

**Distribution limited**

**WHC-97/CONF.208/17  
Paris, 27 February 1998  
Original: English/French**

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

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

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
Twenty-first session**

**Naples, Italy**

**1-6 December 1997**

**REPORT**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page no. |
|--|----------|
| I. OPENING SESSION   | 1        |
| II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE   | 3        |
| III. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY ON THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT SINCE THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE                               | 4        |
| IV. REPORTS OF THE RAPPORTEURS ON THE SESSIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE BUREAU  | 6        |
| V. REPORT OF THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE'S CONSULTATIVE BODY ON THE OVERALL MANAGEMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION       | 7        |
| VI. DECISION OF THE 29TH GENERAL CONFERENCE ON PERIODIC REPORTING  | 8        |
| VII. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST  | 9        |
| VIII. INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE LISTS AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER | 35       |
| IX. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THEMATIC AND COMPARATIVE STUDIES  | 51       |
| X. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE   | 54       |
| XI. EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET FOR 1998, AND PRESENTATION OF A PROVISIONAL BUDGET FOR 1999                                      | 55       |
| XII. WORLD HERITAGE DOCUMENTATION, INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES  | 60       |

|        |   |    |
|--------|---|----|
| XIII.  | WORLD HERITAGE AND THE PREVENTION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC OF CULTURAL PROPERTY                                 | 67 |
| XIV.   | DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE | 68 |
| XV.    | DATE AND PLACE OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE                                   | 68 |
| XVI.   | OTHER BUSINESS  | 69 |
| XVII.  | ADOPTION OF THE REPORT  | 70 |
| XVIII. | CLOSURE OF THE SESSION  | 70 |

## LIST OF ANNEXES

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| ANNEX I   | List of Participants  |
| ANNEX II  | Speeches  |
|           | ANNEX II.1  |
|           | Speech by the Under-Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs   |
|           | ANNEX II.2  |
|           | Speech by the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO   |
|           | ANNEX II.3  |
|           | Speech by the Vice President of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Cultural Property and Environment  |
|           | ANNEX II.4  |
|           | Speech by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee   |
|           | ANNEX II.5  |
|           | Speech by the Chairperson of the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee  |
| ANNEX III | Speech by the Chairperson of the twentieth session of the Committee on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee concerning the overall financial and administrative management of the World Heritage Convention |
| ANNEX IV  | Statements concerning the Central Karakorum National Park   |
|           | ANNEX IV.1 Observer of India  |
|           | ANNEX IV.2 Observer of Pakistan   |
| ANNEX V   | Text of the resolution on periodic reporting adopted by the 29th session of the General Conference  |

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| ANNEX VI   | Statements concerning the inscription of cultural heritage in Poland   |
|            | ANNEX VI.1 Observer of Germany   |
|            | ANNEX VI.2 Observer of Poland  |
| ANNEX VII  | Statement of Italy concerning the co-operation between the Italian Government, ROSTE, the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM |
| ANNEX VIII | Recommendation on Illicit Traffic affecting World Heritage sites   |
| ANNEX IX   | Provisional agenda of the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee                              |
| ANNEX X    | Decisions of the twenty-first extraordinary session of Bureau concerning international assistance requests                 |

## **I. OPENING SESSION**

**I.1** The twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee was held in Naples, Italy, from 1 to 6 December 1997. It was attended by the following members of the World Heritage Committee: Australia, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Republic of Korea, Thailand, United States of America and Zimbabwe.

**I.2** The following States Parties to the Convention which are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Albania, Austria, Argentina, Belarus, Belgium, Cameroon, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Holy See, India, Indonesia, Latvia, Malawi, Netherlands, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Spain, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Vietnam.

**I.3** Representatives of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of the Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and The World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the Arab League Educational Cultural and Scientific Organization, the International Federation of Landscape Architects, the World Heritage Cities Organization and the Getty Conservation Institute. The complete list of participants is provided in Annex I.

