptional natural sites on the List. The UNESCO-Africa-China Cooperation Nominations have also really sped ahead in that direction.

With regard to improving the state of conservation and effective management at World Heritage properties, we have approximately 19 ongoing International Assistance for conservation and management all over the continent. The first African regional course on Promoting People-Centered Approaches to Conservation of Nature and Culture took place in August 2018 with ICCROM, IUCN and the Africa World Heritage Fund in Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls in Zambia. We also had the regional meeting on transboundary cooperation for effective management of World Heritage sites in Africa which sought to signal not only collaboration on conservation but also promoting peace and stability while ensuring the livelihood and benefit of the local communities. We also addressed, thanks to the contribution of Norwegian government activities for conservation and management of natural and cultural World Heritage sites in Africa, and supported by the Rapid Response Facility and also focused on communities affected by conflicts, involvement of local communities and youth.

Regarding the balancing of heritage conservation and development needs and responding to the Ngorongoro Declaration the major activities were two regional workshops on World Heritage and Education Institutions in Africa which really highlighted the integration of World Heritage thematics into an educational curricula. The second part was on involving African educational institutions in the implementation of the Convention and sustainable development. The third was the urgent need to build sustainable African capacities drawing on the vast pool of expertise available at African educational institutions. We also organized a Forum in June as part of regional cooperation, which builds on the UNESCO-Africa-China Cooperation that I mentioned earlier.

On heritage conservation, protection and management in pre-conflict, conflict and post-conflict situations Mali has really been at the forefront in most of our programmes with its programme for the Rehabilitation of Cultural Heritage and the Safeguarding of the Ancient Manuscripts with the support of the European Union as well as the government of Spain. We also pursued developing training courses in heritage-related construction skills for job creation and reduction of emigration in the Sahel region, which has been done through the contribution of the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust. On particular element here is that many of the young people who have been living in the Western part of Africa trying to cross the ocean to reach Europe used to be involved sometimes in the local traditional conservation of heritage. So what we are trying to do is bring them back and give them opportunities to get more involved in their local heritage thereby also contributing to reducing this mass exodus of young people who are leaving their heritage trying to move to Europe. The third one is we had a three week long workshop on First Aid to Cultural Heritage in Times of Crisis which was organized by ICCROM.

So this gives you an overall look on the progress from 2012-2019. With the addition of the Ancient Ferrous Metallurgy sites from Burkina Faso then brings the number of World Heritage properties from Africa from 78 to 96 and we still have more site on the List of World Heritage in Danger which continues to be one of the priority areas we have set as a target and we have the ratification of South Sudan which brought also the number of States Parties to 46. The remains one, which is Somalia and we are hoping that ratification will be concluded soon. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Do we have any comments on the report? Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Mr Chairperson voicing my remarks on behalf of Africa Group V(a) the delegation of Uganda wishes to compliment national, bilateral, regional and local initiatives that catalyzed the synergies of the second periodic reporting initiative among the African States Parties. Distinguished Chairperson and audience, from my insights periodic reporting kicked

off in 1998 for the first cycle and the second cycle from 2008. In stocktaking the second cycle the Africa Group wishes to register its satisfaction in the qualitative and quantitative improvement in periodic reporting expertise and this is evident in the report of the World Heritage Centre we have just listened to a short while ago. As a result Mr Chairperson, the Africa region met most crucial benchmarks and milestones for the successes registered in the second periodic reporting cycle.

While time does not permit to delve in full details respective attainments included the varied training courses, transnational serial nomination initiatives, capacity building in the preparation of the World Heritage nomination dossiers, initiatives in regional harmonization of Tentative Lists, capacity building in the African States Parties in how to enlist more heritage sites on the World Heritage List, heritage training in conservation and disaster risk management skills to mention just a few.

Respectively, Mr Chairperson, the Africa Group wishes to thank the States Parties of China, Belgium, the Netherlands, Hungary, Norway, the European Union and the African World Heritage Fund for all the logistical and financial support that they extended to the Africa Group's States Parties to meet the main targets of the second cycle of periodic reporting. The Africa Group further welcomes continued support as the attendant States Parties draw their attention to more hands-on job workshops in the near future to amass their experts in polishing their expertise in periodic reporting; much as the fruit of this projected attention are poised to manifest in the now ongoing third cycle to conclude in 2024. I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Ma délégation voudrait d'abord remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour ce rapport exhaustif du second cycle qui montre les progrès réalisés pour la période indiquée, surtout dans la région qui nous intéresse : l'Afrique.

Nous voulons saluer particulièrement l'institution du 5 mai, Journée du patrimoine mondial africain, qui est une occasion donnée pour mobiliser tous les acteurs autour de projets de conservation du patrimoine en Afrique. Nous saluons aussi la contribution à l'Organisation de deux ateliers francophones et anglophones qui se sont tenus au Zimbabwe et au Sénégal sur le thème « Patrimoine mondial et institutions d'enseignement supérieur en Afrique ». Ces ateliers, qui ont permis d'engager la mise en œuvre du projet d'intégration du programme du patrimoine mondial dans les institutions africaines d'enseignement supérieur, ont constitué une étape importante dans la participation des institutions africaines d'enseignement supérieur pour la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial.

Ce projet est intervenu, faut-il le rappeler, à point nommé dans un contexte où la plupart des pays avaient déjà amorcé une dynamique nouvelle en créant au sein des universités et grandes écoles de formation des cycles de formation universitaire de gestionnaire du patrimoine culturel. C'est le cas par exemple de mon pays qui ambitionne à travers son campus universitaire de Gaoua de se positionner comme l'un des pôles d'excellence en matière de formation universitaire sur le patrimoine en Afrique de l'Ouest. Il faut le rappeler, Monsieur le Président, suite à l'organisation au Burkina Faso du Forum des jeunes sur le patrimoine mondial, notre pays a pris l'engagement de créer un campus universitaire, à côté de Loropéni, le premier site que nous avons pu inscrire sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, qui allait permettre de former des gestionnaires et qui pourrait éventuellement permettre de faire la synergie avec les pays voisins, le Ghana et la Côte d'Ivoire.

Ma délégation voudrait donc exprimer la disponibilité du Burkina Faso et des autres pays de la région Afrique pour s'engager dans l'exercice du troisième cycle avec détermination et redoubler leurs efforts dans l'amélioration de l'état de conservation des sites du patrimoine mondial, dans l'élaboration et la mise en œuvre de stratégies pour améliorer l'équilibre entre la conservation du patrimoine et les besoins en matière de développement. Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I see no other proposals for interventions so can we proceed with the approval. We don't have any additional information or drafts provided so I approve Item 10A.2, approved. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Now I would like to give the floor to Ms Shaer from the World Heritage Centre to present us information concerning the Arab States region. Please, you are welcome.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The full text of this Item can be found on page 11 in the English version of document 10A and on page 12 in the French version of the same document. Excellences, ladies and gentlemen, since 2011 and with the adoption of the Regional Programme for the Arab States one of the priorities has focused on the conservation of the cultural and natural heritage of countries affected by conflicts, although this was not initially identified as a heritage priority for the Programme. In Iraq, Libya, Syria and Yemen, the need for protection, conservation and training has been substantial requiring human and financial resources. Working closely with the concerned Field Offices and other entities actions have focused on the regular monitoring of developments on the ground, on the rapid assessment of damage and the provision of emergency support in affected areas. Actions have also comprised due reflection on the issue of post-conflict recovery of cultural heritage.

From the operational point of view, ongoing support has been provided to UNESCO Field Offices in the Arab region in the implementation of the Convention and the conservation of heritage. Training workshops are also routinely organized. The Regional Programme for the Arab States puts emphasis on the implementation of capacity-building activities as well as the provision of technical support for the conservation and management of World Heritage properties. Within the framework of implementing the Programme we have made significant progress over the past two years despite some prevailing challenges. The progress comprises updating Tentative Lists for Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates. It also comprises the provision of support for the inclusion of sites on the Tentative Lists of Algeria and Kuwait.

Support was also extended to the Maghreb countries for potential nominations relating to oasis systems and to Tunisia regarding the nomination process for cultural sites in Djerba. Furthermore, in the past two years several reactive monitoring and advisory missions have taken place in several countries including Lebanon, Algeria, Sudan, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia. The planned reactive monitoring missions to Iraq and Yemen have been postponed for logistic reasons. Assistance was provided to Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco and Oman in issues relating to boundary clarification and modification of World Heritage properties.

In terms of capacity building, several training activities have been successfully carried out including those related to the sites of Failaka Island in Kuwait and Djerba in Tunisia. A workshop on cultural heritage impact assessment took place in Egypt in March of this year. In the context of the safeguarding of cultural heritage in conflict situations activities have been carried out in relation to the Ancient City of Aleppo and the site of Palmyra.

Moreover, two International Assistance projects have been recently launched which would contribute to the recovery of World Heritage properties in Syria. This will be implemented between 2019 and 2020. Through successful fundraising efforts several case studies have been undertaken concerning post-conflict reconstruction while Damage Assessment in the Ancient City of Aleppo has been published jointly with UNITAR-UNOSAT.

In conclusion, I would like to underscore the vital role of several partners in implementing the Regional Programme for the Arab States. This includes the efforts of the national agencies in charge of World Heritage, the Advisory Bodies and regional institutions such as the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALESCO) and the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH). ARC-WH, a category 2 centre based in Bahrain has been providing significant support in the implementation of activities within the framework of the Regional Programme. Finally, I would like to join my colleagues in highlighting the important collaboration that we have with UNESCO Field Offices in Amman, Baghdad, Beirut, Cairo, Doha, Khartoum, Rabat and Ramallah. I thank you for your attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Do we have any comments concerning this report? I don't see any applies. Since we have no amendments to the draft decision I propose to approve document 10A.3 as submitted. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

We move to the Latin America and the Caribbean region. I would like to give the floor to Mr Rosi to present the information. Please, you are welcome.

Le Secrétariat:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Mesdames et Messieurs les distingués membres du Comité, pour ce qui est de l'Amérique latine et des caraïbes, les activités de suivi du deuxième cycle des rapports périodiques se sont déployées autour de la mise en œuvre des plans d'action pour le patrimoine mondial de la région. Je dis « des plans », au pluriel, car conformément à la décision 38 COM 10B.4, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a travaillé avec les États parties de la région pour établir, en complément du plan d'action régional 2014-2024, trois plans d'actions sous-régionaux axés sur les besoins et priorités spécifiques de chaque sous-région.

À cet égard, des réunions sous-régionales ont été organisées pour adopter ces plans d'action respectivement à La Havane (Cuba), en novembre 2017, pour les Caraïbes ; à Cusco (Pérou), en mai 2015, pour l'Amérique du Sud ; et à Zacatecas (Mexique), en avril 2018, pour le Mexique et l'Amérique centrale, c'est la réunion que l'on voit sur la diapositive. Les activités du Centre du patrimoine mondial se sont déployées sous les trois axes essentiels qui sont le suivi, au sens du mot littéral, de la mise en œuvre des plans d'action ; la collaboration avec les centres de catégorie 2, chargés d'un rôle stratégique notamment dans le domaine du développement des capacités ; et la mise en œuvre de projets spécifiques identifiés par les États parties en conformité aux priorités et aux objectifs des plans d'action.

Pour ce qui est des activités de suivi, un questionnaire détaillé a été distribué aux points focaux nationaux pour le patrimoine mondial de la région, afin de réunir des informations auprès des États parties sur le degré d'avancement à moyen terme des actions prévues pour le plan d'action 2014-2024. Le nombre de réponses a été important et les résultats, qui sont en cours d'examen, permettent de tirer des leçons utiles en vue du troisième cycle des rapports périodiques.

Concernant le travail avec les centres de catégorie 2, je souhaiterais seulement mentionner la mise en place des programmes de deux centres de la région : le Centre Lucio Costa de Rio (Brésil), et le Centre de Zacatecas (Mexique) qui est désormais opérationnel. Le Centre Lucio

Costa, en coopération avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial, a développé et lancé en août 2018 son plan de travail 2018-2020, tandis que le conseil d'administration du Centre de Zacatecas au Mexique a approuvé son plan de travail annuel en juin 2019, qui deviendra opérationnel au cours des prochains mois.

En ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre des projets pilotes dans les régions en relation avec le plan d'action, de nombreuses initiatives ont été mises en œuvre dans plusieurs domaines prioritaires, dont la conservation, la gestion participative, la prévention des risques et des désastres et la mise à jour des listes indicatives. Dans le domaine de la conservation, il y a lieu de mentionner ici la mise en œuvre d'un ambitieux projet en faveur du Qhapaq Ñan, réseau de routes andin, financé par le fonds-en-dépôt UNESCO-Japon lancé en 2016 et impliquant les six États parties, à savoir l'Argentine, la Bolivie, le Chili, la Colombie, l'Équateur et le Pérou. Ce projet est presque terminé, nous lui avons consacré un événement parallèle ici à Bakou le 4 juillet, où nous avons expliqué qu'une vingtaine d'activités ont été mises en œuvre, dont 12 ateliers internationaux auxquels ont participé les secrétariats techniques nationaux de chaque pays concerné.

Une autre activité à signaler ici concerne la vallée de Viñales, à Cuba, où un projet de formation a permis d'élaborer une stratégie de tourisme communautaire durable afin de favoriser une meilleure gestion du paysage culturel face à la croissance rapide du secteur du tourisme. Pour ce qui est de la gestion participative, dans la région du Pantanal au Paraguay un projet pilote a associé les communautés locales de la région au renforcement des capacités en matière de conservation et de gestion. Un autre projet extrabudgétaire financé par la coopération allemande a été élaboré et est en cours de mise en œuvre dans les établissements de chefferies précolombiennes avec des sphères mégalithiques de Diquis (Costa Rica).

Toujours afin de renforcer les capacités des communautés locales et des peuples autochtones, en particulier des jeunes, dans le domaine de la conservation et de la gestion du bien, plusieurs activités ont eu lieu dans le domaine de la gestion des risques. Ici je voudrais mentionner un important atelier-conférence sur le renforcement des capacités sous-régionales pour les Caraïbes, qui s'est tenu durant l'été 2018 à Phillipsburg, Saint-Martin, avec l'appui du bureau UNESCO de Kingston, sur la gestion postcatastrophe et la préservation du patrimoine. Je signale aussi, dans le domaine de la gestion des risques, le démarrage d'un projet visant à établir des plans de prévention des risques de désastre pour les trois biens du Chili, Humberstone, Valparaíso et Rapa Nui, avec le soutien financier de la coopération allemande. Un projet pour la ville de Quito, en Équateur, a été achevé en 2018 aussi, grâce au soutien financier de l'Agence espagnole de coopération internationale pour le développement.

Enfin, je voudrais signaler qu'une nouvelle méthodologie participative pilote a été mise au point par le Centre du patrimoine mondial en collaboration avec les organisations consultatives pour l'actualisation des listes indicatives. Elle est appliquée déjà au cas du Pérou et sera expérimentée aussi au Honduras prochainement. Ces deux pays ont pu bénéficier d'un financement dans le cadre de l'assistance internationale prévue par la Convention, afin justement d'actualiser leurs listes indicatives. Monsieur le Président, ce que je viens de présenter est loin d'être exhaustif ; plus d'informations peuvent être trouvées dans le document 43.COM/10A ainsi que dans le 43.COM/5A. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. May I ask whether there are any comments? Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We are thankful for the report presented by the Centre showing all the efforts that have been made in terms of setting up regional and subregional plans. This will require multilateral, institutional support. Guatemala

would like to reiterate its thanks to Mexico for playing a leading role and its category 2 centre in Zacatecas and we hope we will be able to continue pushing capacity building at the regional, national and local levels in the region and also its support when it comes to heritage management. We have also benefited from the extrabudgetary financed project thanks to UNESCO/Japan-Funds-in-Trust. We have no doubt that this cooperation will continue to help us push forward into the third cycle of periodic reporting in the coming years. There is still a lot of work to do but we need to continue having a lot of support so that we can protect and manage our sites in the most effective way. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First and foremost we would like to thank the World Heritage Centre as well as the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation for Development for their help on the project that was referenced in the report which is linked to sustainable tourism and community-led sustainable tourism in our country. We have high expectations regarding this project because we believe it's a perfect way of combining tourism and world heritage. We also carry out these ideas with the support of the local community. We remain available to any of the other countries in the region that should like to learn from our experiences. We are also available to participate in any of the action focused on capacity building and the expectations linked to those actions and Cuba would also like to reiterate the need to continue strengthening these actions and activities in the region so that we can implement the Convention fully in the region and the only way we can do this is for all States Parties working together. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Saint Kitts and Nevis.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for that report and also to thank UNESCO through its regional cluster office in Kingston, Jamaica for assistance we have received in ongoing projects in our island state. We also look forward to future assistance of UNESCO in the region especially with regard to capacity building and as we ask for inclusion of support in the assistance given to Small Island Developing States and therefore we look forward to receiving as much assistance as we can from UNESCO. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We are ready to proceed to the approval of paragraph 4 of the 10A document. Mexico. You are welcome.

The Observer Delegation of Mexico:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Thank you to the Committee for allowing us to say a few brief words. We would like to thank the World Heritage Centre and Latin America and the Caribbean for helping us to reach our objectives that were fixed in our subregional meetings and the category 2 centre in Zacatecas implementing the plan in 2018 and above all when it comes to implementing the action plan for World Heritage 2018-2023. The strategic objectives for implementing the Convention through the famous five pillars enable us to identify priorities for our subregion when it comes to Urban Historical Landscapes, cultural landscapes and also archaeological sites.

In Mexico our priority is to strengthen and improve communication and coordination between the different public institutions and civil society as well as local communities and above all indigenous peoples so that we can have better, more effective management of properties. Working with the World Heritage Centre through an ambitious commonly agreed capacity-building programme we hope the subregional Action Plan will serve as a platform for all the different factions and activities that States Parties want to implement.

Finally, through periodic reporting and the time of the implementation of the Action Plan this will help us create the perfect conditions and perfect trends that need to exist in our region so that the different management plans can be fully effective and always in partnership with the Advisory Bodies. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. No other comments? No amendments. So I declare Item 10A.4 approved. Thank you very much. Now we are going to the last report. This is connected to Europe and North America. I would like to give the floor to the Centre. Please, you are welcome.

Le Secrétaire :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Mesdames et Messieurs les membres du Comité. Le rapport sur les activités de suivi du deuxième cycle de rapports périodiques pour l'Europe et l'Amérique du Nord se trouve dans le document 10A, à la page 18 en anglais et à la page 19 en français. Ce rapport concerne donc deux sous-régions, l'Amérique du Nord et l'Europe. Leurs plans d'action respectifs ont été adoptés lors de la 39^e session du Comité, en 2015. Nous avons d'ores et déjà un recul de quatre années sur leur mise en œuvre. Une présentation exhaustive des activités a été faite dans le cadre du rapport du secrétariat examiné par le Comité sous le point 5A.

