

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Eighteenth Session

Paris, 4-9 July 1994

Item 5: Examination of the Reports on the States of Conservation of World Heritage Cultural Properties:  
Action by ICOMOS

A Monitoring Reports

Lübeck, Germany (C 272rev)

An ICOMOS mission (an urban planner and an urban archaeologist) visited Lübeck in late May 1994, at the request of the municipal authorities, to discuss problems arising from development plans for the city centre. Three main areas of concern were identified, for which possible solutions were proposed.

- Investigation of archaeological remains

Lübeck has a rich hidden archaeological heritage, both underground and within standing buildings. Since the end of World War II there has been a series of outstanding urban excavations and the rehabilitation of old buildings has revealed many important features such as wall paintings. These investigations have been possible owing to the relatively slow pace of urban redevelopment in the historic centre. In recent years, however, the pace of this development has increased markedly, with the result that insufficient financial and human resources were available to deal with the flow of planning applications being received.

The mission proposed a revision of the present heritage protection legislation, on the lines of the Areas of Archaeological Importance in Part II of the UK Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. This would provide a statutory period before the start of development work during which scientific investigations could be carried out. It was also proposed that the statutory protection of historic buildings should be amended so as to permit the designation of all the buildings within a prescribed conservation area, moving away from the existing piecemeal designation system and the resulting administrative overload.

- Presentation of heritage

The mission made proposals for the better display and presentation to the general public of archaeological finds that survive *in situ* within cellars and elsewhere within the city but which are at present inaccessible. This will heighten the awareness on the part of the inhabitants of Lübeck of the city's rich heritage and assist in improving their attitude towards it.

- Development strategy

A conflict was perceived in Lübeck between heritage conservation and tourist potential on the one hand and a policy for economic growth on the other. The mission stressed the need for the development of an integrated strategy that would permit both objectives to be achieved.

- Recommendation

ICOMOS recommends that the authorities in Lübeck be encouraged to revise its heritage protection legislation so as to allow sufficient time for the proper investigation of the city's rich archaeological heritage and to implement measures to make the important archaeological and artistic discoveries accessible to the general public. It also recommends that the authorities should seek the assistance of an experienced international planning consultancy in the preparation of an integrated development strategy which reconciles the competing objectives of heritage conservation, tourism, and economic growth.

Puebla, Mexico (C 416)

Puebla is a new colonial town established in 1531 on a regular street pattern, the rigidity of which was expanded in the 18th and 19th centuries with, on the one hand, an extension of commercial and industrial activities and, on the other, a growth in the population. It preserves a very wide range of monuments from the 16th to 19th centuries. It was inscribed on the World Heritage List in December 1987 on the basis of criteria ii and iv.

In December 1993 the Secretariat informed the World Heritage Committee at its 17th Meeting in Cartagena (Colombia) that it had received several letters drawing its attention to an urban development plan prepared by the Municipality of Puebla which might adversely affect the protected zone (the Los Remedios, La Luz, La Cruz, and San Francisco quarters).

The Committee for the Defence of the Historic Centre of Puebla, which had been created by tenants and property owners threatened with expropriation, appealed to ICOMOS, which referred the subject to its Mexican National Committee for study and comment. A mission visited Puebla in May 1994. The Director General of UNESCO in the meantime sent an expert, Giorgio Lombardi, on a mission to evaluate the true impact of the project.

Despite the approaches made to various bodies, the somewhat fragmentary information obtained by ICOMOS has made it impossible to evaluate this urban renewal plan.

It would be desirable to know to what extent this project, even though it is not yet complete, affects the World Heritage Monument. Is it capable of being properly integrated with the ancient urban fabric? Should it become a new landmark for the whole townscape and redefine it in formal, rhetorical, and visual terms? Does the insertion of tourist and commercial architectural programmes, whose centres of gravity are open spaces, not clash with the historic urban fabric, where the accent is placed on the network of streets? Finally, will the likely high elevations of the new constructions not visually overwhelm the colonial architecture and destroy the outstanding views?