**I.4** The twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee was opened by the Mayor of Naples, Mr. Bassolino, who welcomed the participants and stated that it was an honour for Naples to host this event which coincides with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the World Heritage Convention. In referring to the historic centre of Naples, which was placed on the World Heritage List in 1995, he emphasised that it is an outstanding example of a city of many different civilisations which in the past played an important role in international history. In his endeavour to safeguard and protect the cultural heritage of Naples he expressed his support to the World Heritage Convention and offered to join efforts in safeguarding the heritage of humanity.

**I.5** The opening ceremony was presided over by the Under-Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs, Ms Patrizia Toia, who in her speech highlighted Italy's commitment to the World Heritage Convention, recalling that in 1983 Italy had hosted the Committee meeting in Florence. She recalled the many milestones which have been passed since the origin of the Convention and particularly highlighted Italy's initiative with regard to the UNIDROIT Convention on stolen or illicit exported cultural assets (June 1995) as well as its close involvement in the UNESCO Committee for the return of cultural property to their country of origin. She hoped that the World Heritage Committee would address the issues of illicit traffic of cultural goods pertaining to sites protected by the 1972 Convention. Ms Toia concluded by stating that Italy views the protection and enhancement of the cultural and natural heritage of the people of the world as an extraordinary instrument for intercultural communication and for peace (Speech annexed as Annex II.1).

**I.6** The Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Adnan Badran, began his speech by expressing his thanks and gratitude to Italy, for its continuing important contribution to UNESCO and for having organized the Committee session in such a tremendously rich cultural environment, the Palazzo Reale.

**I.7** He announced that on the occasion of the silver jubilee of the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage a Financial Audit of the World Heritage Fund and a Management Review of the World Heritage Convention had been carried out by the Office of the Auditor General of Canada, the External Auditor of UNESCO.

**I.8** In referring to the fact that the Committee would be discussing the state of conservation of the twenty-two World Heritage sites in Danger, he noted that conflicts between World Heritage conservation and economic development are intensifying and that resolution of these conflicts require interventions at the highest level of the executive and legislative authorities in States Parties.

**I.9** He recalled the foresight and vision of UNESCO in creating, 25 years ago, a unique international Convention that simultaneously provided a legal framework for the preservation of both cultural as well as natural heritage of outstanding universal significance. However, he raised a number of questions frequently posed by those who wish to sustain the reputation of the Convention:

How can we improve the universality of the World Heritage List so that it reflects a balanced representation of all regions and cultures in the world and at the same time prevent a rapid rise in the total number of sites inscribed on the List?

How can we ensure that monitoring and conservation of properties become as important as identification, nomination and inscription; and

How can we best meet the rapidly growing demand for information, public education, documentation, promotion and fund-raising for World Heritage conservation?

**I.10** In conclusion, he emphasised that the World Heritage Convention is UNESCO's premier international legal instrument for the protection of heritage, promoting co-operation between its Member States and pursuing an on-going, inter-cultural dialogue that encourages a climate of tolerance and lays the foundations for a culture of peace (Speech annexed as Annex II.2).

**I.11** The Vice-President of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Cultural Property and Environment, Mr. Walter Veltroni, expressed his keen interest in the Committee's mission which is of universal interest and stressed that the Italian Government was profoundly and actively committed to the protection of the cultural heritage in Italy. In this respect he mentioned that innovative measures had been taken for generating additional funding for heritage protection and conservation and mentioned, as an example, the National Lottery. He also mentioned the initiative of decentralisation of management which had been successfully realised in Pompeii. The Minister made further reference to a new structure within the Ministry which ensures the integration of cultural heritage with environmental protection. In this context he informed the participants that Florence has been chosen by the Council of Europe as the venue for the adoption of the European Landscape Convention. In carrying out its policy for safeguarding the cultural heritage and promoting its meaning on an international level, Italy has been inspired by UNESCO. In conclusion, Mr. Veltroni reiterated Italy's wholehearted support for UNESCO (Speech annexed as Annex II.3).