Le document 10A, soumis pour examen, rappelle donc essentiellement la chronologie de la finalisation du second cycle ainsi que les principaux objectifs, pour chaque sous-région, des plans d'action. Pour l'Amérique du Nord et en ce qui concerne le premier objectif du plan d'action, c'est-à-dire la future liste indicative, il faut souligner que l'État partie des États-Unis d'Amérique a soumis une liste indicative révisée en avril 2017 et l'État partie du Canada en avril 2018. En ce qui concerne les autres objectifs du plan d'action, notamment le renforcement de la communication entre les gestionnaires de sites et la coopération en général dans la sous-région, le Secrétariat n'a pas d'activité particulière à signaler. Nous espérons toutefois que cette coopération pourra prendre la forme d'activités concrètes avant le lancement du troisième cycle de rapports périodiques, y compris avec l'autre sous-région Europe, et notamment peut-être par le partage d'expériences à l'occasion de l'inscription de nouveaux biens porteurs de thématiques particulières, comme celle des larges paysages culturels et du rôle crucial des populations autochtones dans leur conservation, ainsi que nous l'avons vu pour Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi du Canada, ou autour de l'architecture moderne, comme cela a été souligné par les membres du Comité lors de l'inscription hier du bien Les œuvres architecturales du XX^e siècle de Frank Lloyd Wright, des États-Unis d'Amérique.

En ce qui concerne l'Europe, le plan d'action intitulé Plan d'action d'Helsinki est sensiblement différent. Il comporte trois objectifs clés et est doté d'indicateurs quantitatifs. Certaines des activités d'ores et déjà conduites et des activités à venir sont rappelées dans le document 10A. Quelques remarques pour l'avenir peuvent toutefois être faites. Il serait souhaitable qu'il y ait plus de mobilisation des États parties pour mettre en œuvre le Plan d'action d'Helsinki, notamment par le renforcement des capacités visant à ces deux premiers objectifs, c'est-à-dire a) identification et protection de la VUE et b) gestion efficace, ceci en cohérence avec la décision 39 COM 10A.1, paragraphe 11, du Comité. On constate en effet un besoin récurrent et important de méthodologies et de bonnes pratiques pour les études d'impact ainsi que pour

les plans de gestion, instruments clés pour la protection de la VUE et une gestion efficace. Il faut rappeler que le renforcement des capacités pour ces deux outils permet de répondre directement à des défis globaux tels que celui de la transition énergétique et du changement climatique, mais également ceux de la pression du développement dans les zones historiques et du tourisme de masse. Cette plus grande mobilisation des États parties, notamment par des partenariats entre États parties ou par les réseaux tels que celui des associations des biens du patrimoine mondial, devrait également compenser certains déséquilibres à l'intérieur de la sous-région Europe ; je pense notamment à la région Baltique, à la région est et sud-est de la Méditerranée.

Dans cette optique de stratégies régionales de renforcement des capacités, une conférence organisée en octobre prochain par l'État partie de l'Islande, dans le cadre de sa présidence du Conseil de l'Arctique, sera consacrée à la gestion des biens du patrimoine mondial situés dans la région Arctique. Une autre réunion, consacrée à la gestion des biens archéologiques, sera quant à elle organisée par l'État partie de la Turquie au mois de décembre. Les États parties des régions d'Europe centrale et du Sud-Est ont bénéficié d'activités de renforcement des capacités au niveau national pour la bonne gestion des biens du patrimoine mondial dans le cadre, par exemple, de l'assistance internationale. Dans ces régions, l'accent pourrait toutefois être mis sur la mise en commun régionale des besoins de renforcement des capacités de manière à optimiser les ressources budgétaires et humaines dédiées.

À la suite du rapport sur le point 6 relatif au rapport d'avancement sur les centres de catégorie 2, et ainsi que l'a souligné la directrice du Centre, je souhaite rappeler que la région Europe-Amérique du Nord n'a pas pour l'heure de centre de catégorie 2 actif qui puisse servir d'instigateur ou de relais pour la mise en œuvre des plans d'action sous-régionaux. Pour terminer, Monsieur le Président, permettez-moi également de rappeler à l'attention des membres du Comité et des représentants des États parties présents que le Centre du patrimoine mondial, dans son rapport sur les plans d'action sous-régionaux lors de la 39^e session du Comité, avait suggéré que des réunions régionales soient organisées en marge des sessions ordinaires de l'Assemblée générale des États parties, afin que les points focaux puissent discuter des progrès accomplis dans la mise en œuvre des plans. Le projet de décision se trouve en page 20 dans la version anglaise, et en page 22 dans la version française du document 10A. Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments on behalf of the Committee Members? Or a State Party? I don't see any applies so we can proceed to the approval of document 10A.5. Thank you, Ms Anatole-Gabriel for the information. We declare this point approved. And with this we close Item 10.

Chairperson:

Sorry, 10A. And we move to Item 10B. We will now listen to the presentation of the progress report on the preparation of the Third cycle of Periodic Reporting, which is contained in document 10B. I would like to give the floor to Ms Totcharova, from the World Heritage Centre, who will introduce this item. Please, the floor is yours.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Document WHC/19/43.COM/10B presents the report on the overall conduct and coordination of the third cycle of periodic reporting, which was launched by the Committee. It was launched in Krakow at the 41st session as an overall cycle and more specifically launched for the Arab States, which was the first region to undergo this process, for the third cycle in 2018 at its session in Manama. If we go to the next slide, you can see what is the role of the World Heritage Centre in this process. You may remember from the documents which we had presented at previous sessions and decisions that have been taken

namely the one adopted in Krakow at the 41st session of the Committee, the role of the World Heritage Centre has been somewhat modified as well as the role of the States Parties because the exercises as agreed have become much more State Party-driven exercises therefore the Centre provides overall coordination of the process, facilitates the State Party driven approach for the exercise, ensures a holistic approach across regions during the exercise and develops guidance tools and analysis.

If we go to the next slide, you can see the overall process, what it actually involves and it's valid for all the regions. Reporting in regions, submission of periodic reporting questionnaires, regional reports, regional action plans, implementation. So this is let's say, what the cycle involves with regard to each of the regions and of course they follow each other and this report addresses, the document addresses the work, preparatory or actual work that has been done in each one of the regions.

As mentioned, the Arab States are the first ones to start the process followed by Africa, then Asia Pacific, then Latin America and the Caribbean, then Europe and North American who will actually start the exercise in 2022. The document also reports on the collaboration in the framework of this exercise with the category 2 centres in the respective regions, which play a very important role, and they have taken upon themselves a lot of responsibilities for the good conduct of this exercise in their respective regions. The Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage, ARC-WH has played a key part in the process in the reporting for the Arab States region. It provided a lot of assistance, technical support, translation of questions in documents as well as the Handbook for Site Managers into Arabic to ensure understanding of questions and concepts. It has also acted and continues to do so as a help desk for Arabic speaking site managers and focal points and very importantly has organized a series of training workshops—not only organized but co-funded—workshops and periodic reporting for the region.

There have been two workshops organized for site managers and two other workshops for national focal points that is, all in all there have been four different workshops organized be it in Manama or other places and for some UNESCO Offices have also provided support. The countries involved in this exercise in the Arab region—19 States Parties to the Convention and it concerns 84 properties including the sites newly inscribed at the 42nd session in Manama, which also undergoes this process.

If you can see this table—I'm not sure everyone can see it well—it presents the level of progression of filling in the questionnaire by the Arab States. Let me just remind that the States Parties from the Arab region that the deadline for submission, the online question is 31 July. This said, I'd also like to mention there have been a number of meetings, side events on periodic reporting in the different regions including in the Arab region and I am sure you have been very well briefed by colleagues in the respective regional units and the coordinator of the exercise at the level of the World Heritage Centre.

Another region that will be starting the third cycle is Africa—that should be launched very shortly. We would also like to say that the World Heritage Centre has done quite a lot to prepare the region from an organizational perspective and training materials perspective for the exercise and the role of the African World Heritage Fund should also be highlighted. They have been very active. There has been a preparatory meeting already in February if I'm not mistaken. There was a side event organized here and there is a road map prepared for the whole cycle in the region, not only the workshops to prepare but also how data is analysed, how the reports will be prepared and so on and so forth so that is another great help for the category 2 centre.

Last but not least --and we can go to the next slide--Asia Pacific is also getting prepared for the launch of the exercise for their region next year in September 2020. They have started an early preparation and it's worth mentioning the support they have received. They have

extrabudgetary support from the Republic of Korea Funds-in-Trust in order to prepare for the third cycle and they also have a series of training workshops planned for the different subregions to build capacities and address specific subregional aspects of World Heritage. Certainly, the category 2 centres in the region, we have two that also are helpful in this exercise. This is a summary basically of what the document contains. The draft decision is on page 6 in both the English and French versions of document 10B. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for the information. Are there any comments on the report? I don't see any. ICOMOS, please, the floor is yours.

ICOMOS:

Thank you, Chairperson. This intervention is made on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies. The Advisory Bodies welcome the commencement of the third cycle of periodic reporting and encourage States Parties to embrace the opportunity which the periodic reporting process provides to facilitate conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of their inscribed World Heritage properties and to deliver that outcomes that are sought by the World Heritage Convention. We observe that the framework now in place for periodic reporting enables information about the state of conservation to be updated and emerging challenges to be identified and addressed through a structured framework. We welcome the integration of cross-disciplinary elements such as synergies with other cultural and biodiversity-related conventions, gender balance and equity and alignment with the 2030 Sustainable Development approach. We support the current empowered approach, which brings together site managers, governments and other stakeholders in the World Heritage system. We welcome the successful initiation of the third cycle of periodic reporting to the Arab region, noting that the Outstanding Universal Value of a number of properties in the region remain threatened by armed conflict.

We recognize the important contribution of the World Heritage Centre to the development of training materials and tools including the site managers Handbook as well as important initiatives such as training workshops and the welcome help desk. Finally, the Advisory Bodies recognize that the opportunity for capacity building provided by periodic reporting is of fundamental importance and strongly endorse the early preparation for the commencement of the third periodic reporting cycle in Africa in September 2019 and the Asia Pacific region in 2020. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We will take it under consideration. Since there are no other interventions or applies, I declare Item 10B approved as proposed. Thank you very much. Now we are moving to the next Item on the Agenda, 9A.

Chairperson:

I would like to ask Mr Balsamo to give us the information on behalf of the World Heritage Centre. I don't see Mr Balsamo. He's coming.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Chairperson. You have document 9A.Rev in front of you. The document is the annual progress report on the Upstream Process. At its 39th session in Bonn 2015 the Committee included the upstream process in the Operational Guidelines thereby recognizing the relevance of the upstream process and that it is important to emphasize that the application of the upstream process approach does not imply that the site concerned will automatically be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The main aim of the upstream process is to reduce the number of properties that are experiencing significant problems during the nomination process by providing guidance at an early stage. In 2017 Decision 41 COM 9A established firmly the upstream process as a statutory procedure and addressed several fundamental issues from a procedural point of view including the adoption of upstream process request format.

In 2018, the Committee in its Decision 42 COM 9A approved the revised definition the upstream process proposed by ad hoc working group and following these two Decisions the Secretariat integrated the revised definition of the upstream process and the upstream process request format in the revised Operational Guidelines which is currently being examined by the ad hoc working group established at this session under Item 11A. It is important to note that the definition of upstream process as approved by the Committee states that the upstream process comprises advice, consultation and analysis that occurs prior to the preparation of a nomination and is therefore once a draft or an official nomination for a site is submitted by a State Party, an upstream request concerning the same site cannot be considered.

Concerning the implementation of the upstream process request received by 31 March 2018 deadline, I would like to recall that by this first deadline 16 requests were received. Unlike the nomination process which is regulated by a set of well defined procedures, modalities, formats and a precise timetable, this is not yet the case for the upstream process due to the fact that it is a relatively new process that is applied on a voluntary basis and that it may concern different options depending on the requirements and expectations of the respective States Parties and the ability and type of financing. Therefore after the selection of requests is endorsed by the Committee the way support will be delivered may differ from one case to another and the mechanism and modalities of responses to requests will certainly have to be refined and improved in the forthcoming years, based on practice and lessons learned.

The requests received in 2018 have progressed in different ways. For some requests, support have been given and their implementation is well advanced. For all other requests the Advisory Bodies have already assessed the scope of support requested in terms of expertise, desk studies and/or site visits and workshops. The budget proposal for these requests is being finalized and most of the respective States Parties have been contacted by the Advisory Bodies.

Regarding the 31 March 2019 deadline, a total of 25 new upstream process requests were received most notably this list includes seven States Parties with up to three properties on the World Heritage List, which is quite remarkable in light of the Global Strategy. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would also like to note with satisfaction that 14 of the 25 new requests concern the revision of the Tentative List. This number shows that States Parties are effectively taking the upstream process by seeking advice at an earlier stage of the nomination process.

On the basis of the combination of all criteria outlined in Decision 41 COM 9A, the World Heritage Centre established a list of all received requests in order of priority and this list is presented in Annex 1 in document 9A in front of you. Despite the fact that the number of requests received exceed the cap of 10 new upstream process requests per year, set in the same decision, the World heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies agree to make an effort to try an accommodate all of the requests within the time limits and resources, at least in screening requests and advising on appropriate approaches and methodologies. Also, given the number of requests received it is suggested to set the next deadline for receiving upstream process requests at 31 March 2020.

We would also like to note that a special budget line in the World Heritage Fund dedicated to financing upstream processing requests is proposed for the biennium 2020-2021 with an amount of \$100,000. However, we are aware that this amount is not enough to cover all the

requests and the Committee may wish to invite States Parties to consider financially contributing to the implementation of requests received from least developed countries, low-income and lower-middle income countries and Small Island Developing States.

Finally, I would like to recall Decision 41 COM 9A, paragraph 18 which recommended that category 2 centres also integrate upstream work into their capacity-building initiatives and use successful models such as the African World Heritage Fund programme in this regard. The Secretariat is exploring the possibility of organizing similar kinds of courses in other regions and subregions where this activity may support the needs of States Parties provided that funds are made available. The draft decision is on page five in both the English and French versions of document 9A.Rev. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for the presentation. Can I apply to the Advisory Body for this report, comment please? ICOMOS, please

ICOMOS:

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Cette intervention est faite au nom des trois organisations consultatives.

Ces dernières années, les organisations consultatives se sont engagées à promouvoir le processus en amont et à apporter des conseils aux États parties dans la mesure de leurs moyens. Le processus en amont est désormais formalisé et les organisations consultatives se réjouissent du vif intérêt qu'il a généré auprès des États parties. Le processus en amont doit rester un outil flexible, qui s'adapte aux besoins des États parties en termes de réponse et de mise en œuvre. Les demandes varient dans leur nature et récemment pour beaucoup portent sur l'étape initiale que constituent les listes indicatives. Les organisations consultatives considèrent que le processus en amont constitue également une opportunité de renforcer les capacités dans le long terme.

Tout en renouvelant leur soutien au processus en amont, les organisations consultatives considèrent que ce processus devrait être renforcé pour lui permettre de continuer à livrer une contribution adaptée pour l'élaboration de listes indicatives robustes et favoriser la soumission de propositions d'inscription de qualité. Il faudrait alors pouvoir disposer de ressources complémentaires pour s'assurer de l'appui administratif nécessaire à une mise en œuvre régulière de ce nouveau processus statutaire. Il conviendrait simultanément de comprendre et de définir plus clairement comment le processus en amont s'articule avec le renforcement des capacités pour la préparation des propositions d'inscription, pour le travail sur la révision des listes indicatives, et comment il pourrait s'articuler avec le processus d'analyse préliminaire dans le cas où ce dernier est approuvé et adopté. Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now we come to the comments. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Chairperson for giving Norway the floor. First of all, allow us to extend our gratitude to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for this comprehensive report on an item, which is actually very important. We are very happy to see that of the 24 requests that were submitted, 15 of those are about revision of Tentative Lists and we find this very important that the States Parties are utilizing this important tool at the earliest stage of a potential nomination process. We are also very glad to see that seven of these requests are coming from countries with fewer than three World Heritage sites on the List. We think that this is a

very important tool both for harmonization of the Tentative Lists and also for filling the gaps on Tentative Lists. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le Burkina Faso reconnaît la pertinence de l'initiative « processus en amont », qui permet d'améliorer les propositions d'inscription, et félicite le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives qui continuent d'accorder toute l'attention qui sied pour l'analyse des dossiers soumis par les États parties, malgré leur nombre croissant, allant de 16 à 25, alors que le nombre attendu est de 10 dossiers par an. Cela confirme l'intérêt qu'accordent les États parties à cet outil précieux pour réaliser les objectifs de la stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée, représentative et crédible.

Permettez-nous de rappeler à cet égard que l'objectif à terme du processus en amont est d'aider les États qui en font la demande à bien préparer leurs dossiers d'inscription et de parvenir avec de bons résultats à corriger le déséquilibre de la Liste du patrimoine mondial, et notamment la sous-représentation du patrimoine de certaines régions. Aussi, il nous semble important de maintenir distinctes les modalités du processus en amont et l'évaluation préliminaire dans le cadre de la réflexion en cours sur la réforme du processus de proposition d'inscription et d'évaluation.

Monsieur le Président, bien que nous nous félicitons de l'augmentation des sites de la Liste du patrimoine mondial avec les inscriptions enregistrées au cours de notre session, le groupe V(a) est toujours à la peine avec un seul bien inscrit. En outre, Monsieur le Président, nous reconnaissons et remercions les efforts fournis par le Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain dans le cadre du renforcement des capacités par la tenue d'ateliers et de forums qui visent à outiller les États parties pour la préparation des dossiers d'inscription sur des bases solides. Ce type d'initiative et d'action devrait être davantage développé dans le cadre de partenariats tant au niveau régional qu'interrégional. Pour finir, Monsieur le Président, ma délégation apporte son soutien au projet de décision 43 COM 9A.Rev relatif au processus en amont. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all I would like to thank the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for their clear report and we are happy to see the progress made both by States Parties submitting such requests for upstream process and the Centre and Advisory Bodies processing them. Our delegation has always mentioned the importance of dialogue and we clearly see the upstream process as a mechanism for such dialogue and we think that its implementation is a success. Of course, our position is that early advice is crucial for later success so we encourage States Parties for joining upstream already in the revision of the Tentative List where possible. Also, just to mention that the upstream process was discussed during the ad hoc working group deliberations, specifically in regard to the newly proposed concept of preliminary assessment and we believe that if approved these two concepts should develop in harmony with each other. And finally, just to mention that we invite the Secretariat to focus and concentrate more on awareness raising for explaining to States Parties the advantages of the upstream process so that we could engage with more and more States Parties with regard to this process. Thank you so much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Since I don't see any more applies. May I ask are there any amendments?

Rapporteur:

I have no amendments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we can proceed to the approval of document 9A as it is submitted. Thank you very much. Approved. Now we are going to Item 9B.

Let us move now to examination of the progress report on the reflection on processes for mixed nominations. Please refer to document 9B. Ms Rössler, please, the floor is yours.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much. You have this document in front of you as a response to Decision 41 COM 9B and for the sake of time I'll just say one thing, Mr Chairperson, that we are very pleased of the reinforced cooperation between IUCN and ICOMOS on mixed sites and with this I think you can turn over to our Advisory Bodies. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. ICOMOS, please.

ICOMOS:

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Dans un esprit de collaboration sur cette question, l'ICOMOS va faire une présentation commune au nom des deux organisations consultatives.