- Recommendation

It is recommended that the Lombardi Report, the entire Angelopolis Project, and the implementation programme for this project should be made available to ICOMOS so that it may carry out a viable evaluation.

## Kathmandu Valley, Nepal (C 121)

### - Background

The Kathmandu Valley was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979. The inscription is a multiple one and includes seven distinct monument zones: the Durbar Squares of Kathmandu, Patan and Bhaktapur; the two Buddhist sanctuaries of Swayambhu and Baudhanath; and the two Hindu sites of Pashupati and Changu Narayan. During the December 1992 meeting of the World Heritage Committee in Santa Fe, ICOMOS brought to the attention of the Committee the rapidly deteriorating state of the World Heritage site and the very real difficulties faced by His Majesty's Government of Nepal in countering these difficulties. ICOMOS's observations followed from a meeting of the ICOMOS International Wood Committee held in the Kathmandu Valley in November 1992. The June 1993 meeting of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee received reports from ICOMOS and UNESCO staff of continuing pressure on historic buildings in the Kathmandu Valley, including the demolition of historic buildings within the inscribed zone. The Bureau supported the suggestion of a joint ICOMOS/UNESCO review mission to examine these apparent difficulties at first hand during the latter half of 1993.

The ten-member ICOMOS/UNESCO mission met during the period 14-30 November 1993; the members were mission leader Alfeo Tonello (UNESCO World Heritage Centre), ICOMOS consultants David Michelmore (UK) and Surya Sangache (Nepal), Romi Khosla (India), Hideo Noguchi (UNESCO Division of Physical Heritage), Dr E Sekler (Austria: Chairman, UNESCO Campaign for the Kathmandu Valley), and three consultants with many years' experience of restoration in Nepal - N Gutschow (Germany), G Hagmüller (Germany), and E Theophile (USA).

A summary of their report was received during the Cartagena meeting of the World Heritage Committee in December 1993. On the basis of the urgent concerns outlined within the report, ICOMOS proposed that the Committee encourage the Government of Nepal to consider recommending inclusion of the Kathmandu Valley on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Unfortunately, the report's supporting documentation was not available for consultation during the meeting and both the Government of Nepal and the Committee were reluctant to accept the recommendation without this material. The final report of the review mission, including all pertinent documentation, was completed in May 1994 and circulated within ICOMOS and UNESCO for comment. It has also been sent to the Nepalese authorities for their comment.

### - Summary of Review Mission Conclusions

The review mission report details many of the conservation difficulties facing the Kathmandu Valley:

- inadequate demolition and development control at national and municipal levels:
  - erection of unauthorized reinforced concrete high-rise structures in the monument zones;
  - unauthorized demolition of monuments or historic residences within the inscribed zone (the report provides specific examples of such demolitions in five of the seven monument zones);
- lack of technical and financial resources to address conservation needs adequately:
  - loss of traditional skills and materials, frequently resulting in technically unsound repair work;
  - inadequate funds to carry out needed capital repair and restoration projects on major monuments;
- the renewal of elements of religious complexes (itself a continuing tradition) in materials and styles unsympathetic to traditional building practices.

The review mission report makes two primary recommendations:

1 Adjustment of the boundaries of all seven monument zones, in some cases involving reduction of the zones to correspond with areas of loss of significant integrity within the zones and in others their extension or redelineation to include more accurately structures of value equivalent to those already included in the inscribed monument zones. It should be noted that a recommendation to reduce the boundaries of some of the monument zones in recognition of the extent to which the values for which they were inscribed have been eroded is more than mere adjustment: it is rather a tacit delisting of areas previously accepted for inclusion on the World Heritage List;

2 That the Kathmandu Valley be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger; a series of sixteen concerns to be addressed in order to secure removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger is identified. These include a wide variety of specific actions intended to address the general problems identified earlier, including improvements in the areas of legislation, site delineation, development of master plans, strengthening of the Department of Archaeology, documentation, demolition control, and conservation practice. A complete list of these concerns is given on pp 26-28 of the review mission report.

