

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, Paris, 2-6 December 1985

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The ninth session of the World Heritage Committee was held at Unesco Headquarters in Paris from 2 to 6 December 1985. It was attended by the following States Members of the World Heritage Committee: Algeria, Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Guinea, India, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Norway, Sri Lanka, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen Arab Republic and Zaire.

2. Representatives of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity.

3. The following 24 States Parties to the Convention, not members of the Committee, were represented by observers: Argentina, Cameroon, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Haiti, Holy See, Hungary, Iraq, Italy, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia and the United Kingdom. A representative of ALECSO, of the Council of Europe, of the League of Arab States, the President of the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA), the Chairman of the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (IFPC) and a representative of the International Union of Architects (IUA) also attended the meeting. The full list of participants is to be found in Annex I to this report.

II. OPENING OF THE SESSION

4. On behalf of the Director-General of Unesco, Mr. M. Makagiansar, Assistant Director-General for Culture, welcomed the participants, especially the new members of the Committee elected at the recent General Assembly of States Parties. After referring to the success of the Convention, with 88 States Parties to date, the Assistant Director-General drew attention to the main items on the Committee's agenda at its ninth session: the growing number of nominations to the World Heritage List, the problems of protection and management of properties on the List and the balance of the List; the need for tentative lists; the elaboration of criteria for mixed properties and rural landscapes; and finally, the financial situation of the Fund, which had a direct impact on the implementation of international assistance - a situation that was less healthy than in certain previous years. In his conclusion, he referred to the Secretariat's efforts to produce promotional material regarding the Convention.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. At the request of the IUCN representative, an item was added to the agenda concerning the status of conservation of natural properties included in the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. The agenda, thus amended, was adopted by the Committee.

IV. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN, VICE-CHAIRMEN AND RAPPORTEUR

6. Mr. Amini Aza MTURI (United Republic of Tanzania) was elected Chairman of the Committee by acclamation. Mr. Alex T. Davidson (Canada) was elected Rapporteur, and the representatives of the following States Parties were elected Vice-Chairmen, also by acclamation: Algeria, Bulgaria, India, Mexico and Norway.

7. The outgoing Chairman, Mr. J. Gazaneo (Argentina), congratulated the new Chairman and members of the Bureau on their election. He wished to convey some recent information to the Committee and make a few suggestions for the future. Mr. Gazaneo informed the Committee that an international conference, held at Solo (Indonesia), on "Tourism and Heritage in the Pacific", in which he had taken part as Chairman of the Committee. He drew the Committee's attention to the large number of endangered properties in the region and the need for the various organizations concerned to make concerted efforts to safeguard them. He considered, moreover, that the time had come to apply photogrammetry and remote sensing techniques to show the state of sites at the time of their inscription and thus be able to assess their subsequent development.

V. REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

8. The Secretary, Mr. B. von Droste, Director, Division of Ecological Sciences, reported on activities undertaken since the Committee's eighth session held in Buenos Aires from 29 October to 2 November 1984. He began by reviewing the general status of implementation of the Convention, announcing that six new States, viz. in chronological order, Qatar, New Zealand, Sweden, Dominican Republic, Hungary and Philippines had adhered to the Convention, bringing the number of States Parties to 88. The Convention thus continued to arouse

the interest of an increasing number of States. It was to be noted, however, that the geographical representation of States was still very uneven, with few States Parties from the Asian and Eastern European regions. Furthermore, while the number of nominations for inclusion in the World Heritage List was growing steadily, too few States (only 23) had as yet provided tentative lists, which were needed for evaluations of nominations to the List. It was also necessary to make sure that a balance was maintained between cultural and natural properties so as to abide by the spirit of the Convention; the present ratio being two-thirds/one-third. The state of the World Heritage Fund continued to be a major concern, despite the payment of a number of mandatory contributions. The level of the Fund's resources was in fact lower than in previous years (1980-1983), whereas the number of States Parties and entries on the World Heritage List had grown substantially.

9. He then reviewed activities since the Committee's eighth session in terms of preparatory assistance, technical co-operation, training and emergency assistance. On the subject of promotional activities, the Secretary said that an exhibit had been produced with the support of the Spanish Ministry of Cultural Properties and shown successively in Madrid, Canada and in the metro in Paris. He called on States to avail themselves of the Secretariat's copy of the exhibit - or to have it reproduced - for circulation in their own countries.

10. The Secretary stressed the excellent co-operation with ICOMOS and IUCN, but emphasized the fact that the Secretariat's workload had increased considerably while the number of staff working for the implementation of the Convention had remained the same since the Convention had become operational. He thanked the Canadian authorities for having provided the Secretariat with the services of an expert for two years.

