

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL
AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Ninth Ordinary Session

Unesco Headquarters, 2 - 6 December 1985

Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Nominations to the World Heritage List

1. At its Ninth session, the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee examined 38 nominations to the World Heritage List.
2. After examining these nominations, the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe 29 properties to which should be added 3 nominations recommended for inscription but deferred by the Committee at its 7th or 8th Session and for which additional information is now available.
3. With regard to some of these properties, the Bureau expressed the wish that the States concerned complete or modify the nominations and that additional information be sent to the Secretariat. The information received in reply has been sent to the competent non-governmental organization and has been added to the summary of the Bureau's comments on the property concerned.
4. The Bureau furthermore, decided to defer the following nominations; two neolithic dwellings in Stara Zagora (Bulgaria), the Archaeological Site of Kourion (Cyprus), the Old Town of Carcassonne (France), Chaco Culture National Historical Park and Glacier National Park (United States of America)
5. Finally, the Bureau recommended to the Committee not to inscribe 4 properties, which are also listed below. The Bureau also recommended to the Committee to uphold its decision and therefore not to inscribe the Archaeological site of the city of Ptolemais (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), on the World Heritage List.

A. Properties recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N^o</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with</u> <u>the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>The Historic Mosque City</u> <u>of Bagerhat</u>	321	Bangladesh	C(iv)

At its 8th Session, this property was deferred by the Committee since it deemed that the site was threatened by the plan to widen the Khulna highway which passes close by the mosques of Shait-Gumbad and Singar. It therefore requested the Government to:(1) study the possibility of altering the route of this highway and (2) to elaborate a conservation and management plan along the lines of the conclusions of the Unesco mission which took place in 1983.

The Authorities of Bangladesh have informed the Secretariat that the planned road would be but a narrow link-road not meant to be used by heavy traffic which will provide a shorter and better approach to the monuments and that the project document, prepared as a follow-up to the International Appeal launched by the Director-General of Unesco, follows the recommendations of the Master plan prepared by the 1983 mission.

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification N^o</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur</u>	322	Bangladesh	C(i)(ii)(vi)
<p>The Bureau recommended that the Government apply the measures which were proposed for this site by the same Unesco mission, particularly so as to avoid the installation of industries in the proximity of the monastery.</p> <p>The Authorities of Bangladesh have informed the Secretariat that the deposits are located 8 miles from Paharpur and that a large area around the site is being acquired by the Department of Archaeology and Museums in accordance with the Masterplan.</p>			
<u>Royal Palaces of Abomey</u>	323	Benin	C (iii)(v)
<p>The Bureau brought the Beninese authorities' attention to the need for a careful and strict restoration and taking account of the considerable damage caused by the 1984 tornado, the Bureau recommended that Benin present a request for inscription of this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.</p> <p>On 16 September 1985 the Authorities of Benin submitted such a request.</p>			
<u>Salvador de Bahia (Historic Centre)</u>	309	Brazil	C (iv)(vi)
<u>Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Congonhas</u>	334	Brazil	C (i)(iv)

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N^o</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with</u> <u>the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Iguaçu National Park</u>	355	Brazil	N (iii)(iv)
<p>(1) The Bureau expressed satisfaction that a study of regional repercussions of deforestation and other developments on the natural integrity of the park was envisaged. (2) The Bureau asked the Secretariat to obtain more details about the possibility mentioned by IUCN of a hydro-electric project inside or near the park. (3) The Bureau recommended the Secretariat to seek an agreement between the Brazilian and Argentine authorities to envisage considering the National Parks of Iguazu and Iguaçu (situated respectively in Argentina and Brazil) as a single trans-frontier World Heritage site in order to encourage cooperative efforts in the management of these two contiguous parks.</p> <p>The question has been raised with the Brazilian authorities who will provide the relevant information to the Secretariat as soon as possible.</p>			
<u>Thracian Tomb of Sveshtari</u>	359	Bulgaria	C (i)(iii)
<u>Quebec</u> <u>(Historic Area)</u>	300	Canada	C (iv)(vi)
<u>Painted Churches in the Troodos Region</u>	351	Cyprus	C(ii)(iii)(iv)