- Conclusions

The Bureau may wish to consider the following points in examining possible actions:

1 In regard to placing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the site is clearly in danger, in the opinion of ICOMOS, under the impact of out-of-control development pressures and given the limited resources and authority of the Department of Archaeology. The values for which the site was inscribed have diminished since inscription.

Although the Nepalese authorities have taken significant steps in the past eighteen months (including improvements to the legislation and strengthening of municipal involvement in protection), losses are continuing. A recent report by review mission member David Michelmores documenting losses in May 1994 at the Baudhanath site demonstrates the continuing fragility of the inscribed site's heritage values.

2 So far as the response of the Nepalese authorities to the recommendations of the review mission is concerned, it is clear from previous discussions that there are at least three points of contention which might be obstacles to their agreement to the inscription of the Kathmandu Valley on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

- the boundaries of the monument zones inscribed by the Committee in 1979 do not in most cases correspond with the boundaries designated by the Nepalese Government and used in day-to-day practice.

- the Nepalese Government's interpretation of the inscription is that only inventoried monuments within the monument zones figure in the inscription, not the many historical residences or other buildings which surround the listed monuments. ICOMOS, however, conceives the inscribed monument zone to include all standing structures and spaces, and believes it to be important to respect the contributions of all elements to the whole.

- the possible negative impact in Nepal of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

3 In conjunction with any examination of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it is important that the Committee and its partners examine ways to strengthen the Department of Archaeology within the Government of Nepal.

Strong efforts must be focused here in order to begin to alter the pessimistic climate which currently surrounds conservation discussions in the Kathmandu Valley.

- 4 Whilst the review mission report provides numerous specific instances of demolition, abandoned buildings, unauthorized intrusive development, and technically unsound conservation work, it does not present a complete inventory of the locations of all such examples. The Bureau might wish to encourage a study to provide a complete picture of site conditions.

In summary, ICOMOS believes that the Bureau's thinking on this site is best guided by asking what combinations of actions would best aid improvement of the conditions for conservation.

ICOMOS has been discussing with the Nepalese authorities the possibility of organizing a seminar for conservation professionals working in Nepal to raise consciousness of conservation practices and technologies appropriate for the country. This is seen as a small step towards improving the climate for conservation in Nepal.

It is hoped that a seminar can be organized in relation to the planned meeting of the UNESCO Campaign Committee for the Kathmandu Valley, and these meetings can provide opportunities for constructive discussions with the Nepalese authorities in the Department of Archaeology concerning the issues raised in this note and in the report of the review mission.

#### Kizhi Pogost, Russian Federation (C 544)

##### - Background

ICOMOS has been involved in collaboration with the authorities responsible for this site since the autumn of 1988, two years prior to its inscription on the World Heritage List. At that time, the USSR conservation official Jonas Glemza (then a Vice-President of ICOMOS) organized an international symposium at the site for 108 conservation professionals, including ICOMOS's International Wood and Vernacular Architecture Committees, in order to examine conservation problems at the site. The Wood Committee's recommendations were adopted at the time and have served informally to guide activity at the site ever since.

Following inscription on the World Heritage List in December 1990, the site entered a period of further difficulties, at least in the short term, during the transfer of authority to the Russian Federation from the former Soviet Union. Many of the site's current problems relate to uncertainties over budget, priorities, and responsibility within the new government as it continues to organize itself.

ICOMOS was invited to undertake an exploratory mission in October 1992 to examine the degree of urgency and the nature of the problems at the site. This mission (in summer 1993) resulted in an extended period of field visits and exchanges between an invited group of eight ICOMOS conservation specialists from Canada, Finland, Germany, and Norway, and more than twenty-five of their Russian counterparts.