Les propositions d'inscription de biens mixtes restent peu représentées sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, avec seulement 3,5 % de biens inscrits, malgré la reconnaissance croissante du fait que les aspects culturels et naturels sont tous deux inhérents à l'expression d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle, et que leurs attributs doivent faire l'objet d'une gestion intégrée. Des progrès significatifs dans l'amélioration du processus d'évaluation des biens mixtes ont été accomplis depuis la 39e session du Comité en 2015, et notamment les actions qui ont eu de faibles implications financières. Par contre, il est vrai qu'en ce qui concerne l'harmonisation des rapports de missions d'évaluation technique et la question d'un panel conjoint ICOMOS-UICN, qui ont un impact financier plus important, ces aspects-là n'ont pas progressé.

L'ICOMOS et l'UICN examinent actuellement des approches potentielles pour améliorer une gestion intégrée des valeurs et attributs naturels et culturels, et notamment à travers le projet innovant que nous avons développé en partenariat, qui s'appelle le « connecting practice ». D'ailleurs, à l'occasion du Self-Manager Forum, qui s'est tenu ici à Bakou, on a lancé un questionnaire destiné aux gestionnaires de sites du patrimoine mondial et qui porte notamment sur la compréhension et l'intégration des concepts culturel et naturel, afin d'améliorer la gestion des biens.

Le Programme de leadership du patrimoine mondial, qui vous a été présenté par l'ICCROM, comprend également un volet qui porte sur l'amélioration des outils de gestion afin d'avoir une gestion plus intégrée des valeurs naturelles et culturelles pour les biens du patrimoine mondial. L'ICOMOS et l'UICN notent que, bien que l'amélioration du processus d'évaluation des biens mixtes était nécessaire, les conditions qui permettront de renforcer la solidité des propositions d'inscription de biens mixtes dépassent ce seul processus d'évaluation.

Effectivement, la mise en œuvre d'approches intégrées de l'évaluation et de la gestion des biens du patrimoine mondial nécessiterait des changements dans les méthodes de travail ainsi que dans les orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre du patrimoine mondial. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial a lui-même souligné que les propositions d'inscription de biens mixtes devait, de façon prioritaire, contacter le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives afin d'obtenir des conseils bien en amont de la préparation d'un dossier. L'introduction récente du formulaire de demande de conseil en amont facilitera certainement l'obtention d'un conseil coordonné entre l'ICOMOS et l'UICN et permettra, nous l'espérons, la préparation de dossiers de proposition d'inscription plus solides.

Finalement, les organisations consultatives, en coordination avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial, s'engagent à soutenir les progrès accomplis et à mettre en œuvre d'autres actions au sujet des processus de proposition d'inscription de biens mixtes, et notamment en ce qui concerne les listes indicatives. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any other further comments on this document? I don't see any. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Chairperson. The Zimbabwe delegation would like to acknowledge the report submitted by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies pursuant to Decision 41 COM 9B. We commend the Centre and Advisory Bodies for the support that gives a clear reflection on the manner in which ICOMOS and IUCN are collaborating with regard to the analysis of mixed sites. This is typically reflected in the project connecting practices. We also note in its conceptual training programmes ICCROM is integrating natural and cultural heritage needs in its World Heritage Leadership Programme. This is particularly important for African heritage properties where natural and cultural dichotomy seldom exists.

Mr Chairperson, the report further enlightens us on how the Advisory Bodies are collaborating in a number of activities including coordination in Tentative listing, interaction on the World Heritage panel as well as the harmonization of approaches to mission reports. We are hopeful that this positive coordination will in future be reflected in the jointly agreed recommendations for mixed sites. It is our sincere belief that site collaboration will positively impact the review process for future nominations. Against the background, Mr Chairperson, we believe strengthening this process provides a framework for strategic exchange towards the presentation of high-quality nomination dossiers particularly for the African continent. We believe this is a positive move towards the promotion and completion of credible World Heritage Lists. Once again, I commend the Advisory Bodies in this regard and urge them to continue with their efforts, as this is a critical component in the evolution and perpetuation of World Heritage ideals. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The delegation of Uganda would like to extend its sincere appreciation to the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS for the tremendous progress on the reflection process for mixed nominations. Our delegation takes note of the difficulties the Advisory Bodies continue to experience in harmonizing approaches to mission reports, joint IUCN/ICOMOS panels for mixed sites and harmonized recommendations and draft decisions. We feel that the continued evaluation of these aspects should be maintained to assess their practical application in the nomination process. Our delegation therefore hopes that the

Advisory Bodies will furnish this Committee with yet another progress report on these aspects at the next Committee session. The delegation of Uganda supports the draft decision. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. No comments anymore and there are no questions to be answered and no amendment to the draft decision as far as I know. So can we approve the document in whole as proposed? So 43 COM 9B is also approved as amended. Thank you very much.

Now we are moving to Item 11B which concerns the Policy Compendium. I would like to invite Ms Totcharova to present this Item. Please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Policy Compendium document 11B presents the work that has been done since the decision of the Committee at its 42nd session, which approved the draft policy compendium presented to it after the first phase of work on the compendium which requested further work during the second phase concerning consistency and review of the contents but mostly at the development of an online tool to facilitate the use of the compendium by those for whom it is intended like the States Parties, authorities, experts, academics and so on. It is probably worth recalling that the first time the question concerning policy guidelines--which later became the Policy Compendium--was raised at the 35th session and it took a certain period of time between this first Decision of the Committee until funds were raised, generously provided by the government of Australia for the work on this project.

Further to the available funds, a scoping study was conducted developed by ICCROM, reviewed by the Committee two years ago and the work was launched with the help of an expert group to develop the Compendium and to present it to the Committee. What did the work during the second phase include? Different aspects were revised of the document both concerning consistency and coherence. Gaps were identified and that was an important part of the work that was done by the expert group and subchapters were written on the role of the Committee, synergies with other Conventions and so on and so forth. We focused also on the link between the Policy Compendium and other Convention tools such as the state of conservation database, the periodic reporting exercise and specific links were made also on the online tools. New introductory paragraphs were added to facilitate access for the users and the understanding of the document.

Finally the group reaffirmed and highlighted that this is a living document that needs to be periodically updated with decisions and policies that have been adopted through Committee decisions, resolutions or resolutions of the General Assembly. A very important part of the work was the creation of the online tool. I must admit that it was a very challenging job because while we do have at the World Heritage Centre expertise on writing documents and analyzing and researching, then it was a very challenging task to identify, to formulate the terms of reference for developing an online tool. We ourselves did a long research of similar websites which could have given us ideas on how to proceed and that was one of the challenges. Another one was to find fund in order to proceed with this task because the web development does really require funds and we are very grateful to the government of the Republic of Korea that provided the funds for the development of the online tool. We did work with a web development company, we had a short period of time to develop the online tool but we are pleased with the results achieved. As you have probably already seen in the Policy Compendium and tried and tested it to see how it works. The expert group was very, very helpful also in this part of the exercise.

We met in Paris in December 2018 and they provided inputs on usability and functions, as well as proposals for keywords and related terms. You can see what the homepage looks like.

Currently it is available, operational and accessible. There is a Homepage with access to different parts of the site: Full Compendium, Themes and About the Compendium. You can also see the structure of the Policy Compendium: a simple visual identification by colors was developed. It includes as a matter of fact all the information included in the Compendium and because of its nature it helps avoid duplication of information and the different chapters, subchapters and topics. Different search mechanisms have been specially developed for this tool, including a simple search engine and advanced search features as well.

The Committee had requested in its Decision last year at the 42nd session to undertake consultations with stakeholders—inclusive consultations as we had done previously with the first phase of the Compendium. Such consultations were organized in the course April and May with guided tests in Paris, with UNESCO staff reacting to the Online Tool through different exercises. This was useful to identify the behaviour of the users in their navigation. In parallel we did online tests and opened them to stakeholders, first of all the expert group; volunteer representatives of States Parties; civil society; and category 2 centres. We received 24 completed surveys and six experts provided more detailed and specific comments.

The feedback from the stakeholders was basically very positive. The majority of participants had a very positive reaction to the design and considered simple, appealing and professional. We received high ratings with regard to ease of use and ease of understanding. We did the online test within a period of let's say, a month between them and already between the two tests we had introduced some improvements which actually increased the ratings from participants in the second group. All together the online tool was considered intuitive, easy to navigate and useful for work. And you have yourselves the possibility to go to our website and test it yourselves.

We had organized last night a side event on the Policy Compendium where we presented some more details concerning the making of the Compendium and demonstrated how the tool works and a number among you have attended the event and have seen more details that we cannot present here as to the functioning of the tool. Finally, how do we present the Policy Compendium to the Committee? We have two formats: one is the word format or PDF format like a Word document and the Online Tool. What is important to note as mentioned, it is a "living document" and needs to be completed. In the future the World Heritage Centre will undertake this task. Once again, it proved that online consultations or consultations all together that are inclusive are very, very useful for stakeholders and for us in order to improve the product we have been working on.

Of course, further work to integrate all the recommendations is needed, to make the Online Tool even more intuitive and clear. This is as you know work with web design and tools like this at least to me it seems never-ending so there is also room for improvement. And we will continue to try and make it even easier for the users, to make the use of it easier and all together to make it useful to all users from States Parties to heritage experts, researchers, civil society, etc. The draft decision can be found on page 7 in document 11B. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ms Totcharova. I would like to inform you that yesterday we had a special side event where this project was submitted to the full auditorium and it was accepted positively so I think there is no sense now to listen to the same presentation from the working group. We are a little behind in our schedule and our interpreters are working until now. If you don't mind we will proceed to the approval of the document if there are no other comments. Are there any? I don't think so. Thank you very much. In this case we declare document 11B adopted as amended. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Actually, we managed to put everything in time. Tomorrow we will go again to the discussion of the remaining Items. At 9:30 a.m. we will have the Bureau meeting and at 10 a.m. we will start our work. Please note that we are scheduled to have our working session tomorrow during the first half of the day, only until 1 p.m. to finalize the questions and then after that the Secretariat will start the work on the final documents, which will be presented the day after tomorrow at the closing session. So please use the possibility and time which you will have tomorrow to go sightseeing to some other places. Thank you very much. Congratulations with the successful next day of the Committee. Thank you. Have a nice time.

The meeting rose at 6.07 p.m.

NINTH DAY – Tuesday 9 July 2019

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev

Chairperson:

May I have all delegations at their seats and places, please? We are not so numerous anymore. I don't see many delegations—some of them departed, some of them didn't come this morning but we have to proceed with the work because we have very serious documents. Please, take your seats and I am starting. As usual, we start the morning and I would like to inform you that we had a meeting of the Bureau, the last meeting of the Bureau today. We updated the work that has been done up to now and we will proceed today with some other questions which are not minor in importance because a long and very fruitful job had been done by the working groups who provided these documents for us and I think we have very serious documents to be approved.

What I want to inform you about is that we agreed that due to the fact that we will work only until 1 p.m. today, with this time the morning session will be finished and the afternoon we will not have any discussions or meetings because the working group for the last preparation of the last document will start their work after that. I hope and count on your understanding on this matter not to open very long debates on the matters which we are going to discuss today, especially concerning draft documents which were submitted two groups regarding the budget and operational matters. Both groups were working and both with documents brought here for a consensus basis. If you have some amendments you can work it out with the working group before but not to open long decisions now. I apologize to all honourable Members of the Committee and States Parties for my sometimes involvement to minimize the discussion. I wanted to inform you of this. And now we move to Item 13.

Chairperson:

We move now to Item 13, devoted to the International Assistance, to this end, I would like to invite you to pay attention to document 13. I invite Ms Totcharova from the World Heritage Centre to introduce the item. Ms Totcharova, the floor is yours, please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. If you look at the documents, you have 13 and 13.Add. The first part of the document is related to International Assistance requests within the purview of the World Heritage Committee, that is, requests above \$30,000 and above \$70,000 for Emergency Assistance.

The first International Assistance request concerns Ecuador, as you can see on the screen and it concerns the development of a monitoring system for the conservation and management of pelagic ecosystems in the Galápagos Marine Reserve. The activity proposed is an important step towards even more integrated management of this complex property, which comprises terrestrial and marine parts, including very significant offshore areas, and is in line with recent Decisions of the World Heritage Committee. All the details on this request can be found from pages 4 to 6 of the document. The amount requested is \$59,975 and the recommendation of the panel is positive. The amount available under the corresponding category is \$61,683. So nothing prevents a possible approval by the Committee if the Committee wishes to do so.

Two more requests are presented to the Committee for a decision by the Committee. The second request comes from Niger and concerns the management plan of Agadez. It is important to revise the management plan in order to address the wide set of challenges that the city faces and it would also be essential to strengthen local governance. All the details on this request can be found on pages 7 to 10 of the original document. The amount requested—you can see it on the screen—is \$42,385 and the recommendation of the panel is positive. Nevertheless, it needs to be mentioned that currently there are not enough funds available on the corresponding budget line for assistance towards conservation and management.

And the same is valid concerning the next request, which comes from Guatemala. Which concerns also conservation activities within the World Heritage city of La Antigua Guatemala. This project is aiming to make a major contribution to the conservation of an important 18th century Spanish Christian structure, which summarizes the attributes that convey the OUV of the property and is highly valued by the communities. The details about this request can be found from pages 11 to 13 of the document. You can see the amount that has been requested, \$69,791 and I would also like to say that the recommendation of the panel is positive. But again, as in the case of the previous request, there are currently no available funds on this budget line.

However, given the importance of these two requests and to make the actual approval and funding of these requests possible—the requests from Niger and Guatemala—we propose a budget reallocation as you can see on the screen and in the document itself in order to increase the budget line dedicated to International Assistance, conservation and management. I would like to show you that the Secretariat has very carefully reviewed the reallocations proposed and they have been carefully reviewed to ensure they were possible and would not jeopardize any activity whether ongoing or planned.

We also have an additional request, a fourth request, coming from Seychelles, and it concerns an emergency assistance activity within the World Heritage site of the Vallée de Mai. This project will directly address the threat to the Vallée de Mai from yellow crazy ants. All the details on this request can be found in document 13.Add dated 6 July, which has been distributed to Committee Members during the course of this session. This request was received, I just want to clarify, after the original document was already issued. The amount requested by the Seychelles is as you can see, \$96,850 and the recommendations by the Secretariat and IUCN are positive. The amount available under the corresponding category, Emergency assistance budget is \$115,775. So there are enough funds in the Emergency assistance budget to cover this request and there is therefore nothing that prevents it and the Committee may approve it if it so wishes.

Overall, as of 30 June, what is the situation of the budget of the International Assistance? As mentioned already in the cases of Guatemala and Niger all the funds have been used. There is 10% left under Conservation and Management assistance, which will become zero if the request from Ecuador is approved. And as far as Preparatory Assistance is concerned all the funds have already been used. It is hoped that the increase of the International Assistance budget by \$300,000 which is foreseen in the World Heritage Fund for 2020-2021 will contribute to avoid reallocations concerning those lines in the next biennium.

Finally, you discussed in one of the forthcoming items, namely that of the revision of the Operational Guidelines, the revision of the International Assistance process which was requested by the Committee by its Decision 43 COM 13, paragraph 6 and was examined, the proposal presented to the Committee was examined by the working group on the revision of the Operational Guidelines in the course of this week and the corresponding decision and revision of the Operational Guidelines will be examined a little bit later by the Committee and the documents have been distributed, the draft decision together with the proposed revision have been distributed to all of you. The draft decision on this Item is contained on page 15 in

the English and French versions of document WHC/19/43.COM/13. The decision will have to be revised accordingly further to the additional emergency request from the Seychelles. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for this report. Do we have any questions? Or amendments to the text? I don't see any so thank you very much. Are there any other drafts?

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just to note as Ms Totcharova said, this draft decision as originally seen has been amended with paragraph 3, point 4 added to reflect that late request so if we just scroll down we can see 3, point 4, Minimizing impacts of the invasive yellow crazy ant *Anoplolepis gracilipes* at the Vallée de Mai UNESCO World Heritage site, Seychelles, to preserve its Outstanding Universal Value (Seychelles), for an amount of \$96,850 under the emergency assistance budget. Thank you.

Chairperson:

No objections to this addition? Thank you very much. Then we proceed to the approval of this document 13 and adopt it as amended. Thank you very much.

Now we move to document 14. As you know, the working group on the budget met throughout of our session and therefore I would like to give the floor the Chairperson of this Working Group so she can present her report and the draft decision proposed on this matter that was distributed to you. As I said to you this document was worked on very thoroughly on the basis of consensus of all the parts so I hope it will not arouse too many questions. So, please Ms Zeichner, you have the floor.

Chairperson of the Budget Working Group, Ms Zeichner:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Good morning to all colleagues. It is my pleasure to report back to you today on the results of the Budget Working Group discussions and present to you draft decision 43 COM 14.Rev. But first allow me to express my sincere gratitude to the Members of the Committee for having elected me as the Chairperson of the Budget Working Group. As scheduled, the Budget Working Group has met three times from 2-4 July for three hours of discussions overall. In total we had 53 participants over those three days representing nine Committee Members, 13 of serving States Parties and four organizations including our three Advisory Bodies. I would like now to thank all the delegates of Committee Members and States Parties as well as the representatives of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies who attended and actively participated at the meetings of the Budget Working Group. The inputs and constructive spirit of all participants allowed us to conclude our work in a very efficient and timely manner.

The work of the Group started with a very comprehensive presentation of the budget document by the Secretariat, which allowed for participants to make general comments and ask for clarifications and explanations. Then the Group proceeded with the examination of the draft decision. The Group noted with satisfaction the increase of the budget for the next biennium as well as the proposal to use this increase for the budget lines of International Assistance and sites in Danger. Therefore, it was agreed to adopt the budget for 2020-2021 as proposed in document 14.

Globally, you will see that the original text of the draft decision was retained with only two additions related to the topics on which our discussions focused over those three days. Namely, the issue of arrears and the cost sharing mechanism proposed in 2018 by Norway for funding of the evaluation of nominations by the Advisory Bodies. Several participants stressed

the adverse impact of arrears, which puts into jeopardy the proper functioning, and operations under the Convention. Possible ways and means to resolve this issue were discussed at length and while it took us eight days in plenary to request the Legal Adviser to take the floor he had plenty of opportunities to interact with members of the Budget Working Group and I wish to thank him for providing his useful insights on many occasions throughout our meetings. Seeing that this topic is of great importance to the States Parties, I imagine that this matter will and, may I add, should be addressed by the States Parties at our forthcoming General Assembly in November.

Concerning the mechanism for funding the evaluation of nominations by the Advisory Bodies, it should be recalled that it was proposed last year by Norway in the framework of the discussions of the ad hoc working group. This mechanism is a short-term measure towards ensuring the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. It proposes to share the cost of evaluations between the World Heritage Fund and the submitting States Parties allowing for a shifting of resources to conservation activities. The ad hoc working group of 2018 had recommended the adoption of this mechanism. The Committee at its 42nd session last year took note with appreciation of the proposal and decided to further examine this matter at its current 43rd session including possible modalities as well as legal basis or implications. In the wake of interest already expressed last year, there was an overwhelming consensus in the Group for the adoption of this mechanism. However, some States Parties expressed regret that the payment of contributions in this framework would not be mandatory because it seemed imposing a mandatory fee for the submission of nominations would not be in accordance with the Convention. Modalities for this mechanism were proposed and included in the draft decision under paragraph 13.