**I.12** The Chairperson of the Committee, Professor Francesco Francioni, took the floor and congratulated and welcomed the new members of the World Heritage Committee who were elected by the eleventh General Assembly of States Parties in October 1997: Finland, Greece, Hungary, Korea (Republic of), Mexico, Thailand, and Zimbabwe. He thanked

the Committee for having elected him as Chair and spoke of the strengths and weaknesses of the World Heritage Convention. He mentioned in particular the capacity of the Convention to raise awareness of the importance of the cultural and natural heritage as an element to reinforce identity and civic pride. He also referred to the need for a balance between cultural and natural heritage which should mutually reinforce each other. Furthermore, the Chairperson recalled the compromise that was reached in Berlin in 1995 with regard to the issue of monitoring and reporting.

**I.13** The Chairperson further addressed the issues that were discussed during the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee pertaining to the future role and operation of the World Heritage Centre and stressed that the time had come to begin on a course of institutional confidence. Finally, Professor Francioni, stressed the need for further coordination between the World Heritage Convention and other international instruments in the field of protection of cultural property (Speech annexed as Annex II.4).

**I.14** The Chairperson then asked Ms Maria-Teresa Franco, the Chairperson of the twentieth World Heritage Committee and the twenty-first Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, to take the floor. He thanked her for her commitment to the World Heritage Convention during this year.

**I.15** Ms Franco thanked the Committee for the honour they had bestowed upon her by electing her as Chairperson a year ago in Merida, Mexico. She continued by highlighting the need to apply the concept of universality even though there is a growing tendency towards the promotion of local identity and singularity. She stressed the need to keep in mind the principle of outstanding universal value to ensure the credibility of the Convention. She presented an analysis of the World Heritage List which showed the continuing accent on European sites. She continued by emphasising that preparatory assistance, available under the World Heritage Fund, is the most suitable tool for the preparation of nominations from regions currently underrepresented on the List. She referred to the Financial Audit of the World Heritage Fund of 1996 and the Management Review that have been carried out to increase the efficiency of the implementation of the Convention. She commented that it had shed light on several issues including the need for transparency of the budgetary and financial information and the need for the Centre to establish closer relations with other Sectors of UNESCO. In conclusion, Ms Franco expressed the belief that these efforts should continue in the future (Speech annexed as Annex II.5).

## **II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE**

**II.1** The Chairperson presented the documents related to the adoption of the agenda and the timetable, (Working Documents WHC-97/CONF.208/1,WHC-97/CONF.208/2.Rev and WHC-97/CONF.208/3). The Agenda and timetable were adopted without any changes.



### **III. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY ON THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT SINCE THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**III.1** Mr Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, reported in his capacity as Secretary of the Committee, on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the twentieth session of the Committee. He referred to Information Document WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.5 and made an audiovisual presentation which highlighted the main lines of activities undertaken by the Centre in co-operation with States Parties, the advisory bodies (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN), other Sectors of UNESCO and other partner.

**III.2** The Director began his presentation by outlining the statutory meetings and meetings with the advisory bodies held in 1997. He then presented a summary of the six main lines of actions that were adopted as part of the Programme and Budget of UNESCO for 1998-1999. He also made reference to the creation of a Consultative Body by the Committee at its twentieth session in December 1996 and to the Financial Audit and Management Review performed by the External Auditors of UNESCO, the Auditor-General of Canada. He commented that the recommendations of the Audit and the Management Review would be useful for planning the work of the Centre in the future and would also ensure greater effectiveness and visibility of the Convention. He thanked the Auditors for their support and advice during the year.

**III.3** The Director welcomed the following new States Parties to the Convention: Andorra, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, South Africa, Papua New Guinea and Suriname. He informed the Committee that there are now a total of 152 States Parties and that the number is steadily increasing. Of these States Parties, only 84 have submitted tentative lists (a list of properties they intend to nominate in the future) in the correct format. The Director informed the Committee that the Centre has prepared a tentative list database on the basis of information submitted by States Parties. The database currently includes more than 1000 properties.

**III.4** The Director presented an analysis of the World Heritage List, noting that of the 506 properties currently inscribed on the List, nearly fifty per cent are from Europe and North America, whilst properties from Africa, the Arab States, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean remain, in comparison, poorly represented. He reported that for the nominations to be considered by the Committee at its twenty-first session, the majority are also from Europe. He commented that for the first time from Dominica, Estonia, Kenya, Latvia and Myanmar have submitted nomination dossiers.