Given Russia's difficulties in paying its World Heritage contribution, no financial or technical assistance has been possible from the World Heritage Fund for this site. Using extra-budgetary contributions made by the Canadian Government to UNESCO for ICOMOS projects, ICOMOS has taken the initiative to bridge the gap in the short term, given the severity of the problems at the site. This group's recommendations were presented to the World Heritage Committee at its meeting in Cartagena in December 1993 and accepted as a basis for further involvement by ICOMOS during 1994.

ICOMOS Canada conservation architect Andrew Powter has continued to lead coordination of technical efforts for conservation planning at the site. However, in spite of the Committee's ongoing encouragement for the project and a further extra-budgetary contribution by Canada (through UNESCO to ICOMOS) in 1994 to support travel expenses, project momentum has been difficult to maintain. Political circumstances in Russia remain difficult, and few significant financial resources for project support appear to be available.

- Current situation

In early May 1994 Andrew Powter met the Vice-Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation, Mr Mikhail Shvidkoy, accompanied by Ministry staff and Russian professionals (including two members of the Russian ICOMOS National Committee, Makovetskii and Semenova) in Moscow. His status report (available from ICOMOS) presents a fairly positive view, despite the continuing problems. It is clear that the Russian authorities have made considerable improvements for site conservation and management in the two years since the initial mission. Improvements to legislation covering the site and the assignment by the Russian authorities of an individual responsible on site for ongoing liaison and coordination with the Russian authorities (architect Tatyana Vachromeyeva) have been key factors in this improvement.

The meeting's primary conclusions were the following:

- 1 ICOMOS would continue in 1994 to attempt to assist the Russian authorities in clarifying conclusions in four defined problem areas (structural engineering, mycology, fire protection, and documentation management and computerization). This would require visits by several ICOMOS experts during the summer and autumn of 1994.
- 2 The planned concept review meeting has been postponed until January/February 1995. Its focus will be on the feasibility of various engineering solutions for the Church of the Transfiguration now developed. (The current Canadian extra-budgetary funding of \$18,750 may be used until 31 March 1995.) ICOMOS believes very firmly that the significance of this extraordinary wooden building, its current extreme fragility, and the unusual nature of the structural problems warrant examination of various alternatives by a qualified international expert panel.
- 3 ICOMOS did not respond positively to requests to use the limited funds available to buy equipment, in particular advanced computers. It has, however, begun to pursue available funding sources for equipment purchase on behalf of the authorities, with a reasonable chance of success. The purpose of the ICOMOS funding has always been conceived as supporting, in association with Russian professionals, the development of a well thought out and integrated conservation plan for the site, not to substitute for missing national funding support, no matter how worthwhile or needed. The request points out the obstacles to long-term conservation success, which will remain until the Russian Government is able to overcome its current financial difficulties.

- Conclusion

This report to the Bureau is for information only, and no action is requested. ICOMOS will provide a detailed report to the Committee in December, including a long-term assessment of conservation problems at the site for the decade to come.

Burgos Cathedral, Spain (C 316)

- Background

The construction of the cathedral of Santa-Maria de Burgos began in 1221 and was completed in 1567. It embodies the diverse trends of four centuries of European Gothic style. It was included in the World Heritage List in November 1984 on the basis of criteria ii, iv, and vi. At that time it was recognized that Santa-Maria de Burgos decisively influenced architecture and the visual arts both in Spain and Western Europe, that it was an outstanding example of an episcopal ensemble while bearing witness to the creative genius of architects and craftsmen who worked on it, and that it is inseparably linked with the history of the Reconquest and the achievement of Spanish unity.

### The current position

In December 1993, on the occasion of the 17th Meeting of the World Heritage Committee in Cartagena (Colombia), it was reported that information from local and national authorities in Spain confirmed the setting up of a multidisciplinary advisory council (building committee) which had drafted a Master Plan setting out the priorities for restoration and all other work on Burgos Cathedral.