11. He concluded his statement by underscoring the challenges to be faced at the beginning of the second decade of the Convention - its universality, commitment and mobilization of States Parties, in particular by establishing national structures for the implementation of the Convention, and making the public aware of the need to safeguard the world heritage.

12. In response to the Secretary's report, the Committee expressed the view that the Director-General's attention should be drawn to the situation of the Secretariat and the need to strengthen it. The Chairman of the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture and the representative of ALECSO reiterated their offer to co-operate with the World Heritage Committee.

VI. REPORT ON THE NINTH SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (Paris, 3-6 June 1985)

13. The Secretariat presented the report of the ninth session of the Bureau and an amendment to that report proposed by the representative of Algeria. The Committee took note of the report as amended.

VII. ANALYSIS OF TRENDS IN NOMINATIONS

14. Introducing agenda item 6, the Secretariat recalled the Bureau's proposals as contained in the report of the ninth session. It was pointed out that, in addition to the question of the growing number of nominations, the real

problem raised by development of the Convention was that of monitoring the status of conservation of properties included on the List.

15. In regard to the Bureau's proposed measures to reduce the number of nominations to be processed each year, the Committee was of the view that it was preferable not to lay down strict rules but rather to appeal to States that already had a large number of properties on the List to restrict their nominations voluntarily. At the same time, the Committee recalled that ICOMOS could evaluate nominations only from States Parties which had submitted tentative lists.

16. On the subject of monitoring the status of conservation of properties on the List, the Committee requested IUCN to report on its system of monitoring the status, not only of natural World Heritage properties, but also of endangered species and natural habitats. The IUCN system is based at the Conservation Monitoring Centre at Cambridge (United Kingdom) and has close links with the Global Environmental Monitoring System of the United Nations Environment Programme. IUCN is assisted by 4000 voluntary correspondents located in 126 countries who report regularly to the Conservation Monitoring Centre. Thus, IUCN is in a position to obtain reliable and up-to-date information on almost all natural World Heritage properties. This year IUCN would be reporting on 12 of the 56 natural World Heritage sites, a task which was assuming larger proportions than that of evaluating new proposals. In general, between 8 and 13 new nominations were examined each year, a number which IUCN considered reasonable. The representative of IUCN underlined the importance of regularly monitoring the quality of World Heritage properties and suggested that the Committee might follow-up the proposals for monitoring made to the Committee at its seventh session in Florence (Italy) in 1983.

17. The Committee acknowledged that a solution should be found to enable the Committee to be kept regularly informed of the status of conservation of cultural as well as natural properties. Such information should be collated at regular intervals, yet to be determined, and could be collected by expert missions, through questionnaires sent out to States, or with the help of ICOMOS national committees. This could only be done, however, if ICOMOS were provided with the necessary funds. In addition, the Secretariat informed the Committee of the forthcoming Unesco publication of a "Manual for the Management of World Cultural Heritage Sites" aimed at the persons responsible for the preservation of these sites.

18. The Committee considered that it was premature to adopt a monitoring system for cultural properties and that possible solutions and their financial implications should first be studied in depth. It recommended that ICOMOS and ICCROM should take the procedures adopted by IUCN for monitoring the status of natural properties as a guide, and make proposals to the Bureau at its tenth session.

VIII. TENTATIVE LISTS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES

19. The Secretariat recalled that at its seventh session the World Heritage Committee had invited States Parties that had not already done so to submit tentative lists of cultural and natural properties on their territories which they were considering nominating for inclusion in the World Heritage List during the next five to ten years. Such tentative lists, drawn up in conformity with Article 11.1 of the Convention concerning the submission of inventories,

were invaluable for purposes of comparison and appreciation of the value of nominated properties in the widest possible context. They were particularly necessary where cultural properties were concerned. As had been announced at the seventh session of the World Heritage Committee, since the beginning of 1985 ICOMOS was no longer examining any nominations from States Parties that had not submitted tentative lists.

20. Since the World Heritage Committee's eighth session, the Secretariat had received new or revised tentative lists from the following countries: Algeria, Cyprus, Germany (Federal Republic of), Guyana, Morocco, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain and Tunisia. The Beninese authorities informed the Committee that they intended to nominate only one property within the next few years, and Canada that it wished to include the Waterton National Park on its tentative list.

21. The Secretariat indicated that of the new tentative lists received, the lists of cultural properties submitted by Cyprus, Germany (Fed. Rep. of), Peru, Portugal and Spain had already been discussed by ICOMOS with the States Parties concerned and could therefore be regarded as final. The Secretariat stressed how important it was for ICOMOS and IUCN to give their opinion on the tentative lists, one reason being to give the States concerned an idea of which of their proposed nominations were unlikely to be accepted.