**III.5** The Director of the Centre reported that the global strategy was being implemented to address these serious imbalances and obtain a balanced and representative List. He noted a number of Global Strategy activities undertaken in 1997, notably the Global Strategy meeting for the Pacific held in Suva, Fiji, which had discussed the "inseparable connection between the outstanding seascapes and landscapes" and the diversity of the cultural heritage of the region which is "bound through voyaging, kinship, trade and other relationships." For natural heritage he made particular reference to the identification of potential World Heritage sites in the Nordic region and to the study entitled "Nordic World Heritage" published by the Nordic Council of Ministers.

**III.6** The Director referred to the adoption of a resolution adopted by the twenty-ninth General Conference of UNESCO on the periodic reporting by the States Parties on the

legislative and administrative provisions and other actions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on its territories. He reminded the Committee that it needed to now define the periodicity, format, nature and extent of the periodic reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and to examine and respond to these reports while respecting the principle of State sovereignty.

**III.7** With reference to state of conservation reports, the Director noted that a total of 130 will have been presented to the Bureau and to the Committee during 1997. Most notably, the Committee will examine reports concerning four natural World Heritage properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Manas National Park in India, Ichkeul National Park in Tunisia, Galapagos National Park in Ecuador and Butrinti in Albania.

**III.8** The Director made brief reference to co-operation projects for the safeguarding and sustainable development of World Heritage cities in Asia through agreements between the local authorities of Asia and countries such as France and the United Kingdom. He reported that a Conference of Mayors of Historic Cities in China will be held in 1998.

**III.9** The Director referred to a number of natural and cultural heritage training activities, including those undertaken in partnership with ICCROM, that had been organized in 1997. He reported on the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Convention referring in particular to events in France and the United Kingdom and to inscription ceremonies such as the one recently held in Salzburg, Austria.

**III.10** The Director reported that more than 100 World Heritage films had now been prepared in co-operation with media partners mainly in Germany and Japan. He informed the Committee that the World Heritage Review was currently published in English, French and Spanish and that next year it would be published in Japanese and Korean. He referred briefly to the availability of World Heritage information materials including the World Heritage map and Newsletter. He reported that the Centre's web site was very successful with more than 16,000 hits per week in October 1997. He announced that the web site had recently received an international award in recognition of its popularity and content.

**III.11** Finally, the Director referred to the continuation of the Young People's World Heritage Education Project and to the support provided to the project by NORAD and the Rhone-Poulenc Foundation. He reported that the World Heritage Teacher's Education Resource Kit would be distributed to schools in 1998 in English and French for testing and that other language versions would follow. He thanked the Chinese authorities for having recently hosted a World Heritage Education Youth Forum in Beijing. In closing, Mr von Droste called upon the Committee to exercise its intergenerational responsibility for the future of young people and for the conservation of the World Heritage.

**III.12** In response to the report given by the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Delegate of Japan made reference to the Annual Report of the Nordic World Heritage Office in Oslo (WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.10) and posed the question as to what approach should be taken by the Committee with regard to the establishment of other similar regional offices. He made reference to the rapid growth of the World Heritage List and the diversity and increase

in the work of the Committee and the World Heritage Centre and inquired whether the regionalisation of the work could strengthen the implementation of the Convention. He expressed Japan's interest in playing a role in Asia and recognized the need to have Committee consensus on this matter. He called for the Committee to take a clear decision and to adopt a strategy on this very important topic.

**III.13** The Delegate of the Republic of Korea expressed his pleasure at his recent election as a member of the World Heritage Committee and announced that Korea also wishes to contribute to regionally based conservation and monitoring of World Heritage sites.

**III.14** With reference to the Eurocentricity demonstrated by the imbalances on the World Heritage List, the Delegate of Benin raised the issue of the role played by the Third World in the establishment of the World Heritage List. He commented that decentralisation through regional centres may be a way of achieving better balance of the World Heritage List. He also emphasised the need for the advisory bodies to involve advisory experts with appropriate cultural sensitivities in the evaluation of nominations.