The Budget Group also decided that the mechanism should be included in the Operational Guidelines and asked me in my capacity as Chairperson of the Budget Working Group to transmit this request to the Chairperson of Operational Guidelines Working Group, which I did. This request was welcome and the modalities of this funding mechanism were included in the Operational Guidelines Working Group in new paragraph 168 *bis* in the Operational Guidelines. Finally, please allow me to reiterate my thanks to all those who contributed to the work of the Group. I hope that the distinguished Members of the Committee will adopt this draft decision, which is the outcome of the collective and applied endeavour of the Working Group. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ms Zeichner. Now I would like to ask the Committee Members if there are any comments on the proposed draft decision. Norway, I can see.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway would like to thank the Secretariat for a very comprehensive report and also the very able chairing of the Budget Working Group by Anna Zeichner. Norway is very worried to see the trend of slowdown of assessed contributions as it is stated in paragraph 4 in the document. We, States Parties, cannot pretend and expect to exercise the rights and enjoy benefits that we have under the Convention if we don't fulfil our obligation to pay. Norway is happy to also this year have been able to follow the good example of Australia, Turkey, Sweden and the Netherlands on doubling the compulsory contribution. We encourage others to do the same.

Capacity building, a balanced and credible List and Priority Africa have been mentioned in almost all of our discussions. Norway signed an agreement with UNESCO in June, which allocates almost \$3M to the World Heritage Fund with a special focus on natural World Heritage sites in Africa. We hope that this contribution will be useful.

Lastly, we hope that the Committee will adopt the mechanism for voluntary funding evaluations of nominations as outlined in paragraph 9 in the draft resolution. We believe that this will release funding conservation activities, which is in line with the priorities set out by the Committee. It is also the very core of this Convention, namely, international cooperation for the protection of the world's cultural and natural heritage. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Any other comments? Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président. J'ai bien pris note de vos recommandations en début de séance pour que nos discussions n'aillent pas trop en profondeur et qu'elles ne s'étalent pas trop dans le temps, nous nous y astreindrons. Cela dit, c'est bien dommage qu'un point aussi important, qui est l'outil qui nous permet d'aller réaliser tous les objectifs et les idéaux que nous n'avons pas arrêté de dessiner et de chérir durant les neuf premiers jours, soit coincé dans un point à l'ordre du jour où on est sous la pression, compréhensible d'ailleurs, du temps.

Je crois que l'année dernière, à ce même point de la session, nous avons formulé le vœu, qui est devenu même une décision de ce Comité, que ce point ne soit pas laissé à la fin, lorsque l'attention est moindre, la fatigue est grande et que le plus grand nombre des délégations sont parties. C'est bien regrettable parce que là nous avons entre les mains le moyen réel de réalisation de nos objectifs. Cela ne m'empêche pas de remercier le Secrétariat et le Centre d'avoir fait des efforts louables, et les directions indiquées l'année dernière sont là, nous les voyons, et elles sont extrêmement précieuses. L'augmentation par exemple du taux de 200 % sur le point 2.1 sur la crédibilité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial est un point extrêmement important à saluer. Cela nécessiterait à ce moment-ci, et c'est pour ça que je regrette le peu de temps que l'on consacre à ce point, que l'on se pose des questions, que l'on évalue et que l'on voit où est-ce qu'on en est.

La question, par exemple, de l'assistance internationale, nous l'avons inscrite depuis plusieurs sessions, il y a des objectifs tracés. Par exemple, nous ne voyons pas le taux d'exécution et de mise en œuvre de ce que nous avons-nous-mêmes décidé lors de la session de 2018, puisque le budget est bouclé. On aimerait savoir quel est le taux d'exécution ; cela nous montrerait réellement si les indications données par les différentes sessions du Comité sont suivies ou pas. Si elles ne le sont pas, on devrait comprendre pourquoi et en tirer des conséquences et arrêter des mesures. Ce point est extrêmement important dans une logique de volonté d'appliquer les points qui nous permettent de réaliser ce sur quoi nous tous sommes d'accord : l'équilibre de la Liste, sa représentativité, venir en aide à ceux qui n'ont pas les moyens techniques ou le savoir-faire, et ça, c'est extrêmement important. C'est bien beau de venir dire que c'est dommage que certaines régions n'inscrivent que très peu de sites par session, alors que nous nous sommes déjà penchés sur ce point et que nous avons dit quels étaient les remèdes. Donc voici par exemple une question à laquelle j'aimerais bien qu'on ait une réponse. Merci beaucoup.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. First of all I would like to really thank the delegation of Norway—true we have a lot of issues to solve in this Committee but it totally depends on their funds and again agree with what they say and encourage all the States Parties to increase their funds as possible for the conservation of World Heritage sites. I also would also like to echo what my colleague from Tunisia said regarding the discussion of this important item early on, where we

have a good chance not just for Committee Members but also the other States Parties where we see behind us to be full but unfortunately not many of them are present today. Kuwait has two nominations and we went through for both of them the upstream process and I was looking at the budget.

I have a specific question on Annex 4 on page 40, Item 14 proposed for the World Heritage budget for 2020-2021 Action 2, identification, management and promotion the World Heritage, the subitem 2.1, credibility for the World Heritage List. I've noticed that that item was increased 200%, 2.1 and we look down on the increase I found a new sub-item created which is the upstream support. If I could get clarification, you know that the whole increase \$100,000 was increased in that subitem, upstream support. If I go to the same part down to 2.2 or in 5.1 which is the International Assistance--if I could get clarification on what is the difference between the two items and why that item was created for the upstream for \$100,000. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I would like first to thank the Secretariat and the World Heritage Centre for their efforts to increase the budget available and that is absolutely good news. I don't want to repeat what has been said before but as Bahrain, we actually agree with the State Party of Norway and Kuwait and we have some worries regarding the timing of the budget discussion that comes towards the end, basically the last day and doesn't give enough time for the rest of the delegations to be present and also as when we are all as our colleague from Tunisia has just pointed out.

Bahrain does appreciate the fact that sub-item 2.2.5 International Assistance was increased by 40% as I can see with a total amount of \$1,050,000. We consider this a positive action as such, however, we would like to inquire about the capacity needed for the implementation of such a significant amount which might need a considerable efforts from the Secretariat and the States Parties for the preparation of the International Assistance programmes and requests that fulfil the requirement of the Operational Guidelines. Therefore, it would be very useful for the Committee Members to take the right decisions in this regard and in the right time with enough time allowed for that decision to be made properly. We need to receive information about the level rate of implementation of the International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund during the previous biennium, which would justify such a significant increase.

I would also like to repeat what was said by our distinguished colleagues from Norway that we have really some difficult problems of underrepresentation in terms of nomination and in terms of ability of States Parties like in Africa and the Arab region where we have really less representation than anywhere else and at the same time we suffer most from economic problems and wars happening in the area. So it is most important as we discussed last year at exactly the same session that the implementation in this areas and others should be more significantly increased since the budget has been increased. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any other comments or questions? Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

La Bosnie-Herzégovine soutient les propositions qui étaient déjà dites, à savoir faire une analyse approfondie du budget et ne pas laisser ce point si important à la fin de la session. Et je ne vais pas répéter ce que les collègues ont déjà dit. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we have some questions. I think that the Working Group has to answer the questions.

Chairperson of the Budget Working Group, Ms Zeichner:

Of course, I will give the floor to the Secretariat because certain of the questions would rather be answered by them and I think I have taken note of the questions related to the placing of this item on the agenda but I don't think I am the one fit to answer that although, just to recall, I believe at the very beginning of this session we adopted the timetable for our Committee meeting and I do not recall hearing any problems with the placing of this item on the agenda towards the end as we always do. Regarding all the questions that were asked which I think we all greatly appreciate, just to recall we had very long discussions and all these questions could have been asked during the three hours of our meetings but I would now like to give the floor to the Secretariat to answer maybe in detail the questions that were asked. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Ms Rössler, please.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. And I would like to thank all the delegates for the points they have raised. First of all from Norway, we are as worried as you are with the arrears of the countries. I actually don't understand how we can benefit from this Convention without paying the dues to the World Heritage Fund. We hope that this changes the closer we come to the General Assembly. Normally countries pay up their dues so that is a plea from our side. I have also take note of the points, which were raised by the delegations. First of all on the point of the item in the agenda as Ms Zeichner said, this is a tradition in this Committee that we open the Item to have enough time to discuss it in the Budget Group but if this helps and we are very much willing to help, instead of giving my presentation as Director to the Budget Group, if you wish we can do the presentation to give the overview on the budget at the opening of the Item and then the Budget Group could work on it if this is a way forward so that everybody is fully informed about the critical situation we have here on the budget. And then there were a number of technical points, which my colleagues will answer. We have Ms Totcharova and our AO is also with us. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Ms Totcharova, please.

The Secretariat:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. I'll try to supply some feedback or information on the questions that have been asked by the honourable delegates of Tunisia, Kuwait, Bahrain and Bosnia and Herzegovina. First of all, concerning the International Assistance--as it was indicated in the presentation of the previous item which was adopted by the decision on which was adopted by the Committee. Now the International Assistance budget is completely used and there are practically no availabilities and no money left on conservation and management. Given this fact, there has been some reallocation from other budget lines as was mentioned again a careful review has been made so that no other activities suffer but at the same time the International Assistance requests of Guatemala and Niger could be approved in order to start implementing important projects for the conservation of their sites.

Concerning the implementation of the budget themselves that have been approved—while I don't have a very precise figure at this point, I can affirm that this is a work in progress and practically half of them have already been launched and there is ongoing work towards the

implementation of this project. I also note the question on upstream support and I do believe that it is important to highlight that so far in the current budget of the World Heritage Fund there was no specific line on budget support—I'm sorry, on upstream support. Basically, further to the discussions of the Committee, further to the decisions of the Committee regarding the importance of upstream support for States Parties, specifically in countries in LDCs, in SIDS countries, in countries that are in need of support—it has been suggested that upstream support budget line is included in this budget in order to provide this crucial support. Of course this is not enough; \$100,000 is not a very big amount of money but it can provide seed money so that further fundraising can be done in order to raise funds for these activities.

So this is the rationale and it is based on the big interest of States Parties to receive upstream support and on the understanding by this Committee that dialogue and early consultations between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies are key towards the development of quality nominations and also that many countries do not have the necessary resources be it financial or human and expertise to do this on their own. I'll refer to the current document 9A on which the decision was adopted yesterday and that also demonstrates what is the interest from countries, LDCs, SIDS and others to receive upstream support and that many of them do not have funding allocated by their governments for that purpose so that is the rationale for the upstream support.

I noted one more question concerning the increase of the International Assistance budget, the proposal to increase the International Assistance budget in the budget of the World Heritage Fund for the next biennium. Allow me to make just a comment. We were so happy to realize that this time we have an increase in the budget for the first time in many years due to the double of funds and thank you Norway for raising the question about the needs to receive the funds and how important it is to receive additional funds for the World Heritage Fund. For the first time we have this increase and it was very clear to us that the most important need was International Assistance because it has been highlighted over time during the Committee sessions that the funds available for provided International Assistance to States Parties for conservation and management or preparatory assistance for identification of sites and nominations is absolutely crucial so for us it was a very natural proposal to suggest that the big part of these additional funds is dedicated to International Assistance and some part was also suggested to increase the budget line of sites on the Danger List.

A question was raised by Bahrain, how this increase of the International Assistance budget can actually make the implementation more difficult for the Secretariat and for the States Parties alike. Certainly, if there is more money to be distributed there would be more work on the preparation of International Assistance requests, on the evaluation of International Assistance requests and more work by States Parties. But at the same time as the increase is not so big as to double the work so with a little bit more effort on behalf of the Secretariat and as you know we are used to making additional efforts on so many levels we think that this would be possible to be implemented. Certainly our regional units at the Centre, they work very well with States Parties to assist them in preparing International Assistance requests and I believe that it would be possible for them to extend a further hand to provide assistance. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I think I have looked at most of the provided answers to most of the questions but it's possible that I may have missed something and possibly our colleagues from the Administrative Office of the Culture Sector may have some further comments. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Welcome, please. It's okay? Maybe other concerns you wanted to raise concerning this matter? I also agree that this matter is of great importance and we have to discuss it very thoroughly but I noted that the preparation of the draft decision was done during the Working Group and all Members of the Committee and the others could participate in the discussions and give indications and ideas. So I would like once more to emphasize the professionalism

of those in the Working Group and the document provided to the agenda is quite fully involved, expressing the work of the committee, etc. etc. Concerning the proposal to submit it earlier for discussion I think the Secretariat will think over that for the next session. By all means it needs some preparation time through the session so if the discussion starts on the first day at least maximum five or six days may be possible to include this document in the agenda, not earlier. If there are no more amendments or questions let me proceed to the approval of document 14 as proposed by the Working Group and I don't see any objections and I approved document as adopted. Thank you very much. Thank you, Ms Zeichner for your dedicated leadership of the Group. Thank you very much.

As you know the Working group on the Operational Guidelines met during the last days and is proposing a revised Draft Decision 11 on the Revision of the Operational Guidelines, which has been distributed to you and is proposed for adoption. If you allow me, I would like to invite Sheikh Khalifa Al Khalifa to further report to the Committee Members on this matter. Excellency, the floor is yours and thank you for the very efficient work of this Working Group during these days. Thank you.

Chairperson of the Working group on the Operational Guidelines, Sheikh Khalifa Al Khalifa:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and a good morning to you all. I have the pleasure to present to you the conclusions of the draft decision elaborated by the Working Group on the Operational Guidelines established by the Committee on Monday, 1 July under Item 11A of the agenda.

The mandate given to the Group by the Committee included the revision of a number of paragraphs of the Operational Guidelines as presented in working document WHC/19/43.COM/11A and more specifically in its Annex 1 which includes the marked up version of the paragraphs proposed for its revision. Additionally, as you have heard in the report by the Chair of the Budget Working Group, we were also requested to discuss during our work the inclusion of a new paragraph into the Operational Guidelines concerning the financing of the evaluation of nominations by the Advisory Bodies.

The Working Group met three times during lunchtime from 2 to 3 p.m. The Group worked very efficiently and was able to finish its work in three hours instead of the four hours originally planned. We had very good participation in the three meetings with an average of 60—66 participants at each meeting with 28 States Parties represented including 11 Committee Members. It was decided to tackle the issues concerning the revision of the Operational Guidelines by theme, rather than in the sequence of Articles, as this allowed for more focused and streamlined discussion.

We started the discussion with Part B of Annex 1 of document 11A concerning the mainstreaming of the principles of the policy document of the integration of sustainable development perspective into the process of the World Heritage Convention and of the other relevant policy documents including the UNESCO policy on engaging with indigenous peoples into specific operational procedures. We had very fruitful debates and the consensual texts were achieved smoothly and efficiently.

The discussion of this item continued at our second meeting. Under this item the Group has also agreed to update section 6B capacity building and research of the Operational Guidelines taking into account the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

At our third meeting we had the pleasure to receive the Chairperson of the Budget Working Group who explained the request for a new paragraph of funding the evaluation of nominations by the Budget Working Group, which reflects the decision on the budget that the Committee adopted a few minutes ago. The inclusion of new paragraph 168 *bis* was unanimously agreed

on by our Group. The meeting continued with the discussion of the proposed revisions concerning the International Assistance process, which were agreed on by the Group. Having finalized the discussion of the proposed revisions we moved to the discussion of draft decision 43 COM 11A. There were no comments from the Group with the exception of a minor editorial change.

The revision of the Operational Guideline agreed on is presented in track changes in the Annex to draft decision 43 COM 11B. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Do we have any comments or questions? Once more, I would like to note that the result of the work of the Working Group is very positive because the document reflecting all the tiny matters at previous sessions were taken into consideration and it is done on the basis of consensus. The document is quite large and very fully reflects the requirements and additions, which we hope, will help us to facilitate the work of nominations and all the procedures in future. So are there any questions—may I ask once more? I don't see any. I would like to congratulate the Working Group for their excellent work on this matter and I think there is an optional draft agenda with some amendments provided to us. Rapporteur, can you update us?

Rapporteur:

Thank you. We'll just get the decision there. The draft decision itself will only be amended to adopt the new Operational Guidelines so paragraph 3 would read, Adopts the proposed revision of the Operational Guidelines, as presented in the present document and we probably wouldn't say present twice. And then we can have a look at the document that you would like. Oh, we don't even have it attached. But it's the one you have in front of you. And we are just fixing up the French as well. That's all Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

I see. So these amendments were also approved by the Working Group, yes? This was agreed on a consensus basis? Should we proceed item by item? I think we have to do it as a whole. Thank you very much. So once more I would like to thank the members of the Working Group for their efficient work and the very high-quality document provided to the session. And I would like to thank Khalifa Al Khalifa for the leadership and effective work. Thank you very much and we approve document 11A adopted in the last version. Thank you very much.

You will remember that we opened Item 12 last Monday and listened to the report by the Chair of the Group. As you will also remember, we decided to leave this Item open to allow for further consultation. I would like to give the floor to Mr Baratli from the Delegation of Azerbaijan, the Chair of the Working group. Please.

The Chairperson of the Ad Hoc Working Group, Mr Baratli:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson and good morning colleagues. Just to briefly inform you that we were able to convene in one full composition meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group and we discussed conceptually what are the general ideas of the members of the group. And further on, we convened several meetings of the drafting group composed of members of the committee. As a result, this drafting group produced a new draft decision, which has been submitted to the Rapporteur to be discussed now, and I'm very happy to mention that yesterday evening we had the last meeting and the meeting was quite inclusive. We had almost each and every member represented of the Committee. So with that I stop here. Thank you so much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Do Committee Members have any questions? Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Ma délégation remercie et félicite le groupe de travail ad hoc sur la présidence de l'Azerbaïdjan pour les conclusions de ces travaux qui nous sont soumis. En ce qui concerne la réflexion sur la réforme du processus d'inscription, nous prenons note du principe des deux phases retenues, avec l'évaluation préliminaire comme première phase et le mécanisme actuel comme seconde phase. Le document relatif à l'évaluation préliminaire préparé par le groupe de travail précise davantage les principes et modalités sur lesquelles se fonde cette évaluation préliminaire. Nous souhaitons à cet égard que la distinction soit clairement établie entre l'initiative du processus en amont, qui est déjà opérationnel, et cette phase d'évaluation préliminaire. Nous remercions le groupe de travail également pour les recommandations sur les autres aspects du processus de réforme d'inscription dont le but, comme on l'a relevé, est de contribuer à améliorer la qualité des propositions d'inscription et à renforcer le dialogue entre les États parties, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organes consultatifs.