Between 1989 and 1993 the press in the region of Castille paid much attention to the future of Burgos Cathedral, protected as it is by Spanish legislation governing historic monuments since 8 April 1885 and by the World Heritage Convention since 2 November 1984. The combination of increased degradation of the exterior of the Cathedral and haphazard restoration campaigns initiated by the Burgos Chapter that were lacking any technical or scientific control by the Spanish Government gave rise to very heated debate on the issue. This debate was fed by the regional media, who also acted as a forum for public opinion. ICOMOS accordingly requested its Spanish National Committee to prepare a report on the situation for submission to the World Heritage Committee.

This controversy unfolded in a very tense political atmosphere owing to the coming into force of decentralization legislation, as a result of which responsibility for heritage matters was transferred from the Ministry of Culture to the regional authorities. The central government still has a role to play in the technical and scientific aspects of these matters. In order more efficiently to protect its threatened heritage, the Ministry of Culture implemented a National Plan for the Protection of Hispanic Cathedrals in 1990 with a budget of 140 million pesetas. This plan was presented to the international community during a symposium on "The conservation of European cathedrals" in Madrid. This places Spain well within current trends in European heritage. The plan sets forth the prerequisites for the implementation of priority restoration programmes for each Spanish cathedral and for the creation of an inventory of all works of art within them. It also requires all chapters, within the framework of the law, to set up a multidisciplinary advisory council (building committee) which will compile the Master Plan defining the scope of future restoration campaigns. No exceptions to this rule will be tolerated and non-compliance will be sanctioned by freezing of State subsidies. The Ministry of Culture wished to have Burgos Cathedral spearhead this new policy in the field of heritage.

Two conflicts arose almost immediately. First, the Chapter of Burgos Cathedral was very reluctant to set up an advisory council until 1992. Secondly, the Regional Government of Castille and Leon refused to sign an agreement with the central government providing for the latter to finance and perform all preliminary studies preceding the actual restoration work, the financial burden of the works themselves being borne by the regional government. The disputes which arose among the various parties (Ministry of Culture, Regional Government of Castille and Leon, and the Chapter) resulted in the cancelling of subsidies and therefore the maintenance of the *status quo* of a building the condition of which required action in the very near term.

The Burgos Cathedral restoration issue, as it has been termed, made the front pages again in February 1992 when Antonio Mas-Guindal, Assistant General Manager for Heritage at the Culture Ministry, stated that the Cathedral of Santa Maria would be removed from the World Heritage List if the "uncontrolled restoration measures of recent years applied to this monument were to continue". At the same time, the Ministry of Culture decided to dismiss Marcos Rico Santamaria, the man who had been the architect of the cathedral for 17 years.

After several years of indecision, the Chapter finally decided in April 1993 to set up a multidisciplinary advisory council, made up of representatives of the Ministry of Culture, the Castille and Leon Regional Government, the museums of Burgos, and the Humanities Department of the University of Burgos. Lena Saladina Iglesias, Professor of Art History at the University, was made responsible for the preliminary technical studies for the restoration work. At the same time, an inquiry into the "stone disease" at the Cathedral was financed by the Interministerial Committee for Science and Technology in 1992. The multidisciplinary team of scientists included geologists and biologists from the Institute for the Restoration of Cultural Properties, the Regional Government of Castille and Leon, and the Universities of Salamanca and Oviedo. Rosa Maria Isbert, Professor of Geology at the

University of Oviedo, was put in charge of the pilot project intended to establish standards for the study of other Spanish cathedrals. The major thrust of this programme was the search for a proper balance between the townscape of Burgos and the conservation of the cathedral. According to Rosa Maria Isbert, there are a number of vectors responsible for the damage to the Hontaria de la Cantera calcareous stone, the principal material used in the construction of the cathedral: air pollution, excessive humidity causing efflorescence, lichen, and fungi, and the most serious cause, a colony of bacteria.