#### **IV. REPORTS OF THE RAPPORTEURS ON THE SESSIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE BUREAU**

**IV.1** In the absence of the Rapporteur of the twenty-first session of the Bureau, Mr. Lambert Messan (Niger), the Chairperson invited the Committee to take note of the report (WHC-97/CONF.204/11).

**IV.2** The Rapporteur of the Committee presented his report on the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, held on 28 and 29 November 1997 in Naples which has been prepared in three parts according to the agenda items. The Committee took note of the report.

**IV.3** The Observer of Pakistan drew the attention of the Committee to paragraphs V.6 to V.10 and Annex IV of the Report of the Rapporteur of the twenty-first session of the Bureau (Document WHC-97/CONF.208/4A) regarding the nomination of Central Karakorum National Park (N 802) as a World Heritage site. He requested the Chairperson to bring this matter "concerning this Park of Pakistan" to the attention of the Committee, stressing that this nomination should be decided upon merits and objective criteria, stating that "the political status of the territory should have no relevance to the Committee's decision". He furthermore stated that "even though Jammu and Kashmir is a disputed territory as recognized by the United Nations, the Northern Areas are under the complete control of the Government of Pakistan". He also requested the Committee to send an IUCN mission to proceed with the evaluation of this nomination as soon as possible, as the mission did not take place in August 1997 as a result of the decision taken by the Bureau at its twenty-first session.

**IV.4** The Observer of India thereafter took the floor stating that in view of the location of the site, the IUCN evaluation should not proceed in the absence of a formal nomination from the sovereign state of the territory, "that is India, since the site legally is part of India".

**IV.5** The Chairperson took note of these interventions, and decided to bring this matter to the attention of the Committee during the discussions for Agenda Item 8.

**V. REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE'S CONSULTATIVE BODY ON THE OVERALL MANAGEMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

**V.1** The Chairperson opened Item 5 of the Agenda by thanking Ms T. Franco (Mexico) for her work as the Chairperson of the Committee's Consultative Body and inviting her to make an oral report on their work.

**V.2** Ms Franco referred to the Committee's decision at its twentieth session to establish a Consultative Body to review the way in which the Secretariat has assisted the Committee in implementing the Convention. She informed the Committee that the work had been undertaken in two steps - a financial audit of the World Heritage Fund for the year ended 31 December 1996, and a management review of the Centre. She reported that the Consultative Body had met five times during the year, including a productive workshop with the staff of the Secretariat at the end of October.

**V.3** Ms Franco commented that in view of the short time given to study the management report, the next logical step seemed to be a thorough examination of the recommendations contained in this report. This management review could be performed by a sub-group of the Committee or by the existing Consultative Body if its mandate was to be extended. She also identified other issues (for example, the use of the World Heritage emblem and quality control issues) that could be further examined by the Consultative Body should its mandate be extended. Ms Franco concluded her report by expressing her gratitude to the Director and staff of the Centre, to the advisory bodies, the External Auditor of UNESCO, to States Parties and most particularly to the Director-General of UNESCO. The text of Ms Franco's speech is included in this report as Annex III.

**V.4** Mrs Bonnie Miller and Ms Esther Stern from the office of the Auditor General of Canada and External Auditor of UNESCO, gave a presentation on the main findings of the Management Review Report. Their report was structured according to the main headings and recommendations in the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Annex B of WHC-97/CONF.208/5). The External Auditors thanked Ms Franco, the Consultative Body, and the Director of the World Heritage Centre for their help during the year. The Chairperson thanked the External Auditors for their clear and comprehensive report.

**V.5** Several members of the Committee commented on the detail and complexity of the Management Review Report, noting that it would take time to analyse it in-depth. Furthermore, several members of the Committee questioned whether the Report went beyond the mandate given to the External Auditors. The Delegate of Italy also noted that the Report did not fully address "certain questions raised by the Consultative Body at its April 1997 meeting" (Recommendation 177 of the Report). Several members of the Committee mentioned particular issues, such as the use of the emblem, the fund-raising guidelines and content validation which required further examination.