22. The Secretariat recalled that 23 States Parties had so far submitted tentative lists, some of which were in the process of being revised. The following countries had submitted tentative lists of cultural properties and natural properties: Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, France, Ghana, India, Italy, Morocco, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Turkey and the United States of America. Tentative lists of cultural properties only had been received from following countries: Algeria, Benin, Germany (Federal Republic of), Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Spain and Tunisia.

23. The Secretariat noted that the tentative lists for Greece and the United Kingdom had just been received. The representative of Denmark informed the Committee that her country was in the process of drawing up a tentative list.

24. In conclusion, the Chairman emphasized how urgent it was for States Parties that had not already done so, to submit tentative lists, and reminded Committee members that, if need be, preparatory assistance under the World Heritage Fund might be made available to States for that purpose.

IX. ELABORATION OF GUIDELINES FOR THE IDENTIFICATION AND NOMINATION OF MIXED CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES OR RURAL LANDSCAPES

25. The representative of IUCN recalled that this question had been first raised at the eighth session of the Committee at Buenos Aires (Argentina) in 1984 and that the Committee had requested IUCN to consult with ICOMOS and the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) to organise a task force on this subject. The meeting of this task force had taken place at the headquarters of ICOMOS (Paris) on 11 October 1985.

26. The representative of IUCN presented document SC-85/CONF.008/3, which summarized the main points of discussion of the task force and its conclusions,

including proposed modifications and additions to the "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention".

27. The Committee recognized the complexity of the subject and congratulated the members of the task force for their valuable proposals. However, the Committee felt that more time was required to fully examine the implications of these proposals. The Committee, therefore, decided that the Bureau should review this document at its next session and make a recommendation thereon to the Committee. However, in order not to stall the nomination and eventual inscription of rural landscapes or mixed cultural/natural properties, the Committee decided that the Bureau should, if the opportunity so arose, test out the proposals of the task force when examining new nominations which seemed to come into these categories.

28. Finally, the Committee noted with appreciation IFLA's proposal to collaborate with IUCN and ICOMOS in the evaluation of rural landscapes and thanked IFLA for its useful contribution to the work of the task force.

X. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

29. The Committee examined 37 nominations to the World Heritage List, taking account of the Bureau's recommendations, and of the evaluations of ICOMOS and IUCN for each property. The Committee decided to include 30 cultural and natural properties on the World Heritage List. These are presented under section A below. The Committee decided to defer its decision on the two nominations presented under section B, and not to include the four properties presented under section C. Section D covers one property whose nomination has been withdrawn.

A. Properties included in the World Heritage List

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
Bangladesh	321	<u>The historic mosque city of Bagerhat</u> The Committee recommended to the Bangladesh authorities that they pursue a preservation and management plan in accordance with the conclusions of the Unesco mission sent to the site in 1983.	C (iv)
Bangladesh	322	<u>Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur</u>	C (i)(ii)(vi)

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
Benin	323	<u>Royal palaces of Abomey</u> The Committee stressed the importance of careful restoration in order to preserve the authenticity of the property.	C (iii)(iv)
Brazil	309	<u>Historic centre of Salvador de Bahia</u>	C (iv)(vi)
Brazil	334	<u>Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Congonhas</u> The Committee expressed the wish that the integrity of this site be preserved, in particular by ensuring that it is surrounded by a large protection zone, and noted with satisfaction a statement by the Mayor of Congonhas giving assurances that the relevant authorities would take strict care to preserve its surroundings.	C (i)(iv)
Bulgaria	359	<u>Thracian tomb of Svecchari</u>	C (i)(iii)
Canada	300	<u>Quebec (Historic area)</u> The Mayor of Quebec thanked the Committee for this inscription on the World Heritage List, pointing out that such an event would provide considerable support to the various Canadian authorities concerned, who will pursue their efforts to preserve the site.	C (iv)(vi)
Cyprus	351	<u>Painted churches in the Troodos region</u>	C (ii)(iii) (iv)