S'agissant du petit groupe d'experts à mettre en place pour discuter des propositions concrètes à introduire dans les directives opérationnelles, nous tenons à ce que ce groupe de travail soit représentatif de l'équilibre régional. Ainsi, ma délégation voudrait proposer un léger amendement qui refléterait cet équilibre régional. Nous remercions l'Australie pour l'allocation du reste du Fonds extrabudgétaire pour cette seconde phase de réflexion et nous sommes en outre favorables à l'extension du mandat du groupe ad hoc tel que proposé, ainsi qu'à l'inscription à l'agenda de l'assemblée générale des États parties du point relatif au code de conduite. S'agissant du statu quo concernant l'implication des organes consultatifs additionnels, ma délégation, tout en s'alignant à ce statu quo, voudrait encourager les organes consultatifs à davantage de consultations avec les organes thématiques et scientifiques de l'UNESCO. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Uganda would like to express satisfaction together with the Africa Group concerning paragraph 13, which reads that retains the status quo regarding the involvement of additional Advisory Bodies. However, in the past there has been a discussion whether or not to add other bodies alongside the Advisory Bodies that here the status quo is maintained but we would like to make a little addition to that paragraph with your permission which would read, yes, paragraph 13. At the end of that to make the addition, and also encourages the Advisory Bodies to sustain consultations with UNESCO's own thematic scientific bodies. Thank you Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway just has to take the floor and really thank Azerbaijan and in particular Rashad Baratli for the excellent chairing of the ad hoc working group. We have reached very important results and this would not have been achieved without the leadership of Azerbaijan and the good spirit we had among the colleagues in the group. Norway is looking

forward to continued work on the issue of preliminary assessment in the next ad hoc working group. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Tanzania commends the work done by the ad hoc working group. I managed to attend one of the sessions—it was a wonderful undertaking by the chairperson. We congratulate him. Secondly, I want to go along with what the delegate from Burkina Faso just said and also what Uganda has said, so Tanzania goes along with what they said. Tanzania also wishes to get guidance from the Legal Adviser on this matter on the issues of code of conduct. We have in our working procedure the Operational Guidelines; we also have the Rules of Procedure that guide us in our decisions. We are asking as the Tanzanian delegation, do we need to come up with a code of conduct or can we change the rules of procedures, improve the rules of procedure? Chairperson, that is our question. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Azerbaijan was honored to chair the ad hoc working group and thanks all participants for constructive engagement. This is a very important and useful platform where Committee Members, regional group representatives, States Parties, the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies meet and discuss important issues with regard to better implementation of our World Heritage Convention.

This year was special as we started our reflections on the nomination reform process. It's clear that we need change for better process in this regard. We are glad that the Group came up with a concrete proposal on a preliminary assessment. We support this proposal as it reflects inclusive discussions held so far in ad hoc and it creates an opportunity for more dialogue. It would make possible to avoid deviations and in some sense contribute to capacity building. The proposal on the table sets certain conceptual matters. For example, that PA should be mandatory, evaluations should be based on desk review, the pilot phase of implementation and so on. We think that this is momentum and this concept needs to be approved. Then further on we may focus on modalities of this process. A two-phased nomination process will create more opportunities for quality nominations with strong potential.

Furthermore, the Group came up with the conclusion to retain the status quo on using additional advisory services. The Group had interesting discussions and for the moment this is the outcome. Additionally the Group came up with useful guiding principles for the overall nomination reform process, which is inclusive and can be used in future process as well. We think that the two concrete outcomes, PA and the position on advisory services the Group did a very useful scoping exercise and defined scope for future deliberations. Among them we can mention the need for more transparency and inclusiveness in the evaluation process, future review of the Global Strategy guidelines for the preparation of nominations and so on. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson and as our distinguished colleague from Azerbaijan has just articulated perfectly the substance of what we would say about the benefits of these reforms. I do want to take the opportunity to acknowledge with deep thanks Mr Baratli for his excellent chairpersonship of the ad hoc working group. When you are seeking to make reforms it requires real leadership and Mr Baratli through this process has shown tremendous leadership and we now have before us a set of reforms that we believe are going to significantly improve the nomination process and will be a longstanding benefit to the operation of this Convention. So I thank you. I would also like to indicate that Australia is very happy to support the amendments proposed by the delegations of Burkina Faso and Uganda.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Chairperson. China wishes to congratulate and thank Azerbaijan for the excellent leadership in the ad hoc working group. The work has been extremely constructive and we are delighted and wish to commend all the participants for their spirit of cooperation and friendship that lead to a satisfactory conclusion of yesterday's last meeting. On this note we support the result. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous allons réagir très rapidement aux trois sujets qui sont devant nous. Premièrement, nous appuyons l'amendement fait par le Burkina Faso concernant la composition des groupes de travail. Nous avons remarqué durant notre mandat qu'il y a parfois une confusion dans la constitution des groupes, notamment, si nous parlons du contexte africain, on confond parfois les centres de catégorie 2 et les États parties. Si on veut impliquer les experts pour travailler sur certains sujets, le centre de catégorie 2 qui est le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain ne représente pas les États parties, donc il ne faut pas qu'il y ait cette confusion. Les États parties sont les États parties, ils ont leurs experts ; les centres de catégorie 2 travaillent avec les centres. Il faut donc que ça soit bien clair que, dans la composition des groupes, le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain, dans le contexte africain, ne représente pas les États parties. Ça, c'est une chose.

Deuxième chose, nous soutenons également l'amendement proposé par l'Ouganda d'encourager les organes consultatifs à travailler en consultation avec des comités scientifiques qui existent, parce que c'est une plus-value pour aider les organes consultatifs à avancer un peu plus rapidement sur les études scientifiques, notamment, sur les directives qui doivent être mises en place pour faciliter le processus d'évaluation de certains biens qui devraient déjà être sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Donc ça, c'est vraiment une plus-value pour ces organes consultatifs.

Troisièmement, par rapport à la question que la Tanzanie a posé au Conseil juridique, peut-être que nous réagirons après, mais nous voulons juste revenir sur le débat que nous avons ouvert hier. La question du code de conduite pose ou illustre qu'il y a un malaise au sein du Comité et des structures qui l'accompagnent dans la prise de décisions. Il y a un véritable problème ; la réflexion doit continuer pour que nous sachions exactement quelles sont les structures qui prennent des décisions à la lumière de la mise en œuvre de la Convention sur le patrimoine mondial. Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We just wish to echo all those in front of us who have thanked Azerbaijan for their leadership in this process and we also want to thank Rashad Baratli for the wonderful and excellent chairpersonship that he has shown throughout this year and we wouldn't have been able to achieve this result without him. We strongly believe that when we look at the future of the Convention something very crucial and important is starting here in Baku at our 43rd session and we also just wanted to take the opportunity to commend the hard work of the whole Ad Hoc Working Group, Committee Members and non-Committee Members alike for working together in a spirit of cooperation, always in a constructive manner to achieve the results that we have in front of us and really again a special thanks to the Chair who has even convened meetings during this session of the World Heritage Committee and we support the draft decision. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Let me say as a part of this committee I would say that this was one of the most constructive, positive spirit of all committee members during the several meetings we had and I have two comments. From day one the objective of this Ad Hoc Working Group was to strengthen the dialogue and transparency between the States Parties and Advisory Bodies and also to strengthen the work of the existing Advisory Bodies was our main objective and also to make it easier—the files to start up with cleaner, more constructive files from the beginning and I think that will reduce a lot of the controversy during these meetings. Another thing, I would urge Committee Members to continue the momentum. It's really important. We went to a lengthy way and we encourage to keep the momentum and we urge also that most of the States Parties participated in the Ad Hoc Working Group to continue because they are having more of a good background in it and I would like to thank everyone, especially Rashad. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président. Je serai bref, néanmoins je voudrais avec beaucoup de fermeté dire combien nous voulons saluer le travail sous la direction de la délégation de l'Azerbaïdjan, à Paris et ici même, pour mener à bien la réflexion de ce groupe. Nous nous félicitons du principe de sa continuité. Même si nous quittons le Comité cette année pour permettre à d'autres, et on en est heureux, de prendre notre place, nous continuerons à accompagner le travail de ce groupe parce que c'est une réflexion extrêmement importante, et si on réfléchit stratégie, c'est un outil extrêmement précieux. Donc je renouvelle nos remerciements à la délégation de l'Azerbaïdjan et à toutes les délégations qui y ont contribué, et nous appuyons le projet de décision.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now IUCN, please.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Allow me to make this intervention on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies—it speaks to the far-reaching reform recommendations we see before us in Item 12 and therefore touches on a number of other interrelated issues to other agenda items that have been before us at this session.

IUCN, ICCROM and ICOMOS are making every effort to continue to actively engage in the reform discussions, as we are highly committed to changes, which will enhance our efficiency and effectiveness. We are very pleased to note therefore the opportunity to together address the time constraints and financial resources that are available to advance these important ideas. We believe that all actors in our process, Committee Members, States Parties, the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies are stretched to deal with these proposed reforms at the busiest time of the cycle and the lead up to the annual World Heritage Committee sessions.

We welcome the amended draft decision which for us we find to be clear, balanced and with an appropriate level of precision in laying out a road map and we look forward to working together to address the necessary resources to translate these reforms into working methods and changes to the Operational Guidelines. Mr Chairperson, IUCN, ICCROM and ICOMOS reiterate our commitment to contribute in a constructive and realistic way to help us together move forward. Our pledge is to continue to support the Convention with high-quality, global, independent and expertise advice. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Now the World Heritage Centre, please. Ms Rössler.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much and thank you for all the comments, which were made. Just one clarification I'm seeking from Uganda concerning the Item, which you have here, point 13, UNESCO's own scientific bodies. We have a number of scientific programmes at UNESCO, for example, the map programme, or Geoparks, or Memory of the World. Do you mean these or do you refer to any other bodies? I would like to seek clarification, Mr Chairperson. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. May I ask Uganda to tell us what you mean under the scientific bodies?

The Delegation of Uganda:

Yes, thank you, Chairperson. As she has just mentioned some of those implied, together with others for instance, the scientific and technical advisory bodies of UNESCO Underwater Cultural Heritage. So you have the resources within but which may not be fully exploited by the Advisory Bodies so that should add value to the work of the Advisory Bodies. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Ms Rössler.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you. As I have been in the past also Secretary to that Convention, it's a subsidiary body. You mean the 2001 Convention? Yes? So maybe the wording should be UNESCO scientific programmes and bodies under other conventions? Is that what you mean? Thank you very much for the clarification.

Chairperson:

Are you satisfied with this version? Thank you very much, Uganda. Burkina Faso, please.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le Burkina Faso avait dans son intervention indiqué le souhait de proposer un léger amendement au paragraphe 10. Je voudrais voir la formulation au niveau du paragraphe 10. Juste après « groupe », « un petit groupe de rédaction qui reflète l'équilibre régional ». Peut-être qu'il serait préférable de mettre « qui reflète l'équilibre régional » après « composé d'experts » plutôt. C'est ça. Merci.

Chairperson:

Thank you. We have Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie voudrait revenir pour soutenir la proposition de Mme la Directrice du Centre du patrimoine mondial ; d'ailleurs on s'était ouvert à la délégation de l'Ouganda pour demander cette précision. Tout simplement, pour être plus précis, « programmes scientifiques et organes relevant d'autres conventions de l'UNESCO », pour que les conventions ne soient que celles dans le cadre de l'UNESCO. Je crois qu'on couvre comme ça les deux manières. Et nous appuyons la proposition de Mme la Directrice du Centre du patrimoine mondial.

Chairperson:

Thank you. If there are no other comments can we accept—Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Zimbabwe delegation is making a follow up on the question that was raised by Tanzania where they were seeking clarification on the need for a code of conduct given that we have Rules of Procedure. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Rashad, can you answer the question?

Mr Baratli:

If I've got it right, the question about the relation between code of conduct and the Operational Guidelines? Rules of Procedure? I'm sorry. With regard to Rules of Procedure I think at this stage we are at the stage where we are endorsing the concept as it is and then we arrive to the modalities of this proposal. At that stage when we think of incorporating this to the Operational Guidelines in more concrete ways. I don't know whether that responds to the question.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you. But maybe we can get something from the Legal Adviser. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Legal Adviser, please.

Legal Adviser:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. I understand that the question was indeed asked by the distinguished delegate of Tanzania regarding the code of conduct and whether it is needed

and whether these same goals could not be achieved through a change in the Rules of Procedure.

To address this question, I can only of course rely on the documentation that is now before the Committee. The Working Group is still working on the text. Paragraph 61 of the document you have in front of you indicates that the Ad Hoc Working Group has agreed that the code of conduct for the Members of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies in the Convention, the Secretariat to the Convention as well as States Parties to the Convention as necessary.

Furthermore, I note that in paragraph 14 of the draft decision that is now before the Committee, the Committee would take note of the discussions in the Ad Hoc Working Group, encouraging informal consultations between States Parties on the elaboration of a code of conduct for States Parties, and requests the World Heritage Centre to include an item to initiate discussion on the Code of Conduct in the agenda of the forthcoming 22nd session of the General Assembly of States Parties.

From all this, the answer to the question depends very much on what the Code of Conduct will contain as information, what will be the contents of the Code of Conduct. My understanding is that the Code of Conduct will not only address issues of procedure but may also include a number of rules that would guide the conduct of States Parties and are of more substantive nature. As such, therefore they would not be—the idea is that the Code of Conduct would not be suitable necessarily for the Rules of Procedure. Having said this, I would mention that the Code of course would not be able to impose obligations or restrain rights that are already provided for in the Convention. That would require a change in the Convention, that cannot be done by simply a Code of Conduct and similarly they cannot change the Rules of Procedure because the amendments of the Rules of Procedure are to follow the Rules of Procedure themselves.

My understanding from the texts in front of us is that the Code of Conduct would be adopted by the General Assembly, which also makes sense in so far as according to the description contained in paragraph 61, the Code of Conduct would not only address the work of this Committee but would also contain some indications that would be applicable to States Parties that are not Members of the Committee. Paragraph 61 refers to States Parties to the Convention. So it would mean all States.

I would have with your permission, Mr Chairperson a last point. I do note that paragraph 61 also refers to the Secretariat as also being one of the recipients of the Code of the Code of Conduct. In that regard I should raise a concern. As you may know Article 14, paragraph 1 of the Convention foresees that the World Heritage Committee shall be assisted by a secretariat appointed by the Director-General of UNESCO and Rule 43, paragraph 4 of the Rules of Procedure indicates that the Director-General shall appoint an official of the Secretariat of UNESCO to act as a secretary to the Committee. In other words, the Convention has made the decision not to create its own secretariat but to rely on the Secretariat of UNESCO and indeed the Secretariat of this Convention is composed of UNESCO's officials whose duties and obligations are embodied in UNESCO's staff regulations. Pursuant to the staff regulations staff members are subject to the authority of the Director-General and are responsible to the Director-General in the exercise of their duties. The Secretariat being composed of UNESCO officials, it follows that only the General Conference of UNESCO and the Director-General to whom UNESCO staff members are subject can impose rules of conduct to the Secretariat to the Convention of the World Heritage Committee. The Committee would not be entitled to impose such rules on the Secretariat.

Having said this, I would like you to know that the staff regulations refer to the status of members of the Secretariat as international civil servants which require independence, impartiality and integrity. Furthermore, the standards of conduct for the international civil

service developed by the International Civil Service Commission and which applies to civil servants of the United Nations systems including its specialized agencies also refer to independence, impartiality and integrity as principles that guide civil servants in their actions. It would be therefore possible to refer maybe in the Code of Conduct to the abovementioned principles which apply to the Secretariat to the Convention and which are enshrined in UNESCO staff rules and regulations and the standards of conduct for international civil servants. This could be done for example in the preamble. But the Code of Conduct should not impose new obligations on the staff members of the Secretariat as part of UNESCO. I hope this assists the Committee. Thank you for your time.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Mr Baratli, please.

The Chairperson of the Ad Hoc Working Group, Mr Baratli:

Thanks so much, Mr Chairperson. Just to clarify that the Legal Adviser clearly explained the reasoning whether there should be Rules of Procedure or why is there a possible need for a code of conduct but just to mention why it was included in our discussion and why it was discussed in previous years as well and it was Decision 42 COM 8 paragraph 4, that further discussion was also requested so just to point out this point. And the second point is that one of the important outcomes of our discussion vis à vis the code of conduct is that we more or less agree that the code of conduct should not just be focused on just Committee Members but all stakeholders including Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat but of course, I thank the Legal Adviser for the recent comments on this issue. I think it can be incorporated in our future deliberations and that is the reason why you can find the inclusion of this item on the agenda at the General Assembly because we believe that it would give more inclusiveness and all States Parties will have a possibility to react to this important issue. Thanks so much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. That is exactly the concern of Tanzania because if you wanted to introduce a code of conduct and then you include the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties, we thought that this would be difficult to enforce and as it is difficult to enforce then maybe there is no need of doing it and it may take a long time to conclude it. We note the concern of the discussions in our decision why this idea of conduct has come up and we thought we should only work on the issues of our concern and not involve the other stakeholders who are not part of our work here in this Committee's meeting. We are suggesting that if we are to continue discussing this issue we should exactly continue on the issue that brought that aspect. Maybe other issues could come in, not only the code of conduct, maybe other issues could be discussed because it's under discussion rather than specifically mentioning that we are going to reflect on the code of conduct because I see the difficulties of enforcing the code of conduct. Thank you, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway would like to propose if this is agreeable to all of you Committee Members that we actually keep the draft resolution as it is now on the screen and that we include this item on the agenda of the General Assembly and that we have the

discussion at that moment whether we need a code of conduct or not and that we don't any code of conduct but we discuss whether we need it or not and also who should be included in this code of conduct. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. I would like to propose, to note that the final decision and discussion will be going on in November during the General Assembly of UNESCO when all States Parties will be there. And this is noted in paragraph 14 that it is clearly understood. Until that time you can go further with consultations and the discussions of all matters concerned with the questions raised by the honourable delegates from different countries. If you don't mind we will proceed with the adoption of this text as proposed with the inscription of the amendments, which were done now during this moment's discussion. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous voudrions qu'on revienne un peu sur le code de conduite. On va juste ajouter un mot, peut-être que ça va nous aider. Le paragraphe sur le code de conduite. Voilà, exactement, c'est le 14. On voulait proposer, à la deuxième phrase, « encourage les consultations informelles entre les États parties sur la possibilité de l'élaboration ». C'est une possibilité, ça peut se faire ou pas. Donc « sur la possibilité de l'élaboration d'un code de conduite ». Voilà le mot que nous voulions ajouter.

Chairperson:

Maybe it better reflects the idea that we are talking about. Thank you very much. So we proceed to the approval of the document. Once more I would like to thank all the members of the Working Group. Being the host country I am proud that such kind of evaluation of the work of the delegation of Azerbaijan. Thank you very much for Rashad Baratli and to all those who were working hard on the preparation of this draft. Thank you very much and I declare the Item 12 adopted [*applause*].

Now we move to Item 15. This Item inquires whether there is any other business, which may be interesting by the honourable delegates. The delegation of Tanzania wanted to make a statement at the end of the participation of this Committee. You want to make it today or tomorrow?

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

I'll be guided by you, sir.

Chairperson:

If you are ready you can do it now. You are welcome.

The Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Thank you, Chairperson. Mr Chairperson, first and foremost I would like to commend the State Party of Azerbaijan for successfully organizing and steering the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. I take the floor to inform this august house that Tanzania was elected a Member of the World Heritage Committee in November 2015 a position it has humbly served to date and therefore has completed its membership to this Committee. Our membership to the Committee was an honor and a rewarding and has been a steppingstone to many milestones in learning and improvement on heritage capacities. We appreciated the cooperation and support extended to us throughout our tenure on the Committee. With thank the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, the States Parties and Members of the Committee for their outstanding cooperation.