**V.6** The Committee decided to prolong the work of the Consultative Body, to be chaired by the President of the World Heritage Committee, Professor F. Francioni (Italy). The Delegate of Australia stated that the Director of the Centre should also be closely involved in the work of the Consultative Body. It was decided that the Consultative Body would report initially to the twenty-second session of the Bureau and then to the twenty-second session of the Committee. The Committee asked that the Consultative Body analyse the Management Review Report, further study the use of the emblem and fund-raising guidelines and investigate the balance between the Centre's work on promotion compared to that on the management of World Heritage properties.

## **VI. DECISION OF THE 29TH GENERAL CONFERENCE ON PERIODIC REPORTING**

**VI.1** The Committee took note of the resolution adopted by the twenty-ninth General Conference of UNESCO on the periodic reporting by the States Parties on the legislative and administrative provisions and other actions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on its territories. The Committee noted, in particular, points 14, 15 and 16 of the resolution in which the General Conference:

*Invites* the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to submit in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention, through the World Heritage Committee, via its Secretariat at the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, reports on the legislative and administrative provisions and other actions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on its territories;

and

*Requests* the World Heritage Committee to define the periodicity, form, nature and extent of the periodic reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention and on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and to examine and respond to these reports while respecting the principle of State sovereignty;

and

*Requests* the World Heritage Committee to include in its reports to the General Conference, presented in accordance with article 29.3 of the Convention, its findings as regard to the application of the Convention by the States Parties.

**VI.2** The full text of the resolution adopted by the General Conference is included in Annex V.

## **VII. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

### **A. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC REPORTING**

**VII.1** The Committee considered the manner in which to implement the decision of the General Conference on the basis of some initial reflections that were presented by the Secretariat in Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/7.

**VII.2** While recognizing the need for the States Parties to report on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, the Committee stressed the importance of periodic reporting as a mechanism for exchange of information and experiences between States Parties. In this context, the attention was drawn to Article 29.1 of the Convention in which States Parties are requested to report also on other actions, *together with details of the experience acquired*.

**VII.3** A regional approach for the examination of the periodic reports by the Committee, as already proposed in paragraph 72 of the Operational Guidelines, was supported as a means to promote regional co-operation and to identify specific needs.

**VII.4** As to the format of the periodic reports, the Committee stressed that this should be practical and simple with due consideration given to the specific characteristics of different types of cultural and natural heritage properties. It should, furthermore, focus on the main issue, which is the maintenance of the World Heritage values of the site and the identification of indicators for its measurement.

**VII.5** The Committee reviewed different options for the periodicity of the periodic reporting, i.e. four, five or six years. Although these options will have to be studied in more detail, a great number of Committee members expressed their preference for a six-year cycle, whereas some others were of the opinion that a four- or five-year cycle would be preferable.

**VII.6** There was general agreement that the decision-making on periodic reporting would not affect the importance and continuing role of reactive monitoring that is foreseen in the procedures for the eventual deletion of properties from the World Heritage List, and in reference to properties inscribed, or to be inscribed, on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**VII.7** Finally, a suggestion was made to look into the relation between the allocation of international assistance and compliance with the periodic reporting requirement.

**VII.8** Concluding the debate, the Committee, having examined the resolution adopted by the 29th General Conference of UNESCO, as well as Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/7:

1. requested the Secretariat jointly with the advisory bodies to prepare, on the basis of the observations made by the Committee, for consideration by the twenty-second session of the Bureau in 1998, a draft format for the periodic reporting by the States Parties on the application of the World Heritage Convention and on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties;

2. requested the Secretariat to submit, for consideration by the twenty-second session of the Bureau in 1998, proposals for the handling and the examination and response by the Committee to the periodic reports;
3. requested the Secretariat to prepare, on the basis of the discussions at the twenty-second session of the Bureau, a draft revision of Section II of the Operational Guidelines for consideration by the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

**B. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES  
INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**VII.9** The Committee examined reports on the state of conservation of twenty properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger as submitted in Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/8A and complemented with information provided by the Secretariat and the advisory bodies during the session.