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification N^o</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Pont du Gard (Roman Aqueduct)</u> The Bureau drew the attention of the French authorities to the importance of strictly protecting the site's surroundings.	344	France	C(i)(iii)(iv)
<u>St. Mary's Cathedral and Saint Michael's Church of Hildesheim</u>	187 Rev.	Germany (Federal Republic of	C(i)(ii)(iii)
<u>Kaziranga National Park</u> The Bureau encouraged the Indian authorities to provide the legal basis to protect the buffer zone south of the park (Mikir Hills and the Karbi Plateau). The Bureau also expressed concern over the impact of the planned construction of a railway line along the southern boundary of the Park and asked the Secretariat to obtain more information about this from the Indian authorities. This information has been requested from the Indian authorities and should be received by the Secretariat before 1 November.	337	India	N(ii)(iv)
<u>Manas Wildlife Sanctuary</u> The Bureau noted with satisfaction the plans for extending the Sanctuary's northwest boundary and to strengthen protection by upgrading the area to national	338	India	N(ii)(iii)(iv)

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification N^o</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<p>park status. The Bureau also expressed its concern at the possibility of a hydro-electric dam being constructed in the Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in Bhutan.</p>			
<u>Keoladeo National Park</u>	340	India	N (iv)
<p>The Bureau commended the Indian authorities on their recent efforts to strengthen the protection of this park and encouraged them to finish the Park Management plan which is currently being drawn up.</p>			
<u>Hatra</u>	277 Rev.	Iraq	C(vi)
<p>At its 7th session, the Committee deferred this site as the Authorities of Iraq had not yet defined the precise perimeter of protection. In September 1985 the Authorities submitted a map indicating the delimitation of the zone proposed for inscription.</p>			
<u>Jerash</u>	324	Jordan	C
<p>The Bureau recommended the property for inscription on condition that the Jordanian government states precisely what its boundaries are, provides a management plan for the sites, and gives assurances that future restoration would be conducted with the strictest respect for the authenticity of the property.</p>			

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N°</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with</u> <u>the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<p>In October 1985 the Authorities of Jordan sent a map indicating the delimitation of the property proposed for inscription and have stated in writing that they will preserve the authenticity of the site.</p>			
<u>Petra (Archaeological site)</u>	326	Jordan	C
<p>The Bureau recommended the property for inscription on condition that the Jordanian government states precisely what its boundaries are.</p>			
<p>In October 1985 the Authorities of Jordan sent a map indicating the delimitation of the zone submitted for inscription and have stated in writing that they will preserve the authenticity of the site.</p>			
<u>Quseir Amra</u>	327	Jordan	C(i)(iii)(iv)
<u>Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus</u>	287	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	C(iii)
<p>The Bureau noted the declarations of the representative of Algeria who indicated that the Algerian and Libyan authorities were coordinating their efforts to protect Tassili N'Ajjer and Tadrart Acacus.</p>			
<u>The Medina of Marrakesh</u>	331	Morocco	C(i)(ii)(iv)(v)
<p>The Bureau called the attention of the Moroccan authorities to the need to ensure that Marrakesh conserve its excep-</p>			

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N°</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with</u> <u>the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<p>tional character of a completely preserved historic town; in this connection it would be advisable to avoid any breaching of the ramparts, to protect carefully the Medina and in particular its gardens, and also to ensure the protection of the surroundings of Marrakesh, in particular the palm grove, the Menara, and the gardens of Bab Djedid, by strictly enforcing the management plan adopted in 1981.</p>			
<u>The Alta Petroglyphs</u>	352	Norway	C(iii)
<u>Chavin (Archaeological Site)</u>	330	Peru	C (iii)
<u>Huascarán National Park</u>	333	Peru	N (ii)(iii)
<p>The Bureau asked the Secretariat to inform the Peruvian authorities that the recommendation for inscription concerned only the Huascarán National Park (and not the Callejon de Huaylas and the Cordillera Blanca). Moreover, the Bureau encouraged the Peruvian authorities to intensify their efforts in the management of the Park.</p>			
<u>Altamira Cave</u>	310	Spain	C (i)(iii)
<u>Roman Aqueduct, Segovia</u>	311	Spain	C
<p>The Bureau recommended the property for inscription on condition that it be redefined so as to include at the same time the old town which forms with the aqueduct an inseparable whole.</p>			

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N°</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with</u> <u>the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Churches of the Kingdom of the Asturias</u> (<u>Sta. Maria del Naranco,</u> <u>San Miguel de Lillo,</u> <u>Sta. Cristina de Lena</u>)	312	Spain	C(i)(ii)(iv)
<u>Santiago de Compostela</u> (<u>Old town</u>)	347	Spain	C(i)(ii)(vi)
<u>The Walls of Avila</u>	348	Spain	C
<p>The Bureau recommended the property for inscription on condition that it be redefined so as to include at the same time the old town intra-muros, and the extra-muros Romanesque churches of San Segundo, San Vicente, San Andres and San Pedro.</p>			
<u>Punic Town of Kerkuane</u>	332	Tunisia	C (iii)
<u>Historic zones of Istanbul</u>	356	Turkey	C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)
<u>Göreme Valley</u>	357	Turkey	C(i)(iii)(v) N (iii)