The issues of coordinating actions and respective roles with regard to the cathedral have now been solved, paving the way for a comprehensive evaluation of the future of the cathedral and several concrete actions plans. The Ministry of Culture, the Regional Government of Castille and Leon, and the Chapter have signed an agreement for the implementation of technical specifications for emergency restoration measures. It provides for the restoration of the towers, spires, ridges, part of the altars, and the stained glass windows as well as the solving of problems caused by humidity. Roughly 14 million pesetas have been earmarked for this programme. Scaffolding is already in place. The two architects managing the site are Dionisio Hernandez Gil and Pio Garcia Escudero.

The inquiry into stone disease is being pursued at the Petrology Department of Oviedo University. A number of Hispano-Flemish paintings of the 15th and 16th centuries are also undergoing restoration. The Ministry of Culture has stated that at the present time Burgos Cathedral is the most carefully studied cathedral in all Spain.

All the other restoration measures will be implemented within the framework of the Advisory Council's Master Plan, which is currently being drafted. A preliminary study has already been carried out. The Burgos Chapter has launched an appeal to patrons of the arts in order that part of the works may be carried out more quickly (through, for example, concerts). The Banesto Foundation has made a pledge to the Chapter to fund the restoration of the interior of the Condestable's Chapel, and the Burgos Savings Bank is to back another restoration campaign. The Municipality of Burgos is further protecting the immediate environment of the cathedral by closing virtually the entire quarter to car traffic. First the Plaza Santa-Maria and the Calle de la Paloma, and now the Calle Fernand Gonzales, are open only to pedestrians.

#### Recommendation

ICOMOS recommends that the Bureau should congratulate the various Spanish organizations involved on resolving the impasse regarding Burgos Cathedral. At the same time, however, it should express a desire to see those components of the total project which are still under negotiation put into effect with the minimum delay.

For its part, ICOMOS will continue, through its National Committee, to monitor the progress of the project and will report further to later meetings of the World Heritage Committee and Bureau.

*Durham Cathedral and Castle, United Kingdom (C 370)*

*Ironbridge Gorge, United Kingdom (C 371)*

*Studley Royal Park and Fountains Abbey, United Kingdom (C 372)*

*Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites (C 373)*

*Blenheim Palace, United Kingdom (C 425)*

*The City of Bath, United Kingdom (C 428)*

*Hadrian's Wall, United Kingdom (C 430)*

*Palace of Westminster, Westminster Abbey, and St Margaret's Church, United Kingdom (C 426)*

*The Tower of London, United Kingdom (C 488)*

*Canterbury Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey, and St Martin's Church, United Kingdom (C496)*

At the request of the Department of National Heritage, and with 50% financial support, the UK National Committee of ICOMOS has been carrying out monitoring of the ten UK cultural inscriptions on the World Heritage List situated in England. The detailed reports are currently (June 1994) still in draft form. The full final reports and recommendations will be presented to the 18th meeting of the World Heritage Committee in December 1994.

## **B Site Reports**

### **Kakadu National Park, Australia (N/C 147)**

At the request of the Australian Nature Conservation Agency, an ICOMOS mission paid a three-day visit to Kakadu National Park in April 1994. The mission had discussions with the Traditional Owner (Aboriginal) representatives on the managing council and visited a number of the rock-art sites within the property. It also the opportunity to observe the mosaic burning land-management practices of the Park management, which follow the pattern in use by the Traditional Owners over at least 25,000 years.

The mission was impressed by the high level of management skills within the Park and their extensive use of traditional practices. It also felt that the entire area represents a cultural landscape of great importance, since it preserves intact a form of land management that has survived nowhere else in the world outside Australia.