Furthermore, we would like to extend our special gratitude to the African States Parties Members of the Committee for their collaboration, experience and knowledge sharing during the tenure of our membership. We acknowledge the good working environment created through the teamwork of this Committee, which enabled us to successfully implement the mandate of this Committee. We therefore encourage the remaining Committee Members to continue with this spirit. Although it is an undeniable fact that a lot still needs to be done in the work of the Committee, Tanzania is confident that the remaining Committee Members and those who will join later will continue with the good work and move forward from where we have left.

Chairperson, we do not leave the Committee with a sad face but rather a strong Member who is confident in the direction of the work of the Committee. We can safely say that despite our departure Tanzania will always remain in good working relations with the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre, individual States Parties and civil society organizations in the full implementation of the 1972 Convention.

Finally, Chairperson, Tanzania would like to underscore its commitment not only as an outgoing Committee Member but also as an active State Party to the Convention that has brought oneness to the entire world. I thank you so much, Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. And we on behalf of all the Committee Members highly value your involvement and very active position during these four years and we are sure that Tanzania will always follow all the requirements and implement all the decisions which have been taken with your participation or without your participation because you are very active member dedicated to protection of the World Heritage. Thank you very much for these words. [Applause] Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Dans la même veine que l'intervention avant nous, je suis très heureux d'annoncer à l'ensemble des membres du Comité et à toute notre famille du patrimoine mondial qu'hier soir les autorités nationales et locales, avec l'aide de l'Institut national du patrimoine, sur le site de Carthage ont appliqué déjà notre décision prise en début de session, la 43 COM 7B.55, puisque, au niveau du cirque de Carthage et des ports puniques, des destructions de constructions illégales ont eu lieu. C'était ce à quoi on s'était engagé et nous sommes ravis que, le Comité encore réuni, ces réalisations ont été faites. Et vous pouvez compter sur nous pour que la totale conformité soit assurée à l'aune des dates que vous nous avez indiquées. Merci beaucoup. Je voulais partager cette bonne nouvelle avec vous.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. We are very proud to hear that and as we noted in the Bureau meeting this morning the implementation of the recommendations, which were given by the Committee by the States Parties, the managers of the sites, those involved in the protection of the areas listed on the World Heritage List is a matter that we are all proud of. It means that the Committee is working and the decisions of the Committee are respected, accepted and implemented by the world community and is a matter of pride, the work of the Committee. It's a very good example and our congratulations. Thank you very much. Are there any other comments under Item 15? I don't see any so now we are moving to another very important question.

Item 16, which concerns the election of the new Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and also to proceed with the election of the Vice-chairpersons and the Rapporteur of the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee, in 2020. As you may know, China invited the next session of the World Heritage Committee to Fuzhou (Fujian Province). I would like to know if

you all agree with this proposal? I see no objection. This is so decided. Congratulations China [applause]. I understand that the delegation of China wishes to propose a candidate as Chairperson for the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee. May I give the floor to the Chinese delegation?

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Chinese government would like to nominate Mr Tian Xuejun, Chairperson for the National Commission for UNESCO and Vice-Minister of Education to be the Chairperson of the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee. I thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. [Applause] We consider your applause as confirmation and support for the proposal. The newly elected Chairperson of the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee is His Excellency Tian Xuejun. Let me congratulate His Excellency for his election and let me express all my best wishes for his task ahead. And now I give the floor to the elected Chairperson. Please, the floor is yours.

The Chairperson of the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Tian Xuejun:

Mr Chairperson, dear colleagues, it is my great pleasure to join you here for the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee in Baku, a city of historical richness and modern vitality. I'd like to thank the Government of the Republic of Azerbaijan and its people for the enormous and effective effort that you have made to ensure the success of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee and further thank you for the warm hospitality you have extend to the Chinese delegation. World heritage conservation is a noble cause of critical importance to the development of human society. It is essential for safeguarding and promoting cultural diversity and biodiversity.

For a long time, UNESCO has led and played an instrumental role in the global effort of world heritage knowledge dissemination and heritage conservation, scoring remarkable achievements. The World Heritage Convention has become one of the international conventions that has the largest number of States Parties and the most extensive influence. Under the guidance of the Convention, the World Heritage Committee has vigorously optimized their global governance system of World Heritage formulated and implemented global strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List, established the World Heritage Fund and launched a series of heritage conservation projects. Consequently, conservation management capacity has been significantly enhanced around the world.

Today, World Heritage has become an important bridge and link connecting countries and peoples of different geographical environments, cultural traditions, historical origins and developmental stages across the world. As an important annual event in the field of World Heritage, the World Heritage Committee meeting has always attracted worldwide attention. I would like to take this opportunity to express my heartfelt gratitude to the Committee for accepting China's sincere invitation and unanimously adopting the decision to hold the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee in China in 2020 and for electing me as the Chairperson of the 44th session of the Committee. We are deeply honoured by your trust and recognition of China's heritage conservation work.

Dear colleagues, China is an active practitioner of the World Heritage Convention, the vast territory and 5,000 years of civilization have given China a rich natural and cultural heritage. The Chinese government attaches great importance to heritage conservation and transmission and has incorporated as an important component of the national strategy for modernization and national rejuvenation. Chinese President Xi Jinping put forward the concept of innovative, coordinated, green, open and shared development. He points out that today's work in heritage conservation will bring benefits to future generations and protection of conservation as well as

utilization of cultural heritage and their transmission to future generations should be enhanced. He further points out that clear waters and green mountains are invaluable assets of humankind and building an ecological civilization is vital to sustaining the development of the Chinese nation.

Since its accession to the World Heritage Convention in 1985, China has been committed to establishing and improving its legal framework, administrative structure and management system for heritage conservation forming a relatively complete world heritage conservation management and monitoring system as well-developed heritage research and capacity-building system. The state of conservation of properties in China has continued to improve. The capacity for heritage conservation and research has been continuously enhanced. Education for world heritage is carried out nation-wide. Safeguarding and transmission of heritage has become the consensus of the whole society.

With the strong support of UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee, 55 properties in China have been inscribed on the World Heritage List. China is a firm contributor to World Heritage conservation. China supports the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List. China and UNESCO have co-established category 2 centres such as WHITRAP and HIST, to provide capacity building and remote-sensing monitoring services of World Heritage sites to States Parties. China supports UNESCO Priority Africa strategy and held in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre the UNESCO-Africa-China Forum on World Heritage Capacity Building and Cooperation in Paris, in June this year. China emphasizes the importance of exchanges and mutual learning in the field of world heritage.

Chinese institutions have established partnerships with ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM and carried out collaborative projects with Cambodia, Myanmar, Nepal and Uzbekistan to effectively enhance the capacity for heritage conservation, restoration and management in both China and these countries. China is an unswerving promoter of the global governance of the World Heritage. The World Heritage embodies miraculous creations of nature over hundreds of millions of years and the rich accomplishments of human civilization of thousands of years. They are valuable assets shared by all humanity.

Today, our world is undergoing profound changes, unprecedented in the past century and humankind is facing complex and serious global challenges. The importance and urgency of World Heritage conservation is more prominent than ever. It requires the cooperation of all States Parties and relevant international organizations to carry out their shared responsibilities. China hosted the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2004 in view of its importance as a platform for global governance of World Heritage. China proposes to host the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee in China for promoting exchange and mutual learning among civilizations, advancing sustainable development of human society and building community with a shared future for mankind.

Ladies and gentlemen, Fuzhou, the host city of 44th session of the World Heritage Committee is the capital of Fujian Province of China. With a history of more than 2,200 years it has a rich cultural tradition, a beautiful ecological environment, well-developed infrastructure and a booming economy. Chinese President XI Jinping worked in Fuzhou as the city's Party leader and again as the Provincial Governor in the 1990s during which time he put forward a series of important expositions on heritage conservation, proposed and implemented many important policies leaving the city with a rich cultural legacy and natural beauty. Representatives of Fuzhou city are also present here today. They are confident to organize a successful World Heritage Committee meeting next year. We are ready to keep in close communication with UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre in particular, and to work closely with Committee Members and the Advisory Bodies. As the Chairperson of the 44th session I very much welcome views and suggestions from all stakeholders. Let's work together for a successful

44th session and write another important chapter in the history of World Heritage conservation. I look forward to seeing you all at the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee. Welcome to Fuzhou. Thank you. *[Applause]*

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Before we give the floor to the Mayor of Fuzhou to present the film, I propose to elect the Vice-Chairpersons of the Committee therefore I apply to the country Groups to present their proposals. So Africa region, Burkina Faso, the floor is yours.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Le groupe Afrique sera représenté par l'Ouganda.

Chairperson:

Any objections to this proposal from the Committee Members. Thank you very much. Approved, Uganda. Arab region, please. Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Pour le groupe arabe, la Tunisie propose le Royaume du Bahreïn.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any objections to this candidacy? I don't see any so approved, Bahrain, congratulations. Europe and North America Group. Norway, you have the floor.

The Delegation of Norway:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Norway would like to propose Spain as Vice-Chairperson. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Any objections to this proposal? Thank you very much. Spain, approved, congratulations. Europe Group II, I think Azerbaijan has a proposal.

The Delegation of Azerbaijan:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Azerbaijan proposes Hungary to be a Vice-Chairperson. Thank you so much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. No objections? Then we approve Hungary. Congratulations.

Chairperson:

Now we come to Latin America and the Caribbean. Dear colleagues, as you know we have still to elect one more from this region. However, I would like to inform you that internal consultations are still going on within the Regional Group and that a candidate cannot be proposed at this stage. Therefore, it is suggested that the mandate of the actual Vice-Chairperson of Latin America and the Caribbean Region, which is Brazil be extended until the matter is settled. The Vice-Chairperson for the Latin America and the Caribbean region will be designated during an extraordinary session of the Committee which will be convened next November immediately after the General Assembly which will elect new Committee Members at its 22nd session from 27 to 28 November at UNESCO Headquarters. Do you agree with this proposal, to have Brazil remain in the position until this time? Thank you very much for your understanding. Now are there any other proposals for candidates? Is there a Committee

Member who wishes to propose a candidate? Thank you. I don't see any. May I give the floor to Hungary, please?

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. We have the honor to propose Ms Miray Hasaltun Wosinski to be the Rapporteur for the 44th session of the World Heritage Committee from the Kingdom of Bahrain. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Tunisia, please.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. La Tunisie soutient la proposition de la Hongrie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there any objections? If not, we propose that the Rapporteur at the next session will be Ms Miray Hasaltun Wosinski and we approve that [*applause*]. Thank you very much. Let me present the lady. So our congratulations. Now I would like to give the floor to the Vice-Mayor of Fuzhou to present the information about the site. Please.

Vice-Mayor of Fuzhou:

Welcome to Fuzhou! [*video plays*]

Chairperson:

Thank you very much and I hope that it will be really the unbelievable impressions. We are looking forward to this event. So now we declare Item 16 closed as we approved all the details of this agenda. Thank you.

We move now to the last Item of today's discussion, which is the provisional agenda. May I ask Ms Rössler present the item?

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Document 17 that has been distributed to all of you, which is the provisional agenda of the next session of the World Heritage Committee with the usual schedule of examination of Items. There is one sub-item which we have to add to provisional agenda which you can see in track changes on the screen because it was put forward during this session. You have decided to put sub-item 5C here, which is Priority Africa, Sustainable development and World Heritage.

Furthermore, dear Mr Chairperson, I would like to recall that General Item 8 is now considered as a standing item in the same way we examine General Item 7 on State of Conservation which means it is open and is kept open until its closing. This will allow you to take into consideration all debates, interventions you have for the decisions on Item 8. And also I wanted to remind you that for a number of years we cover thematic studies under item 5A so please be assured that this will also be covered by us. Thank you very much for your attention.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So we have the provisional agenda. I understand that during the period before the opening of the 44th session there will be some possibilities to make amendments and to approve it at the beginning of the 44th session. As we have no comments I would like to proceed to the approval of the provisional agenda. You don't mind? Thank you very much. We approve Item 17.

Dear colleagues, we are even better than we are supposed to be on the schedule so you have a little bit more time to visit the city, to enjoy free time. The other thing that we have to do is start our work tomorrow as usual. At 9 a.m. the final documents will be provided to all tables of the delegations and whenever it is considered necessary to come read and make some comments on this matter you are welcome to have these documents from 9 a.m. But we will start the session at 10 a.m. and after such a productive day of work and all these days I wish you a very good time in hospitable Baku. Thank you very much. Enjoy your time. Thank you very much. *[Applause]*

The meeting rose at 12.00 a.m.

TENTH DAY – Wednesday 10 July 2019

EIGHTEENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev

Chairperson:

I kindly ask you to proceed to your seats. Good morning everyone. This is the last day of work of our session and I think that we have to proceed according to the agreed agenda. You know that yesterday there was the preparation of documents, the process was finished in time and the documents were distributed to the honourable delegates and Members of the Committee at 9 a.m. We now come to our final task, the formal adoption of the Report of Decisions. We will go through the report, which was prepared on time. Allow me to congratulate the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for that achievement. The report is divided into two parts, which you have now in front of you. Before I give the floor to our Rapporteur, allow me to recall that the Decisions included in this report have already been adopted by the Committee and therefore the task we have before us is essentially an editorial one, and we will not reopen the debate on the content of the Decisions. I would like to invite our Rapporteur, Ms Mahani Taylor, to briefly explain the process of preparation of the Report and give you additional guidance for you to consider as you review it. Madam Taylor, the floor is yours.

Rapporteur:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Firstly, I'd like to reassure all the relatively few people in the room that I'm going to be very brief with this presentation.

I'm pleased to have been a part of the preparation of the Decisions of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee here in beautiful Baku. Over the past 10 days, the World Heritage Committee has made an impressive 245 Decisions. That's 20 more than last year and in fact the most since 2011. It's not insubstantial. These Decisions have included the addition of 29 new properties to the World Heritage List and has considered that state of conservation of 166 World Heritage Properties and there have been many important policy decisions made also.

In particular, I take note of the nomination reform, which I think is a really exciting way forward and I look forward to being part of this as we move forward. The purpose of this presentation is to briefly explain my involvement as a rapporteur and with the Secretariat in assisting to prepare the document before you. Of course, the original draft decisions were drafted by the World Heritage Secretariat in close consultation with the Advisory Bodies, and they were put on line in batches before and during the meeting. It's in terms of the proposed amendments that the rapporteur team is of most importance.

The Secretariat distributed all the amendments that were received in enough time to all the Committee Members in hard copy and these were also posted at the time on the web. They were also translated into English or French. We received 91 amendments in this way. The Rapporteur team would then type these amendments and mark these using track changes and sometimes highlighting into the draft decisions and this was for the Committee to see on screen as we discussed those during the sessions. For the late amendments including those presented from the floor, these were typed as we went on to the screens and I'd just like to take note now of our wonderful typists, Olivia and Jean-Marc who did a really fabulous job under really quite stressful conditions sometimes. The proposed amendments were shown on screen during the sessions and then I would also read them out and for Miray our next Rapporteur I would just like to give a tiny bit of gratuitous advice, do not under any

circumstances read an unpronounceable species name for the first time you see it in front of hundreds of people—maybe just say yellow crazy ants and leave it at that.

After each session, the Rapporteur team, so five of us, would sit down and go through those amendments and accept them paragraph by paragraph. It's at this stage we would fix formatting errors which can often happen in track changes, change any typographical errors and some grammatical changes and we would do that carefully, paragraph-by-paragraph and then save those into a new document.

The very final check of the documents is undertaken by the Secretariat who shares the significant workload. There are over 230 pages of Decisions to be checked. And they search through those documents very carefully and provide me as the Rapporteur with any proposed amendments again in the nature of grammatical, typographical or formatting errors and then I confirm that I'm comfortable with those changes and in order to feel valuable I would search very, very carefully through the documents that I have at least one additional change to make which I would then do. So distinguished colleagues you now have the Decisions of the 43rd session in front of you for your final adoption and consideration.

But before I pass the floor back to our eminent Chairperson, I'd like to say just a very few thank-yous, first and foremost to our wonderful hosts of Azerbaijan and to our Chairperson. This meeting has run so smoothly and I personally have been very grateful to Mr Garayev for being such a respectful and strong Chairperson. Baku is such a beautiful city and I am very privileged to have been able to visit and stay here and I have really enjoyed my time. My warmest thanks also to the Committee for having elected me to this position and for the opportunity to struggle with many different decisions flying at the same time. It's been an excellent opportunity. Thank you very much also warmly and finally to the wonderful people of the World Heritage Centre. I was made instantly very welcome before I even came to Baku as part of this team and I know that Dr Rössler is very aware of how wonderful her team is and how very competent and excellent and finally I make note of Richard and Luba and our wonderful typists. They are such an experienced Rapporteur team that they made my job very easy and I'm very grateful to them. So thank you very much, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much, Ms Taylor and I would like to thank you on behalf of all the Committee Members for the professional approach and very effective work done by Rapporteur personally and by your team. Note please that taking into consideration that you liked our country you and your team are always welcome in any position either Rapporteur or just welcome guest! Now in order to be as efficient as possible, the Committee Members could indicate to us where they have identified factual or editorial errors, which should be corrected so that we can deal with those. Please note, also that formatting issues will be fixed at a later stage by the Secretariat during the finalization of the report.

I would like to suggest adopting the Report of Decisions part-by-part. Dear colleagues I would like to be sure that you all had a chance to review the first part of the report starting with Decision 43 COM 2 to 43 COM 7B.112. Are there any opinions? Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Actually, we noticed a little technical error that has slipped in but it's in the second part of the report if I may say it now.

Chairperson:

You are welcome.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you. So it's on page 110, Draft decision 33 COM 12, paragraph 6, it reads now, takes note with appreciation of the outcomes of the online consultations survey on the nomination report. I believe the online consultation survey it was on the nomination reform so this would be our suggestion. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Are there amendments, proposals, maybe some drafting, some wording, someone found something wrong in this? But we understand it will be clarified later so even if you find something later when you look at the documents on the site, it is already available on the site of the conference so you can apply to the Secretariat with your proposals with minor changes in the wording. If there are no objections, I would like to propose to adopt part 1 as a whole. I don't see any comments so good job by the Rapporteur team. The first part of the report of the decision is therefore adopted.

Now we pass to part 2 and we have one amendment from Hungary which was already announced. We will take it under consideration. The document consists of the decisions starting with COM 8 to COM 17. Are there any objections, amendments, changes to the text? Thank you very much, so in this case the second part is also adopted. Therefore we can accept the document as a whole, in both parts. Thank you very much. Approved.

I think that the unanimous approval of the documents, which were provided today, reflects a very thorough and dedicated work of all the Committee Members of the Secretariat and Rapporteur which permitted us to bring the documents which were not even necessary for additional discussion so it's very good result of the common work. Now I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler. The floor is yours.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Dear Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to say a few words on the closing of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee here in Baku. First and foremost I would like to thank you, Mr Chairperson for your guidance throughout this session and to your country for providing such excellent facilities and for your very warm hospitality. Thank you so much, Mr Chairperson.

I would also like to thank all the Committee Members for their substantive contributions to the debates and decisions taken which were not always easy for many of us but we made it and we achieved it to the end of the session. Our Rapporteur did not have an easy job with many amendments throughout the session but I think she did it really brilliantly and thank you so much Mahani, it was fantastic.