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
France	344	<u>Pont du Gard (Roman aqueduct)</u> The Committee drew the attention of the French authorities to the importance of strictly protecting the site's surroundings.	C (i)(iii)(iv)
Germany (Federal Republic of)	187 rev.	<u>St. Mary's Cathedral and St. Michael's Church at Hildesheim</u>	C (i)(ii)(iii)
India	337	<u>Kaziranga National Park</u> The Committee encouraged the Indian authorities to provide a legal basis to protect the buffer zone south of the Park (Mikir Hills and the Karbi Plateau). The Committee expressed concern over the proposed construction of a railway along the southern boundary of the park and asked that environmental impact studies be carried out.	N (ii)(iv)
India	338	<u>Manas Wildlife Sanctuary</u> The Committee expressed its satisfaction that the Indian and Bhutanese governments had cancelled plans for the construction of a hydro-electric dam on the Manas River which would have had severe impacts on the integrity of this property. The Committee furthermore encouraged the Government of Bhutan to adhere to the World Heritage Convention and to nominate the contiguous Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in Bhutan which could then form a transfrontier World Heritage property.	N (ii)(iii)(iv)

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
India	340	<u>Keoladeo National Park</u>	N (iv)
Iraq	277 rev.	<u>Hatra</u>	C (ii)(iii) (iv)(vi)
Jordan	326	<u>Petra</u> The Committee noted that the boundaries of the site corresponded to those of the Petra National Park.	C (i)(iii)(iv)
Jordan	327	<u>Qusair Amra</u>	C (i)(iii)(iv)
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	287	<u>Rock-art sites of Tadrart Acacus</u> The Committee noted the statement of the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya by which he expressed his agreement with the amendment to the report of the 9th session of the Bureau presented by the representative of Algeria and indicating notably that scientific and technical co-ordination between their two countries for the protection of Tadrart Acacus and Tassili N'Ajjer would be possible.	C (iii)
Morocco	331	<u>The Medina of Marrakesh</u> The Committee recommended that the Moroccan authorities ensure that Marrakesh conserve its exceptional character as a fully preserved historic town. In this connection it would be advisable to avoid any breaching of the ramparts, to protect carefully the medina and especially the facades	C (i)(ii) (iv)(v)

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
		<u>The Medina of Marrakesh (cont'd)</u> of its buildings and 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.	
Norway	352	<u>Rock drawings of Alta</u>	C (iii)
Peru	330	<u>Chavin (Archaeological site)</u>	C (iii)
Peru	333	<u>Huascarán National Park</u> The Committee wished to point out to the Peruvian authorities that the inscription concerned only the Huascarán National Park. The Committee, furthermore, encouraged the Peruvian authorities to intensify their efforts in the management of the Park, and particularly to update the management plan.	N (ii)(iii)
Spain	310	<u>Altamira Cave</u>	C (i)(iii)
Spain	311 rev.	<u>Old town of Segovia and its aqueduct</u>	C (i)(iii)(iv)
Spain	312	<u>Churches of the Kingdom of the Asturias</u>	C (i)(ii)(iv)
Spain	347	<u>Santiago de Compostela (Old town)</u>	C (i)(ii)(vi)
Spain	348 rev.	<u>Old town of Avila with its extra-muros churches</u>	C (iii)(iv)

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
Tunisia	332	<u>Punic town of Kerkouane</u>	C (iii)
Turkey	356	<u>Historic areas of Istanbul</u>	C (i)(ii) (iii)(iv)
Turkey	357	<u>Göreme National Park and the rock sites of Cappadocia</u>	C (i)(iii)(v) N (iii)
		The Committee encouraged the Turkish authorities to proceed with the legal formalities for the setting up of a Göreme National Park.	
Turkey	358	<u>Great Mosque and Hospital of Divrigi</u>	C (i)(iv)

B. Nominations to be deferred

Brazil	355	<u>Iguaçu National Park</u>	
		The Committee noted that the Bureau had recommended the inscription of this property and had suggested that it could be considered as a single transfrontier property along with the contiguous Iguazu National Park in Argentina, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1984. The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Brazilian authorities had requested the Committee to postpone the examination of this nomination. The representative of Brazil explained that the authorities wished to study the points raised by the Bureau in its report. He further indicated that this nomination could be re-examined by the Bureau at its next session. The Committee accordingly expressed the wish that the property would be inscribed on the World Heritage List at its 10th session in 1986.	

Contracting State
having submitted
the nomination of
the property in
accordance with
the Convention

Ident.
No.

Name of property

Jordan

324

Jerash

The Committee decided to defer inscription of the property pending receipt of information on the exact boundaries of the proposed site, a management plan and assurances regarding the restoration policy, which should be compatible with universally accepted standards. The Committee was of the view that an ICOMOS mission should visit Jerash to discuss these matters with the Jordanian authorities and that a nomination duly completed should be submitted at the Bureau's next session.

C. Properties not to be considered for inclusion in the List

Costa Rica

329

Coco Island National Park

The Committee recognized the interest of this property for its flora, and its importance in the Costa Rican context, but felt that it did not fulfill criteria established by the World Heritage Committee for inclusion in the World Heritage List.