The Bureau was of the opinion that the outstanding universal value of this property justified without a doubt its inscription on the World Heritage List. However, the present delimitation of the site nominated appeared to be rather restricted since it encompassed neither the National park in its entirety (which would be desirable according to IUCN), nor the sites of Karain, Karlik, Yesilöz and Soganli, and the subterranean cities of Kaymakli and Derinkuyu (which ICOMOS recommended for inclusion). The Bureau

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N°</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with</u> <u>the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
-------------------------	------------------------------------	--	-----------------

therefore decided that additional information should be requested from the Turkish government. On 9 September 1985, the Turkish Authorities informed the Secretariat that they approved the insertion of the sites of Karain, Yesilöz, Soganli and of the subterranean cities of Kaymakli and Derinkuyu in the zone proposed for inscription.

<u>Great Mosque and Hospital of Divrigi</u>	358	Turkey	C(i) (iv)
---	-----	--------	-----------

B. Properties not to be considered for inscription on the List

<u>Coco Island National Park</u>	329	Costa Rica	
----------------------------------	-----	------------	--

The Bureau recognized the interest of this property for its flora, and its importance in the Costa Rican context, but felt that it did not fulfill the criterion of 'outstanding universal value'.

<u>Abbey of St. Nicolas de Tolentin in Brou</u>	346	France	
---	-----	--------	--

While recognizing the great importance of this site for the French national heritage, the Bureau was of the opinion that it did not fulfill the criterion of 'outstanding universal value' as understood by the World Heritage Committee, considering the existence in Europe of other more representative examples of late Gothic architecture.

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N°</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with</u> <u>the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Karak Castle</u>	325	Jordan	
While recognising the value of this site, the Bureau was of the opinion that it did not constitute the most representative example of Frankish fortifications.			
<u>Tabaqat Fahl (Pella)</u>	328	Jordan	
While recognizing the great interest of this site, the Bureau was of the opinion that it did not fulfill the criterion of 'outstanding universal value' as understood by the World Heritage Committee.			
<u>Archaeological site of the City of Ptolemaïs</u>	301	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	

At its 8th Session, the Committee decided not to inscribe the archaeological site of Ptolemaïs on the World Heritage List, with the following comment:

"The Committee, while taking account of the great importance of this site for the Libyan national heritage, felt that it did not fulfill the criteria of 'outstanding universal value' as understood by the World Heritage Committee".

At its 9th session, the Bureau took note of a letter from the Permanent Delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, dated April 29, 1985, addressed to the Chairman of the Committee. In it the Libyan authorities referred to the additional documentation on the archaeological site of the city of Ptolemaïs furnished since the 8th session of the Committee and underlined in particular the importance of this city's water reservoir dating from the 3rd century B.C. and hoped that the nomination of this property would be re-examined.

The Bureau referring to the "consultation" with the State Party foreseen in Article 11, paragraph 6 of the Convention, concluded in favour of the receivability of the request for re-examination. It took note of the comments made by the ICOMOS representative who proposed drafting a complete evaluation and sending it to the Secretariat for presentation to the Committee. He underlined the fact that ICOMOS had studied the new documents and information provided by the Libyan authorities and, moreover, had already taken into account in 1984 the presence of the ancient

reservoir in question. No additional information was furnished that would be likely to alter the judgement of ICOMOS on the intrinsic qualities of this site. It was indeed of very great archaeological interest. However, the cities founded by Alexander or his Generals, called Alexandria or Pella, the numerous cities founded by Ptolomies or Seleucids, called Ptolemaïs or Seleucia, all testify equally to an important historical phenomenon: the new organization of the Hellenistic World subsequent to Alexander's conquests. Furthermore, many sites around the Mediterranean (around 50, perhaps) can be considered to be of equal worth to Ptolemaïs and the Committee had already considered that some of these should not be inscribed. Unless the Committee changed its policy, the 1984 evaluation of Ptolemaïs by ICOMOS was still valid. If, on the contrary, the Bureau decided to re-interpret the criteria in such a way as to allow the inscription of Ptolemaïs, as of other properties of equal worth, the ICOMOS could take into account this new orientation and revise its evaluation at the Bureau's request.

After a debate on the question, the Bureau unanimously decided to recommend to the World Heritage Committee to uphold its decision and therefore not to inscribe the archaeological site of the city of Ptolemaïs on the World Heritage List.

On 10 September 1985 the Permanent Delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya sent a letter regarding this nomination to the Director of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee. This letter, together with the letter dated 29 April 1985 from the Delegation, will be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee at its 9th Session.