Thanks also go to all the Observer States for their continued interest and commitment and to all the other Observers whether NGOS, IGOs, universities and others and especially civil society representatives and indigenous peoples. Your contribution is important in the continuous evolution and implementation of the World Heritage Convention. My deep thanks also go to our dear Advisory Bodies, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM. You are one of the pillars in the system to provide scientific and technical advice.

Let me also thank my own team, the Policy and Statutory Meetings Unit headed by Ms Totcharova who you see here with the efficient team. Many thanks for your work and for your professionalism. You managed very well. This will be the last Committee Meeting for Ms Totcharova so I wish her all the best for the future but you will see her in the General Assembly in November so it's not yet time to say good bye to her. She has to run that meeting as well. I'm also grateful to all the Chiefs of the Regional Units with the teams: Africa, Asia

Pacific, Arab States, Latin America and Caribbean and Europe and North America units and our Nature Team, NTO, as well as our colleagues from the Culture Sector, PCM unit providing all the logistical support to this session. I would also like to express my sincere thanks to Mr Baakrim, our Administrative Officer, who was instrumental in producing many budget documents for this Committee. He will be leaving UNESCO in August this year, so many thanks for his immense support and also I have to say moral support in producing these budget documents.

My gratitude goes to my team and the Directorate of the Centre as well as to our Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr Ernesto Ottone and his team. He's on the plane already going back to UNESCO. Special thanks to our Legal Adviser. You didn't use him so much but he helped a lot behind the scenes, and to his team, who tries to keep us on procedures and who really enjoyed his very first World Heritage Committee. I would also like to thank Ms Mone, our security advisor who is always there when you need her and special thanks goes to all the people behind the screens for supporting our Rapporteur and helping with the processing of the decisions and texts including for the working groups as well as to our KMI technical team working hand-in-hand with the host country team. I wish to also thank our typists as Mahani did and our interpreters who really help us to dialogue and all other staff including the room clerks here.

Thank you all for your close collaboration and invaluable contributions and support. The excellent and smooth chairing by you, Mr Chairperson at this 43rd session of the Committee. The warm hospitality of the people in Azerbaijan and your team will be very long remembered. Safe travels home and see you in November at the General Assembly at UNESCO and next year in China. Thank you so much. *[Applause]*

I have some gifts to give. First of all our Chairperson has now all the time to travel to the World Heritage sites so here is a book of all the descriptions of all the World Heritage sites. It's heavy! And I have a gift also for our Rapporteur who is now off the hook so to say. A little book with World Heritage sites from all over the world. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

We will have a chance to travel together along with the Committee Members. Thank you very much. You know, I didn't suppose that we would have our last meeting so short. So we were pressing for time but before I come to my final speech and thanks to you. Norway, please.

The Delegation of Norway:

Good morning, Mr Chairperson and all dear colleagues of World Heritage. On behalf of the Norwegian delegation, I would like to express my gratitude for the wonderful time here in Baku and for your extremely professional leadership of this meeting. We, the Committee have inscribed 29 wonderful sites on the World Heritage List. As an architect, I will especially highlight the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright and as we know, Mr Chairperson, you are a true fan of culture and music. I will quote Simon and Garfunkel's song, So Long Frank Lloyd Wright but with a slightly different text. So long Baku, I can't believe your song has gone so soon. I barely learned the tune. Baku is exceptional. So has this meeting been. Our deepest thanks to all your colleagues, Mr Chairperson, to the Secretariat, the Rapporteur, the NGOs and the Advisory Bodies. And our deepest thanks to you, Mr Chairperson. This meeting has truly been a great success. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for the very high appreciation. Thank you very much. Tunisia.

La Délégation de la Tunisie :

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous arrivons à la fin d'une très, très belle session, pour plusieurs raisons. D'abord, grâce à vous, votre présidence, la disponibilité de vos équipes et l'hospitalité de votre pays. Au nom de la Tunisie qui quitte, convaincue parce qu'elle est heureuse de laisser la place à d'autres pays, ce Comité qui lui est très cher pour plusieurs raisons, nous voudrions remercier tous ceux sans lesquels cette session n'aurait pas pu être ce qu'elle a été.

Tout d'abord, ceux qui travaillent tous les jours à la veille bienveillante de l'application de notre Convention, j'entends le Centre du patrimoine mondial, un Centre ami, présidé par une directrice brillante avec des équipes extraordinairement impliquées – on l'a vu jusqu'à la dernière minute. Nous voudrions saluer leur travail ; sans eux l'idée même de la protection du patrimoine mondial serait divisée en pays. Or l'idée de converger vers un intérêt général de la protection du patrimoine, vous la concrétisez tous les jours. Soyez assurés de notre reconnaissance et de notre sollicitude.

Je voudrais également saluer les 20 autres délégations qui, avec la Tunisie, ont porté l'esprit de cette Convention en cette 43^e session. Nous sommes très heureux de ce qui nous arrive. Le multilatéralisme est malmené aujourd'hui ; il est très bien porté à travers l'idée de ce patrimoine en partage. Je voudrais dire un mot à l'adresse de notre Rapporteur, que j'ai vu déjà affairée à la question et préparée depuis le printemps dernier à une rencontre à Canberra. Je voulais la saluer pour la qualité du travail, la patience requise et le résultat édifiant. Nous sommes très, très heureux d'avoir été avec vous durant quatre sessions, et nous sommes très heureux de passer le témoin. Nous allons nous mettre au fond de la salle, mais nous continuerons à porter l'esprit et à porter de nouveaux dossiers à inscrire puisque nous levons, en ce qui nous concerne, la suspension et nous revenons aux inscriptions. À vous voir bientôt en Chine. Merci beaucoup, et merci encore une fois à Bakou qu'on n'oubliera pas.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Angola, please.

La Délégation de l'Angola :

Monsieur le Président, au nom de la délégation de l'Angola, nous voudrions tout d'abord vous remercier pour avoir orienté et guidé le débat de notre session. En novembre 2015, lorsque l'Angola a été élu pour faire partie du Centre du patrimoine mondial, nous nous sommes engagés à contribuer efficacement à la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial aux niveaux national, continental et mondial, en apportant des réflexions significatives sur les problématiques et les enjeux qui touchent le cœur du système du patrimoine mondial. Nous pensons que nous l'avons humblement fait durant les quatre dernières années.

Nous voudrions remercier tous les membres du Comité, les États parties, le Secrétariat et les organes consultatifs et toutes les autres parties prenantes qui nous ont assistés et qui ont travaillé en étroite collaboration avec nous afin de nous permettre d'être efficaces durant notre mandat, et aussi pour leur soutien spécifique pour l'inscription du premier bien angolais sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, les vestiges de Mbanza Kongo, la capitale de l'ancien royaume du Kongo.

Nous pensons que les futurs membres de ce Comité poursuivront les discussions engagées sur certaines questions clés de la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial qui demandent la solidarité de la communauté internationale, notamment l'équilibre de la représentation des sites sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ; l'équilibre entre la conservation et le développement durable, en analysant de manière spécifique les contextes des pays en voie de développement qui sont confrontés au défi d'améliorer la qualité de vie de leur population en garantissant leurs droits humains de base ; le reflet de l'universalité dans le processus de

prise de décisions et dans la composition des organes et institutions qui sont appelées à assister le Comité dans l'accomplissement de ses missions.

Une fois de plus, Monsieur le Président, nous avons été très honorés de faire partie de ce prestigieux Comité et nous vous remercions tous, ainsi que le Secrétariat et les organes consultatifs, d'avoir travaillé en étroite collaboration avec nous. Nous ne pouvons clore cette déclaration sans remercier la République d'Azerbaïdjan pour la manière avec laquelle nous avons été merveilleusement accueillis et les féliciter pour l'organisation parfaite de notre session. Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Cuba, please.

The Delegation of Cuba:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Since this is the last day that we are here in the Committee we would like to thank the contribution of all the Members of the Committee. We'd like to thank absolutely everyone, the Advisory Bodies as well as the Secretariat. We've learned about the capacity for dialogue, consensus, constructive building for issues which are vital for the Convention. Cuba today is more committed than ever for the implementation thereof and will continue to defend the principles and objectives of the Convention. Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson for your wisdom. Thank you, Baku for your hospitality. Thank you Azerbaijan for your leadership. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Burkina Faso.

La Délégation du Burkina Faso :

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Au moment où les travaux de la 43e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial s'achèvent, il me plaît de vous adresser, au nom de la délégation du Burkina Faso, mes vives félicitations pour la dextérité avec laquelle vous avez conduit nos travaux, et vous adresser également nos remerciements pour votre hospitalité et votre accueil. Vous me permettrez d'adresser mes remerciements à l'ensemble des membres du Comité pour la parfaite collaboration dont ma délégation a bénéficié, ainsi que pour l'ambiance conviviale qui a prévalu en notre sein tout au long des quatre dernières années, et particulièrement durant la présente session.

Monsieur le Président, nos assises ont formulé des pistes en vue d'améliorer la mise en œuvre de la Convention pour la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel, et notamment le fonctionnement du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Le Burkina Faso, qui est en fin de mandat, sort du Comité avec un fort sentiment de satisfaction, tant pour la contribution qu'il a pu apporter que pour la riche expérience qu'il en a tirée. Je renouvelle la gratitude de mon pays au Comité pour l'inscription de son troisième bien, les sites de métallurgie ancienne du fer du Burkina Faso, sur la Liste du patrimoine commun de l'humanité. Au Centre du patrimoine mondial, au Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain et aux organes consultatifs, je réitère nos remerciements pour leur collaboration et leur accompagnement sans lesquels cette inscription n'aurait pas été possible.

Le Burkina Faso reste engagé et continue à jouer sa partition en tant qu'État partie pour le renforcement de la Convention pour la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel. À l'équipe qui continuera le combat pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine mondial, je dis bon vent et que les mânes de nos ancêtres les guident. Je vous remercie.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for such appreciation. Kuwait, please.

The Delegation of Kuwait:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Since it's the last meeting for the State Party of Kuwait, I would like to say several things. Kuwait will always be committed in every aspect for this Committee. We will still continue working for this Convention and the spirit of this Convention. Let me take this opportunity to thank you personally for your guidance and patience. Let me also thank the Assistant Director-General of Culture for his guidance and the work done behind the scenes, the Director of the Centre, also the Deputy of the Centre, thank you. The Secretariat, Rapporteur--you have been so patient and professional. I'll never forget your smiles, always there. That's really a lot of things a lot of times. I would like to thank each of the 20 Committee Members for their positive, constructive dialogue in every aspect. I salute you all and maybe I take the microphone most of the time but the State Party of Kuwait cannot be what it is without the two people next to me, on my right and on my left. They are the people doing the hard work. Special thanks Zahraa and Jaber, without them our performance would not be the way it is. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much to all Committee Members and of course to their teams. Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.

The Delegation of Kyrgyzstan:

Thank you, Chairperson. On behalf of the Kyrgyz Republic I'd like to thank you personally, the Government of Azerbaijan and the people of Azerbaijan for hosting us here. I'd like to also thank the Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat, the Committee Members for the hard work they have done here and we would also like to express special gratitude to the support staff as well as volunteers who have always met us with big smiles on their faces every day we came to the congress hall. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Spain, please.

The Delegation of Spain:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The delegation of Spain can only join its voice to all expressing thanks to you, to the host country with its glorious history illustrated by the streets of Baku. The Spanish delegation feels at home here. And to you, Mr Chairperson for your precise and concise work which has brought our work to a conclusion, to the Centre, to the interpreters which have made these sessions very effective and we'd also like to thank the Advisory Bodies for their scientific and technical work and all the Members of the Committee that have always created a spirit of dialogue in the debates which we think for the future of the Convention are necessary. We would also like to thank all the support staff that made our participation smooth. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis.

The Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Saint Kitts and Nevis wishes to thank you and the Government of Azerbaijan and congratulates you for hosting a very successful meeting here in the impressive city of Baku, a city of historical richness and modern vitality. Your hospitality and the people of

Azerbaijan were indeed excellent and we express our profound gratitude and look forward to the next meeting in China. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Brazil, please.

The Delegation of Brazil:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. There is a lot that could be said about this session, but to do justice to the extraordinary hospitality of our hosts here in Azerbaijan, to the excellence of the work accomplished by the Chairperson, Rapporteur and Secretariat and also to the persistent endurance of all delegations that stood here for 10 days of hard work we would speak here for hours.

So we concentrate briefly on one point we find particularly important—the spirit of constructive consensus that we found in this meeting. Despite making important and sometime difficult decisions that we had to take here some of them with very sensitive political backgrounds, we always managed to reach decisions by consensus and without aggressive clashes between delegations. There was of course a divergence of opinions on many points and all delegations were correct in standing by their positions and arguing them extremely well but they were flexible in taking into consideration opposing views and working for the general consensus. It was not only that; they also worked hard, some very hard for the improvement of this Convention by means of the reform of the Operational Guidelines. We place high hopes on these reforms especially on the new concept of preliminary assessment, which has been approved in this session. I believe this is a way forward for this Convention and also for UNESCO to continue work towards constructive consensus and to improve our working methods as has been done here.

We will always remember this meeting for the final inscription of our mixed site Paraty and Ilha Grande Culture and Biodiversity on the World Heritage List after 10 years after it was first presented in Seville and we were also particularly touched by the inscription on the List of Portugal's Royal Mafra Building and the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Monte which are also part of our history as well as for the removal of the basilica of the Nativity and the Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works from the World Heritage in Danger List. Now we look forward to the 44th session of this Committee in Fuzhou with very high expectations from our Chinese hosts for hosting this meeting. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you. Uganda, please.

The Delegation of Uganda:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. The Ugandan delegation would like to thank you, Mr Chairperson, for the excellent leadership you have provided. Your patience and thoroughness are extraordinary. I also wish to thank the people and Government of the Republic of Azerbaijan for the excellent facilities that were put at our disposal, that made us feel at home and loved so much that we did not realize how fast the time passed. The World Heritage Centre also deserves our praise for the excellent and professional conduct it has exhibited. It would be remiss of me if I did not appreciate the very wonderful work done by the very able Rapporteur and her team. Lastly, I thank the Advisory Bodies and all the distinguished Members of the Committee for the excellent accomplishment of the assignment of the 43rd session. I thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.

The Delegation of Indonesia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. On behalf of the delegation of Indonesia, I would like to express our profound gratitude to the Government of Azerbaijan for the exceptional hospitality during the 43rd session of the Committee. I would like also to thank the Committee Members, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for the rewarding experience and excellent collaboration during our four-year membership on the Committee. Indonesia remains committed to the implementation of the Convention and looks forward to continuing working with all of you in the future. Thank you for the outstanding collaboration and we are looking forward to more cooperation in the future. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

The Delegation of Hungary:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. On behalf of the Hungarian delegation, let me express our gratitude and thanks to Azerbaijan for the successful and wonderful organization of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. Special thanks to our Chairperson, His Excellency Mr Garayev for his excellent work in leading the session. Of course we would like to express our gratitude to the Rapporteur of the session and last but not least to the Secretariat of UNESCO. We are grateful to Dr Mechtild Rössler for her permanent advice and instructions to help the Committee to take always the best decisions, and the Centre and Committee Members for their support to find always the best solution always in the most delicate cases. Before closing my contribution, let me express my thanks to the electoral group for proposing Hungary to be elected for one of the Deputy Chairs of the Bureau. Thank you very much.

Chairperson:

Thank you so kindly. Bosnia and Herzegovina, please.

The Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

We join with the Members of the Committee and would like to thank Azerbaijan and Mr Garayev for the perfect organization. Every hour was perfectly organized starting with the opening ceremony which was fantastic and the extraordinary events for us and then what is very important—the work of the Committee here every day was full and very productive and especially important for us as a Member of the Committee the successfully changed policy of national and level and we move in two years like the previous 10 years thankful to be part of this group. Thank you once again.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.

The Delegation of Guatemala:

[Interpretation from Spanish] Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Guatemala would like to join with the other delegations that have expressed their congratulations to you and the Republic of Azerbaijan and the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and to all the support staff for having made this session successful. It represents progress in the implementation of the Convention's objectives for the protection of World Heritage. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.

The Delegation of Bahrain:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Just echoing the previous speakers and would like to again commend your wise leadership of this meeting and stress the general sense of consensus that has been experienced throughout this session and we look forward as well to continue in this spirit in the next two years with the Members of the Committee. On the organizational side as hosts of the last Committee meeting, we appreciate the hard work and effort that has been done by our colleagues here in Azerbaijan in a flawless Committee session and we thank all the team who have worked very hard. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Australia, please.

The Delegation of Australia:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. We firstly thank you for your fine stewardship of this meeting. It is a meeting that stands out to us as one where as a Committee we have worked very positively. There has been respectful dialogue and we've always sought to find consensus around sometimes difficult issues. That is only enabled through excellent chairing so we thank you for that. We very much want to express our appreciation to the Centre, to the Advisory Bodies for the huge amount of work that they do not just when we get to our meeting each year but throughout the course of the year to make this really one of the jewels of international conventions and we strongly affirm the great work that we do on behalf of everyone as Members of the Committee, collectively and the great support that we have received. I am really delighted that our Aussie Rapporteur, Mahani, has done such a wonderful job. We thought she was a little bit mad last year when she, with about five minutes notice, agreed to do the job and good on you, Mahani, for taking it on. Thank you, you have done brilliantly.

We've together inscribed some quite extraordinary places on the World Heritage List this year and of note, we have through the work of the World Heritage Committee and the diligence and dedication of the relevant States Parties, seen two places removed from the World Heritage in Danger List and we think that is a tremendous achievement and it provides guidance to us all and reminds us that the conservation of our existing World Heritage is such an important part of this Convention.

Lastly, I want to say that we will as the Australian delegation, be departing Baku with fond memories of this beautiful country, this beautiful city and its people. We had the opportunity yesterday to visit one of your World Heritage sites and it was a tremendous opportunity. But the spirit of the city is very much encapsulated by a little family-run restaurant that we attended a few nights ago. Each year we have an Aussie dinner where all the Australians and then a few other tag-alongs get together and we have a night of letting our hair down. We found this little family-run restaurant. About 30 of us turned up there. We had a wonderful meal; three generations of a local family and the hospitality, the hosting of us was just exceptional--energetic and enthusiastic and very much embracing of having a great group of international visitors there and that to us encapsulated more than anything else the spirit of Baku and that is a memory that will be with us forever. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

The Delegation of Zimbabwe:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Mr Chairperson, on behalf of the delegation of Zimbabwe, I wish to express our sincere appreciation to the Government and people of the State Party of Azerbaijan for hosting us in your beautiful and amazing city. We also want to thank you, yourself, Mr Chairperson for the excellent manner in which you steered the deliberations of the

43rd session of the World Heritage Committee together with the representative of Brazil. We also want to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for providing guidance and advice to this session. Our gratitude also goes to all the Members of the Committee for working together with us very well throughout the 10 days that we have been looking at the agenda of the 43rd session. Mr Chairperson, we want to wish you the best as we close this session. We wish the people of Azerbaijan the best because we have really enjoyed our stay here. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you so much. China, please.