France

346

Abbey of St. Nicolas de Tolentin
de Brou

While recognizing the great importance of this site, the Committee was of the opinion that there were more representative examples of late Gothic architecture.

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>
Jordan	325	<u>Kerak Castle</u> While recognising the great importance of this site, the Committee was of the opinion that there were more representative examples of crusader castles. It also asked that ICOMOS conduct a comparative study on this type of property.
Jordan	328	<u>Tabaqat Fahl (Pella)</u> While recognizing the great importance of this site, the Committee considered that there were more representative examples of the various categories of property with which Pella is associated (neolithic vestiges, Greco-Roman cities, monuments of the Omayyad and Mameluke periods).

D. Nominations withdrawn

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya informed the Committee of the withdrawal of the nomination of the archaeological site of the city of Ptolemaïs.

XI. NOMINATION TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

30. Taking account in particular of the considerable damage caused by the 1984 tornado and the urgency of the work needed to preserve the site, the Committee decided to include the Royal palaces of Abomey (Benin) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

XII. SITUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND BUDGET FOR 1986

31. The Secretary introduced document SC-85/CONF.008/5 which included statements on mandatory and voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund. With regard to the mandatory contributions, he noted that many States Parties had responded to the appeals to pay their arrears before the General Assembly of States Parties held during the 23rd Unesco General Conference

on 4 November 1985. With regard to voluntary contributions, he quoted the report of the Committee to the Unesco General Conference (23 C/86) recalling Article 16 paragraph 4 of the Convention which stipulates that these contributions "... shall be paid on a regular basis, at least every two years, and should not be less than the contributions which they should have paid if they had been bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article" (i.e. mandatory contributions at present amounting to 1% of the annual contributions of States Parties to Unesco). This report had also indicated that certain States Parties had however paid voluntary contributions which were considerably less than the equivalent of 1%. In this connection therefore, it was gratifying to note that certain States Parties, which provide large voluntary contributions, had paid to the World Heritage Fund the full sum equivalent to their 1% contribution for 1984-85. The United States of America had on several occasions, such as at the 8th session of the Committee in 1984 and at the 5th General Assembly of States Parties on 4th November 1985, indicated that they would resume their voluntary payments. In this respect, the Secretariat noted that a bank draft for \$238,903 had recently been received by Unesco from the U.S. Treasury and indicated that clarification had been requested to ascertain whether this sum was indeed a contribution to the World Heritage Fund.

32. The Committee took note of the financial statements contained in document SC-85/CONF.008/5. The Committee noted that as at 28 November 1985, a sum of \$1,645,639 was available in the World Heritage Fund, to which the sum of \$238,903 would be added if the above-mentioned contribution proved to be for the World Heritage Fund.

33. The Committee considered that it would be prudent to set aside part of this total amount during 1986 since a new financial biennium was beginning and experience had shown that States Parties tended to pay their contributions late in the financial period. Accordingly, the Committee decided to adopt a budget of 1.1 million dollars for 1986, which could be increased to 1.3 million in the event that the important voluntary contribution referred to above were to be received soon. The budget adopted by the Committee is set out below:

Activity	Budget approved for 1986	Amounts to be added to 1986 budget lines upon receipt of supplementary \$200,000
Preparatory assistance and regional studies	\$ 90.000	\$ 10.000
Technical cooperation	250.000	50.000
Training	300.000	60.000
Emergency assistance	100.000	-
Promotional activities and information	120.000	30.000
Advisory services	IUCN: 45.000 ICOMOS: 75.000	IUCN: 18.500 ICOMOS: 31.500
Temporary assistance to the Secretariat	120.000	20.000
SUB-TOTAL	1.100.000	200.000
3% Contingency funds	33.000	6.000
TOTAL	1.133.000	206.000

34. In addition, the World Heritage Committee felt that more active measures should be taken to ensure that contributions to the World Heritage Fund would be made by States Parties on a more regular basis than in the past in order to allow it to plan its activities more effectively. Accordingly, the Committee decided to ask the Director-General to write letters to all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention:

- noting the resolution of the 23rd Session of the General Conference of Unesco, which calls upon Member States of Unesco to take the necessary steps to ensure that their contributions are paid in full at as early a date as possible during Unesco's financial period 1986-87; and
- accordingly inviting States Parties to the Convention to pay their contributions to the World Heritage Fund at as early a date as possible in each calendar year;

35. The Committee also decided to ask its Chairman to write letters as follows:

a) To the United States of America:

- expressing gratification at the announcement of its representative at the 5th General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention meeting in Sofia, Bulgaria on 4 November 1985, that his Government intended to make a contribution to the World Heritage Fund in 1986;
- noting his statement that his country would be a candidate for election to the Committee at the next General Assembly;
- noting that in these circumstances the United States would make voluntary contributions in accordance with the terms of Article 16 of the Convention; and
- inviting the United States, in order that the Committee might be able to plan its operations effectively, to indicate on what dates and in what amounts the contributions would be received.

b) To other States Parties which, at the time of depositing their instruments of ratification, acceptance or accession, made declarations that they would not be bound by the provisions of Article 16.1, inviting them, unless they intend to contribute more than the equivalent of 1% of their contribution to the Regular Budget of the Organization, to study the possibility of withdrawing the said declarations as permitted by Article 16.3.

The representative of Brazil informed the Committee that Brazil dissociated itself from this decision and requested that, in addition to being noted in the report, Brazil's position be clearly stated in the letter from the Chairman which would be sent.

36. Finally, the Committee urged the Secretariat to do its utmost to encourage all Member States which are not States Parties to the Convention to adhere thereto as soon as possible.

XIII. CONSERVATION STATUS OF NATURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

37. In accordance with paragraph 34 of the "Operational Guidelines", IUCN is requested to report on the state of conservation of natural World Heritage properties. IUCN reported to the Committee on the following sites:

A. Natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Djoudj National Park, Senegal: The immediate situation of this Park, which is threatened by a large hydro-agricultural project, has been alleviated by the construction of a temporary canal. The longer term solutions were investigated by IUCN, Unesco, the Senegalese and Mauritanian authorities at a special workshop held in Senegal in July 1985. The main conclusions of this meeting included the agreement to establish the contiguous area to Djoudj in Mauritania known as Diawling as a national park and to eventually nominate this site with Djoudj as a transfrontier World Heritage property. Also, the completion of the Diama dam in 1986 would improve the water supply for Djoudj, although the effects of another dam, at Manatali, to be completed in 1989 were as yet unknown. IUCN indicated that, in the light of this favorable progress, Djoudj National Park could perhaps be removed the List of World Heritage in Danger by 1987.

Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Tanzania: The Tanzanian authorities had organised a commission of enquiry into the management of this property but as yet the conclusion had not yet been made known. However, with the financial support of NORAD (Norway), a major technical workshop was being held in December 1985 to study improving the management of this property. IUCN considered that this progress was positive and indicated that Ngorongoro could perhaps be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger by 1987.

Garamba National Park, Zaire: The representative of Zaire, the President Delegate General of the Zaire Institute for the Conservation of Nature (IZCN), presented the Committee with an up-to-date report on the progress of work undertaken by IZCN and the consortium formed by Unesco-World Heritage, IUCN/WWF and the Frankfurt Zoological Society. The main objective of the project is to safeguard the population of endangered northern white rhinoceros in the park. The project was progressing well and the equipment provided with support of the World Heritage Fund had helped to strengthen the protection of this park. Indeed, there had been no deaths of rhinoceros reported since 1984 and two baby rhinoceroses had been born in May and June in 1985, bringing the population to 15 specimens. The representative of Zaire stressed his Government's commitment to this project, which, in particular, would enable the rhinoceros population to build up its numbers in its natural habitat. The Committee congratulated the Zairois authorities on their laudable efforts to ensure the success of this project and hoped that sufficient progress could eventually be made to remove Garamba National Park from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

B. Natural properties identified for possible inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger

Tai National Park, Ivory Coast: IUCN reported that the situation had not improved since its reports of 1982 and 1984. The Secretariat had written to the Ivory Coast authorities indicating the possibility of nomination to the List of World Heritage in Danger but to date no response had been received. The Committee requested the Secretariat to continue its contacts and inform the Bureau of progress in this respect.

Ichkeul National Park, Tunisia: The critical situation of this park, as reported to the Bureau at its 9th session had not altered and IUCN noted that if compensatory measures to re-establish the water regime of this Park

were not taken very soon, the property would lose its international importance for migratory wildfowl. IUCN therefore strongly recommended the inclusion of this Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Tunisian authorities had not responded to the Secretariat's request for further information, however, the representative of Tunisia informed the Committee that he would take up this matter at the highest level and he would inform the Secretariat and IUCN of the results of this enquiry.