### **Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites, United Kingdom (C 373)**

ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO have been monitoring the progress of the proposed developments in the Stonehenge area. The current position is that progress is held up awaiting a decision by the UK Department of Transport on the upgrading of the A303 trunk road which runs to the south of the monument. Two options are being studied: a long bored tunnel on the present alignment (the alternative advocated by English Heritage and the National Trust) and a new route to the north of the World Heritage site, proposed by the Department of Transport. A conference on the subject is being held on 8 July 1994, after which it is hoped that the necessary statutory procedures (including a Public Inquiry) will be completed without further delay so that the project may proceed to implementation.

## **C Future projects**

### **Asian Monitoring Initiative**

#### **- Context**

Given the very successful regional monitoring efforts undertaken by the UNDP in Latin America, the growing emphasis in the ICOMOS programme on initiatives to strengthen conservation activity in Asia, and the current efforts of the World Heritage Committee to develop and articulate an approach to systematic monitoring for World Heritage sites, ICOMOS has launched a monitoring initiative in Asia in the last year for the benefit of World Heritage sites.

#### **- Purpose**

This monitoring initiative, unlike the UNDP approach in Latin America, is not intended to provide comprehensive reports for all sites in the region. Unlike UNDP, ICOMOS is not an institution and lacks the infrastructure to attempt to implement a similar approach. Rather, the ICOMOS monitoring initiative has as its purpose the testing of monitoring models and tools which may be adaptable and useful for World Heritage sites in other Asian contexts. The initiative is designed in 1994 to produce results in several areas:

- 1 a broad survey of conservation trends in the region (strength, needs, concerns) to provide a context for designing site-specific monitoring models;
- 2 to test some of the ideas currently in the draft report of the World Heritage Centre's monitoring consultant, Francis Golding (ICOMOS UK), particularly the possibility of revision of the nomination form and links between the nomination form and systematic monitoring;

- 3 to test a number of the recording and documentation tools useful in helping sites more accurately to determine "baseline data" for monitoring (including the draft "Recording, Documentation and Information Management Guidelines for World Heritage Sites," prepared by ICOMOS member Robin Letellier, and various GIS-based information management software packages (combining data and visuals/mapping), including those developed by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre for IUCN and World Heritage natural sites (WCMC has generously offered their cooperation in this area) and leading ICOMOS experts in the field;
- 4 a model monitoring method to be tested during the ICOMOS monitoring mission to three Sri Lankan World Heritage sites in 1994 (and possibly three further sites in 1995). On the basis of these experiences, the Sri Lankan mission methodology would presumably be available for adaptation to other similar sites in Asia.

- Survey Report

A Canadian Government extra-budgetary World Heritage contribution in 1993 directed to ICOMOS through UNESCO permitted the initiation of a survey report on monitoring needs in Asian World Heritage sites. A Canadian archaeologist and ICOMOS member, Michelle Guitard, began the project by visiting eight sites in China and Indonesia in the summer of 1993.

In addition, a series of essays was commissioned to provide a comprehensive overview of patterns of strength and need in Asian conservation. These essays have been prepared by individuals (Europeans, North Americans, and Asians) with long years of experience in Asian conservation, including recent work on sites of current interest to the Committee such as the Kathmandu Valley. These essays have been submitted to ICOMOS and are currently being edited; a synthesis is also being prepared. The full report will be available to the World Heritage Committee at its meeting in December 1994.

- Sri Lanka Monitoring Mission

In 1993 the Sri Lankan Government asked ICOMOS to monitor three of the country's World Heritage sites: Anuradhapura (C 200), Polonnaruwa (C 201), and Sigiriya (C 202). This project was intended primarily to develop and test *model* approaches to monitoring, which could be useful in other Asian countries. It was also intended to derive lessons from these missions which could be brought to efforts within UNESCO to examine appropriate systematic monitoring methodologies.

The mission involves a team of three outside professionals (architect/site manager, tourism expert, archaeologist), working closely with two Sri Lankan professionals. The mission will take place in the first two weeks of August 1994.