The Delegation of China:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. The Chinese delegation wishes to draw on all the other Committee Members to express our deep appreciation for the warm hospitality of the Azerbaijani Government and also to congratulate you on this well-organized and successful meeting. Under your able leadership, Mr Chairperson, we have smoothly and successfully finished all the proscribed items and achieved great success and as the next host of the Committee session we wish to express again our welcome to all Committee Members, States Parties of the Convention and all other stakeholders our warm welcome to you to Fuzhou, China for the next Committee session. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. IUCN.

IUCN:

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Let me on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies also offer our thanks for the session here in particular to the Government of Azerbaijan for all the host country arrangements; all the organizers here have been very friendly, helpful and attentive and we greatly appreciated that. Our special thanks to you, sir, as Chair for your guidance and your very efficient time management which I think everybody has greatly appreciated, to Committee Members, to the World Heritage Centre colleagues, to my fellow Advisory Body colleagues, we offer thanks and we share common aspirations for heritage and humanity and it's always a great pleasure to be at the Committee and to share those views. We thank you for that. Let us also offer our thanks to the people of Baku who have been wonderful, warm and welcoming. We have a similar story to the one we heard from delegate of Australia. The Advisory Bodies ate dinner last night at a local restaurant and a table of local ladies offered us to dance which of course we did and then they brought us a cake at the end of the evening and I think this really typifies the wonderful warmth and hospitality of this fantastic city. We thank you for that and we look forward to working with you all again in China next year. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much for all these kind words about our country, about our city, about our traditions, food and organizing manner. Thank you very much. Now I will give the floor again to Ms Rössler.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre:

Thank you very much, Mr Chairperson. Just to inform you that I slipped one line in my text because I forgot one team which is our nominations team sitting behind me so I wanted to thank them also because that was not an intention but you all know the hard work they are doing so please excuse me and I give the floor back to the Chairperson.

Chairperson:

Without them it would not have been possible to achieve all these results. Observers. I can see one lady. Welcome.

Observer NGO (International Indigenous Peoples Forum on World Heritage):

Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Thank you for this opportunity to give this closing statement. On behalf of the International Indigenous Peoples Forum on World Heritage, I would like to make a short statement to express my thanks to the World Heritage Committee, States Parties, Advisory Bodies and other stakeholders for the support and work of the Indigenous Peoples Forum at this 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee meeting. We are pleased with the feedback of our back-to-back side event and interjections and participation in the Operational Guidelines, which have reflected our concerns that impact on indigenous peoples and we feel that it has been a very successful meeting for the Indigenous Peoples Forum. We look forward to continuing to be a useful forum in the World Heritage processes for all the States Parties, Advisory Bodies and indigenous peoples around the globe in World Heritage sites. I'd also like to express my gratitude to staff in the World Heritage Centre who helped us to organize the side event and assisted with our arrangements to get to this meeting. I've enjoyed this beautiful city of Baku and the positive experience of my first World Heritage Committee meeting. The icing on the cake so to speak for the Indigenous Peoples Forum and for me personally is the inscription of Budj Bim from Australia and Writing-on-Stone/Áísínai'pi from Canada as cultural landscapes for their indigenous cultural values. I would like to thank you sincerely, Mr Chairperson. Thank you.

Chairperson:

Thank you very much. So as far as we are coming to the end of this session, let me also make some comments on my behalf. Dear colleagues and friends, Members of the World Heritage Committee, representatives of States Parties, representatives of ICRROM, IUCN and ICOMOS, representatives of local communities and nongovernmental organizations, two weeks have passed, the Committee session is now going to close. First of all, I would like to thank you like in answer to all of you because in 2013 when I was chairing the Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee here in Baku I said that I never heard so many thanks. This time I want to repeat myself because this time I heard them even more because every intervention started with the words, thank you, Chair. Really I can't return to you the number of the thanks you have given to me but I thank you for such a polite apply to the leadership of the conference.

This session was attended by more than 2,300 participants including States Parties to the Convention, Observers from civil society and NGOs as well as representatives of the press. This number demonstrates the increasing interest the international community is paying to the preservation of World Heritage and to the work of our Committee. Our work was intense, constructive and enriching. The success of this session was possible thanks to our joint efforts, hard work, cooperation, spirit of mutual understanding and consultation and above all, our common commitment to the World Heritage Convention. Allow me to thank each and every Member of the World Heritage Committee. Your contributions have allowed me a smooth running of the session and helped us in taking decisions in the collective process of transparent and confident consultations involving every single body of the Convention.

Ladies and gentlemen, during these last days we reviewed the state of conservation of 166 properties and we inscribed 29 new sites on the World Heritage List. From now on, we have to do our utmost to ensure that these sites retain their Outstanding Universal Value for which they have been inscribed. It is our duty and responsibility in transmitting this heritage to future generations, and I must say the work is only beginning. In this regard, I was personally very impressed to witness the commitment of the young generation that actively participated in the Young Professionals Forum which we held here and in the interaction with the site managers meeting, who gathered here in this very building for their third meeting organized within the

framework of our session. This testifies to the involvement of the young generation in activities aimed at conservation of natural and cultural properties, building on the experience and knowledge of their elder colleagues.

Dear colleagues, I would like to express my sincere thanks to all of you for the trust you had in me during my office of chairing the work of the Committee. With your confidence and recognition, I succeeded in carrying out my duties. From your words I understood that it was done not bad and it was done not only during this period of time but it was done during the whole year when we were making preparations—we had meetings, discussions and reports on the preparation level. I am very grateful to you all my dear colleagues for your insistence and concerned efforts, assistance and support in making a lot of progress for the future of World Heritage. It was a pleasure for me working with you, the Committee Members, the Bureau, States Parties and Advisory Bodies in the implementation of such a precious instrument as the World Heritage Convention.

I also very much appreciated the continuous commitment of the Director-General of UNESCO, Madam Azoulay who honoured us with her presence and participated in the opening ceremony. The Assistant Director-General of Culture, Ernesto Ottone who left early this morning with all the results taken in consideration. The Director of the World Heritage Centre, Ms Rössler, without whom I would never achieve such a big understanding of World Heritage in general because we've known each other for almost 12 years. The first time was at the 2006 meeting in Vilnius. It was in Vilnius when the Baku site was on the Danger List and then we did our best to present Baku like you see it today. This was the result of the dedication given to the responsibilities through inscribing to the Danger List. I would not like to forget the personal assistants who are doing a lot of things along with me. Allow me also to thank the young volunteers for their dedicated efforts in making this session a success.

I would like to tell you that the President of the country issued a special decree according to which half a year we had a state organizing committee, which I had to chair with the numerous representatives of the all the states bodies who made the process with entering the city and your meeting participation possible. I would like to thank media, TV and the technical team who provided the possibility to the whole world to see what we are doing here in a direct line and immediate access to the information. I would like to thank the leadership of the Baku Congress Center where we have this very efficient meeting, for their dedication. I would like to thank drivers, hotel staff, security staff, catering staff—all those who participated in the preparation to make this conference smooth and successful.

Allow me also to express how grateful I am for the outstanding support to our Rapporteur. Ms Mahani Taylor from Australia has given to me personally and to you as a Committee in guiding our work. This was a wonderful effort on her part for which we are truly grateful. My thanks also goes to the Vice-Chairpersons who have offered invaluable advice during the Bureau meetings held during this session, to the Bureau meetings, to the Bureau members. A special thanks to my dear friend, her Excellency, Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis, Ambassador of Brazil who efficiently assisted me in chairing the session.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am certain that you will join me in sincerely congratulating my successor, His Excellency Tian Xuejun to whom I shall gladly pass the world of experience I have gained in this post. Congratulations again. His Excellency is not here but please deliver my congratulations to him and you can count on our experience to be shared with you at any time during this year.

Before I proceed to the closing words, I would like to make, because I'm still the Chairperson, two announcements. One announcement is connected with our proposal after this meeting to immediately proceed to the front entrance by the escalators in front of the flags to make a family photo in commemorating our meeting here in Baku. Secondly, I consider that our

meeting is not closed finally even when I declare it closed but because we invite all of you, all participants to the reception today in the traditional restaurant outside the city. At 6p.m. buses will be ready to pick you up and the hotels, for those hotels which don't have shuttles because there are some we propose for you to come to the Hilton Hotel where you will take the buses at 6 p.m. and the buses will bring you back again to the Hilton Hotel in the centre of the city. So, I hope you will enjoy the evening reception to have some impression of the traditional and modern music and food of Azerbaijan.

So thank you very much and now on behalf of the Government of Azerbaijan, on behalf of the President of the country, first Vice-President of the country I would like to reiterate how honored we have been to welcome you all in our country and this beautiful city, Baku. I sincerely hope that you had time to enjoy your stay and that you will take back home great memories of your visit and we hope that you will return many, many time. Wishing you all a safe journey back, I officially declare the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO closed [applause].

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.

BAKU DECLARATION ON THE PROTECTION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

(43rd session of the World Heritage Committee, Baku, 1 July 2019)

We, members of the World Heritage Committee, gathered in Baku today on the occasion of its 43rd session, declare the following:

1. **Recognizing** that the World Heritage Convention since its inception has become the most widely accepted international legal instrument for the protection of cultural and natural heritage;
2. **Recognizing also** the importance to the protection of cultural and natural heritage of upholding the integrity and credibility of the World Heritage Convention;
3. **Highlighting** the critical importance of the world's cultural and natural heritage for the mankind;
4. **Emphasizing** that the cultural heritage and the natural heritage are increasingly threatened with destruction not only by the traditional causes of decay, accidents and natural disasters, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction;
5. **Underlining** that the *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* demonstrates that world's ecosystems and biodiversity are deteriorating faster than at any time in human history, undermining humanity's well-being and future existence;
6. **Mindful** of the fact that deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world;
7. **Stressing** the importance of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2347 (2017) which is its first Resolution that highlights the importance of strengthening the link between the protection of cultural heritage and the maintenance of international peace and security, and welcomes the central role played by UNESCO in protecting cultural heritage and promoting culture as an instrument to bring people together and foster dialogue;
8. **Reaffirming** the relevant United Nations Security Council and General Assembly Resolutions, in particular UNSC resolutions 2199 (2015) and 2253 (2015);
9. **Reiterating** the commitments undertaken through the 2002 Budapest Declaration on World Heritage, the 2015 Bonn Declaration on World Heritage in order to strengthen the international protection of cultural and natural heritage and the 2016 Istanbul Declaration on the protection of World Heritage;

10. **Recalling** the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its two (1954 and 1999) Protocols, Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970) and the 2015 Strategy for the Reinforcement of UNESCO's Action for the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Action Plan;
11. **Recalling further** the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity, the 1973 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, and the 1971 Ramsar Convention on Wetlands;
12. **Reaffirming** the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as a plan of action for people, planet and prosperity, and other development strategies adopted at the regional level;
13. **Distressed** by the continued destruction of natural and cultural heritage in the conflict affected territories such as the increase of illegal excavations at archaeological sites, as well as the looting and illicit trafficking of cultural objects and the illegal exploitation of natural resources, including the poaching of wildlife species, threatening existing natural and cultural World Heritage and potential future sites;
14. **Calling attention** to the concerning outlook for many World Heritage properties posed by climate change;

15. **Express gratitude** to the Government of Azerbaijan for generous hosting the 43rd session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee;
16. **Encourage** countries that have not yet joined the Convention to do so at the earliest opportunity, as well as all UNESCO standard-setting instruments in the field of culture, and other related international heritage protection instruments;
17. **Further encourage** all States Parties to support the effective implementation of the World Heritage Convention and invite the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and States Parties to enhance inclusive dialogue and cooperation to this end;
18. **Welcome** the efforts to reform the processes of the World Heritage Committee and strengthen dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies to reinforce the integrity and credibility of the Convention;
19. **Invite** all States Parties to prioritise the effective protection, conservation and management of World Heritage properties situated on their territories in consistency with the "Policy Document for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention";
20. **Call on** UNESCO Secretariat to further enhance the synergies among cultural and biodiversity-related Conventions with a view of ensuring comprehensive approach for heritage protection;

21. **Welcome** UNESCO's Revive the spirit of Mosul Initiative and **recall** the obligation of all States Parties to safeguard cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value at national and international levels and to take all appropriate legal and policy measures in that direction, including in times of conflict;
22. **Appreciate** UNESCO's actions and efforts for preservation of natural and cultural heritage during armed conflicts, including the preparation and publication of the Military Manual on Protection of Cultural Property;
23. **Encourage** all States Parties to support World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy, giving emphasis to Priority Africa;
24. **Call on** all stakeholders to integrate the human dimension at the heart of sustainable recovery and reconstruction and to intensify cooperation by the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value;
25. **Call upon** States Parties to enhance proactive policies towards the protection and rehabilitation of cultural and natural heritage sites, especially those included on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
26. **Stress** the urgent need to address emerging global challenges and diverse factors such as climate change, natural and human-made disasters and other various pressures on heritage properties.

DÉCLARATION DE BAKOU SUR LA PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE CULTUREL ET NATUREL

(43^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, Bakou, 1^{er} juillet 2019)

Nous, membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial réunis aujourd'hui à Bakou à l'occasion de sa 43^e session, déclarons ce qui suit :

1. **Reconnaissant** que la Convention du patrimoine mondial est devenue depuis sa création l'instrument juridique international le plus largement reconnu pour la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel ;
2. **Reconnaissant également** l'importance pour la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel de préserver l'intégrité et la crédibilité de la Convention du patrimoine mondial ;
3. **Faisant valoir** l'importance cruciale du patrimoine culturel et naturel mondial pour l'humanité ;
4. **Soulignant** que le patrimoine culturel et le patrimoine naturel sont de plus en plus menacés de destruction non seulement par les causes traditionnelles de dégradation, d'accidents et de catastrophes naturelles, mais aussi par les changements des conditions sociales et économiques qui aggravent la situation par des phénomènes encore plus exceptionnels de dommages ou de destruction ;
5. **Soulignant** que le *Rapport d'évaluation mondiale sur la biodiversité et les services écosystémiques* démontre que les écosystèmes et la biodiversité du monde se détériorent plus rapidement qu'à aucun autre moment de l'histoire de l'humanité, ce qui compromet le bien-être de l'humanité et son existence future ;
6. **Conscients** du fait que la détérioration ou la disparition de tout élément du patrimoine culturel ou naturel constitue un appauvrissement néfaste du patrimoine de toutes les nations du monde ;
7. **Soulignant** l'importance de la résolution 2347 (2017) du Conseil de sécurité des Nations Unies, la première résolution soulignant l'importance de renforcer le lien entre la protection du patrimoine culturel et le maintien de la paix et de la sécurité internationales, et saluant le rôle central joué par l'UNESCO pour protéger le patrimoine culturel et promouvoir la culture comme instrument de rapprochement des peuples et de dialogue ;
8. **Réaffirmant** les résolutions pertinentes du Conseil de sécurité et de l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies, en particulier les résolutions 2199 (2015) et 2253 (2015) du CSNU ;
9. **Réitérant** les engagements pris dans la Déclaration de Budapest sur le patrimoine mondial de 2002, la Déclaration de Bonn sur le patrimoine mondial de 2015 afin de renforcer la protection internationale du patrimoine culturel et naturel et la Déclaration d'Istanbul sur la protection du patrimoine mondial de 2016 ;

10. **Rappelant** la Convention de La Haye de 1954 pour la protection des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé et ses deux Protocoles (1954 et 1999), la Convention concernant les mesures à prendre pour interdire et empêcher l'importation, l'exportation et le transfert de propriété illicites des biens culturels (1970) et la Stratégie pour renforcer l'action de l'UNESCO pour la protection de la culture et la promotion du pluralisme culturel en temps de conflit armé et son Plan d'action pour 2015 ;
11. **Rappelant en outre** la Convention sur la diversité biologique de 1992, la Convention sur le commerce international des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages menacées d'extinction de 1973 et la Convention de Ramsar de 1971 sur les zones humides ;
12. **Réaffirmant** l'Agenda 2030 pour le développement durable en tant que plan d'action pour les peuples, la planète et la prospérité, et les autres stratégies de développement adoptées au niveau régional ;
13. **Affligés** par la destruction continue du patrimoine naturel et culturel dans les territoires en situation de conflit, comme l'augmentation des fouilles illégales sur les sites archéologiques, le pillage et le trafic illicite d'objets culturels et l'exploitation illégale des ressources naturelles, y compris le braconnage d'espèces sauvages, qui menacent le patrimoine mondial naturel et culturel existant et les sites futurs potentiels ;
14. **Attirant l'attention** sur les perspectives préoccupantes suscitées par le changement climatique pour de nombreux biens du patrimoine mondial ;

15. **Exprimons notre gratitude** au gouvernement de l'Azerbaïdjan pour avoir généreusement accueilli la 43^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO ;
16. **Encourageons** les pays qui n'ont pas encore ratifié la Convention à le faire dès que possible, ainsi que tous les instruments normatifs de l'UNESCO dans le domaine de la culture et les autres instruments internationaux connexes de protection du patrimoine ;
17. **Encourageons en outre** tous les États parties à soutenir la mise en œuvre effective de la Convention du patrimoine mondial et invitons le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les organisations consultatives et les États parties à renforcer le dialogue inclusif et la coopération à cette fin ;
18. **Saluons** les efforts visant à réformer les processus du Comité du patrimoine mondial et à renforcer le dialogue entre les États parties et les organisations consultatives pour renforcer l'intégrité et la crédibilité de la Convention ;
19. **Invitons** tous les États parties à donner la priorité à la protection, à la conservation et à la gestion efficaces des biens du patrimoine mondial situés sur leur territoire, conformément au « Document d'orientation pour l'intégration d'une perspective de développement durable dans les processus de la Convention du patrimoine mondial » ;
20. **Demandons** au Secrétariat de l'UNESCO de renforcer plus avant les synergies entre les conventions relatives à la culture et à la biodiversité en vue d'assurer une approche globale de la protection du patrimoine ;

21. **Nous félicitons** de l'initiative de l'UNESCO « Faire revivre l'esprit de Mossoul » et **rappelons** l'obligation qui incombe à tous les États parties de sauvegarder le patrimoine culturel et naturel de valeur universelle exceptionnelle aux niveaux national et international et de prendre toutes les mesures juridiques et politiques appropriées dans ce sens, notamment en période de conflit ;
22. **Apprécions** les actions et les efforts de l'UNESCO pour la préservation du patrimoine naturel et culturel pendant les conflits armés, y compris la préparation et la publication du Manuel militaire pour la protection des biens culturels ;
23. **Encourageons** tous les États parties à soutenir la Stratégie de renforcement des capacités du patrimoine mondial, en mettant l'accent sur la priorité Afrique ;
24. **Appelons** toutes les parties prenantes à intégrer la dimension humaine au cœur du relèvement et de la reconstruction durables et à intensifier la coopération de la communauté internationale dans son ensemble pour participer à la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel de valeur universelle exceptionnelle ;
25. **Invitons** les États parties à renforcer les politiques proactives de protection et de réhabilitation des sites du patrimoine culturel et naturel, en particulier ceux figurant sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril ;
26. **Soulignons** la nécessité urgente de faire face aux nouveaux défis mondiaux et à divers facteurs tels que le changement climatique, les catastrophes naturelles et d'origine humaine et autres pressions diverses sur les biens du patrimoine.