C. Other natural properties

Los Glaciares, Argentina: Part of this Park was being considered for re-appropriation for a settlement scheme by the Province of Santa Cruz and the second phase of this project could result in the excision of a further 20,000 ha which included an important habitat for the humeal deer. The Argentine representative confirmed this report and indicated that this problem was in fact of concern to the central government authorities, who wished to take this matter up with the Provincial Government. The Committee requested the Secretariat to contact the Argentine authorities to obtain more information on this matter.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, Australia: In reply to the Bureau's request for further information on the impacts of the construction of a road on the fringing reef adjacent to Cape Tribulation National Park, the Australian authorities had provided a comprehensive report which outlined a 3 year scientific research programme costing approximately 1 million \$ to determine any short or possible long-term damage these reefs. The Committee expressed its satisfaction with this programme although it noted the comment by the IUCN representative that 3 years would be necessary before any conclusions could be reached. The representative of Australia indicated that it would inform the Committee at regular intervals on the progress and the results of this research programme.

Pirin National Park, Bulgaria: The construction of a hotel and a ski-resort at the head of the Vihren Valley within this Park was being undertaken, against strong opposition by local conservation groups. The representative of IUCN requested whether an environmental impact assessment had been made for these developments. The representative of Bulgaria confirmed these developments and informed the Committee that she would request the Pirin National Park authorities to provide a full report which she would transmit to the Bureau at its next session.

Wood Buffalo National Park, Canada: It was recalled that, when inscribing this property on the World Heritage List in 1983, the Committee had drawn the attention to the harmful consequences of the possible construction of a dam on the Slave River to the natural characteristics of this property. The Committee was informed that the plans for such a dam had been definitively cancelled and expressed its satisfaction to both the Provincial and National Canadian authorities.

Galapagos National Park, Ecuador: A man-caused fire on Isabela Island in March 1985 had resulted in an international appeal to aid the efforts of the Ecuadorian Government and Park authorities to extinguish the blaze, which had burnt over 30,000 ha. A contribution of US\$10,500 from the World Heritage

Fund under emergency assistance had been provided, in addition to contributions from WWF-Germany and the United Kingdom and contributions in kind from the Province of Québec (Canada) and the United States. There had been no serious losses of animal species and it was reported that the fire could even have had some positive effects on habitat.

Simen National Park, Ethiopia: The management plan for this park, which resulted from a workshop supported by the World Heritage Fund, had been finalised. However, the situation described by IUCN at the 8th session of the Committee in 1984 had not developed further and no further information had been obtained.

Durmitor National Park, Yugoslavia: This property had been threatened by the construction of a dam on the Tara River, however, due to public pressure from within and without Yugoslavia, this proposal had been cancelled. The Committee noted its satisfaction that this threat had now been removed and congratulated the Yugoslav authorities on making the best use of the Convention to support efforts to protect this property.

38. The Committee thanked IUCN for these comprehensive reports and for regularly providing information on the status of natural properties. It furthermore welcomed the proposal of ICOMOS to submit similar reports, as far as its means would allow, in the near future.

39. Finally, the Committee welcomed document SC-85/CONF.008/INF.2 reporting on the measures taken by Yugoslavia to implement the World Heritage Convention and encouraged other States Parties to prepare such national reports for submission to the Committee.

XIV. REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

40. The Secretariat presented document SC-85/CONF.008/6 with new requests for technical cooperation. The Secretariat recalled the procedure for submission of requests for technical cooperation set out in paragraphs 69 to 82 of the Operational Guidelines and in particular that requests amounting to more than \$20,000 should be received by the Secretariat before 1st March and reviewed by the competent non-governmental organisation and the Bureau before being submitted to the Committee. It was also recalled that the Chairman was authorised to approve "small" requests for technical cooperation not exceeding \$20,000 at any time during the year.

41. The Committee approved two requests concerning properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

Benin	Royal palaces of Abomey	\$20,000
Zaire	Garamba National Park	\$20,000

The Committee authorized the Bureau to approve an additional amount of \$20,000 under technical cooperation for this property subject to the receipt of an appropriate request.

42. The Committee approved the following requests for technical cooperation:

Costa Rica	Talamanca-La Amistad Reserve	\$40,000
	The Committee noted that \$20,000 of this amount concerned training activities.	
Panama	Darien National Park	\$27,000
	The Committee decided not to support the construction of park guard stations within the Park as it was considered that this activity should be covered under the national counterpart contribution.	
Sri Lanka	Anuradhapura	\$28,000
	The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Sri Lankan authorities had previously submitted a request for a total of \$42,000, of which \$28,000 had been identified for priority activities.	
Zaire	Salonga National Park	\$28,000

XV. REVIEW OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES AND WAYS OF STRENGTHENING THESE ACTIVITIES AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

43 The Secretary introduced document SC/CONF.008/07 on promotional activities and drew the Committee's attention to several points, including the exhibit of photographs of World Heritage sites, the information material produced during the current year and the contribution of States Parties in promoting the Convention. On the whole, the contribution of States to public information for their own nationals was still somewhat limited. However, the presence of the Mayors of Quebec, Congonhas, Segovia and Santiago de Compostela at the current session was evidence of the growing interest aroused by the Convention at the local level. The Secretary gave several examples of ways in which States Parties might contribute to promotional activities on a larger scale than the Secretariat could mount on its own. They might, for instance, assist in circulating the exhibit referred to above, with the possible addition of material on World Heritage sites in their own countries, and, above all, set up the specific national bodies provided for in the Convention.

44 The Secretary also drew the Committee's attention to two points requiring decision. Firstly, the Bureau had requested the Committee to consider launching a full-scale promotion policy. The Secretariat, which had consulted communication specialists on the subject, reported that if the Committee was agreeable in principle to calling upon professionals to improve its promotion policy it could request the Secretariat to undertake a more detailed study. In the light of concrete proposals resulting from this study, the Bureau might decide whether to launch a preliminary campaign in one or more

countries. Secondly, the Secretary drew the Committee's attention to draft guidelines for the production of plaques to commemorate the inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List. These guidelines had been recommended by the Bureau.

45 The representative of IUCN informed the Committee of the efforts made by his organization to promote the World Heritage Convention by means of publications, press releases, etc. and to arouse interest among States not yet parties to the Convention, particularly at meetings in the South East Asian, South Pacific and Arctic regions.

46. The Committee commended the Secretariat on its promotional activities over the past year and, in particular, the production of extremely useful public information material. The Committee encouraged the Secretariat to continue its efforts to ensure wider dissemination, in other languages, of the material produced.

47. Several delegations reported on activities carried out in their countries and on specific projects such as films on the World Heritage.

48. One delegate thought that it would be useful to produce an official diploma awarded on the inclusion of a property in the World Heritage List, and proposed to forward a model designed by an artist from her country for submission to the Bureau.

49. The Committee recognized the fundamental part to be played by States in promoting the Convention, as was the case in informing the public about Unesco's international campaigns. In this connection, the attention of the Committee was drawn to document 23 C/INF.25 presented to the 23rd General Conference containing an in-depth study of the international campaigns for the preservation and safeguarding of the cultural heritage of mankind. The Committee, in consequence, recommended that States Parties create and run the national structures foreseen under Article 17 of the Convention.

50. The Committee approved the report and the two proposals concerning, respectively, the implementation of a promotion policy and plaques to commemorate World Heritage sites.

XVI. DATE AND PLACE OF THE TENTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

51. The Committee decided to hold its tenth session in November 1986, leaving it to the Bureau to decide on the exact dates. It noted with gratitude the invitation by Brazil to host the tenth session, but felt that in view of the Organization's current situation, it would be preferable to hold the meeting in Paris at Unesco Headquarters and consider this offer again for another session at a later date.

XVII OTHER BUSINESS

52. One delegate requested the Committee to look at ways of ensuring a better turnover in the membership of States Parties on the Committee, for example by recommending that States confine their membership of the Committee to one or two successive terms of office. The Committee decided to submit this matter to the Bureau for consideration.

53. The representative of the United Kingdom said that his Government had announced on the 5th of December that the United Kingdom would not withdraw its notice to leave Unesco. The United Kingdom would therefore withdraw from Unesco on 31 December 1985. The United Kingdom would remain a State Party to the World Heritage Convention and continue to play an active part in furthering its objectives.

VIII. CLOSING OF THE SESSION

54. Mr. M. Makagiansar gave a short closing speech in which he assured the Committee that the Secretariat would do its utmost to implement the Committee's decisions. He thanked all participants for their valuable contributions to this session and he particularly expressed his appreciation to the Chairman Mr. Mturi for his able leadership in guiding the Committee's work. The Chairman, after thanking Mr. Makagiansar for these remarks and all those who had contributed to this session, closed the meeting.

Paris, April 1986

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, Paris, 2-6 December 1985

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

Addendum to paragraph 29 B. Nominations to be deferred (page 11)

Please note that the text for Nomination N° 355 FOR Iguazu National Park (Brazil) should read as follows:

"The Committee noted that the Bureau had recommended the inscription of this property and had suggested that it could be considered as a single transfrontier property along with the contiguous Iguazu National Park in Argentina, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1984. The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Brazilian authorities had requested the Committee to postpone the examination of this nomination. The representative of Brazil explained that the authorities wished to study the points raised by the Bureau in its report. It was further indicated that this nomination could be re-examined by the Bureau at its next session. The Committee accordingly expressed the wish that the property would be inscribed on the World Heritage List at its 10th session in 1986."