**NATURAL HERITAGE**

**VII.10** The observations and recommendations of the Bureau at its twenty-first session (see WHC-97/CONF.208/4) were transmitted to the respective States Parties. The Committee took note of the integrated report provided by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre contained in Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/8A and of updated information presented during the session.

**VII.11 Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)**

The Committee recalled that at its nineteenth session (Berlin, 1995) it requested the Bulgarian authorities to submit a threat-mitigation status report in 1998.

The Committee requested the State Party to submit, before 1 September 1998, a status report on measures taken to mitigate threats to the site. The Committee requested IUCN to review that report and to recommend measures to the consideration of the Committee at its next session. The Committee decided to retain Srebarna in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**VII.12 Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)**

The Committee recalled that at its last session (Merida, 1996), it decided to retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to damage to the Park infrastructure and possible negative impacts due to over-visitation. The Bureau, at its twenty-first ordinary session held in June 1997, commended the Park authorities for having increased the total area of the Park to include the entire underground basin supplying the Park's lakes and streams. The Park had admitted and managed 270,000 visitors, using educational guided tours. The construction of a new sewage system will commence soon. The Director's view that Plitvice Lakes should no longer remain in the List of World Heritage in Danger, had been endorsed, via a letter dated 18 September 1997, by the Croatian Permanent Delegate to UNESCO.

The Committee commended the Croatian authorities for having undertaken measures to repair damage to the Park's infrastructure. The Committee decided to remove Plitvice from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee requested the Park management to

expedite the reconstruction of the sewage system. In accordance with paragraph 66 of the Operational Guidelines, the Committee invited Croatia to nominate the extension of 100 km<sup>2</sup>, using standard nomination procedures as set out in paragraph 64 of the Operational Guidelines.

### **VII.13 Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo)**

IUCN provided a detailed report, including a map showing locations of major areas of armed conflict, refugee camps and rebel activity in relation to Virunga and three other World Heritage sites in the eastern parts of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The situation in and around Virunga is unstable with militia groups threatening human population and wildlife. Aerial census of wildlife has not been undertaken since 1995; there are frequent reports of deforestation, poaching and illegal gold mining in the Park. Many automatic weapons left behind by fleeing soldiers have been claimed by local inhabitants and poachers and greatly endanger the life of the small number of Park personnel attempting to carry out anti-poaching activities. IUCN has listed fourteen recommendations for restoring the Park; however, it has noted that the high-level mission to Kinshasa, recommended by the Bureau at its June 1997 session, to remind the national authorities of their responsibilities under the Convention and determine the policy of the new Government on nature conservation, is the most urgent priority action needed at this time.

The Committee decided to retain Virunga in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Director-General of UNESCO to send a high-level mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo as soon as possible.

### **VII.14 Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo)**

Since the Committee included this property in the List of World Heritage in Danger, at its last session in December 1996, the eastern regions of the country where this site is located have become further destabilised. Infrastructure of the Park has been damaged and wildlife poached. The uncertainty surrounding the new policy as regards nature conservation puts all World Heritage sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo under threat.

The Committee decided to retain Garamba in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Director-General of UNESCO to send a high-level mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo as soon as possible.

### **VII.15 Sangay National Park (Ecuador)**

At its last session (Merida, 1996), the Committee reiterated its concerns regarding road construction, poaching and colonisation and its call for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the road construction project. The Bureau, at its twenty-first session in June 1997, was informed that colonisation, and small scale mining activities had been stopped, a new management plan was nearing finalisation and that several conservation projects funded by WWF had begun.

The Committee decided to retain Sangay National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger and urged the Centre, in collaboration with IUCN, agreement with the State Party and possible support from WWF, to plan and organise a site visit to address the problem of the Guamote Macas road construction and other threats to the integrity of the site.



The Delegate of Ecuador welcomed the decision by the Committee to field a mission to the site and stated that the construction of the road is currently paralyzed and that the impact studies still have to be completed.

#### **VII.16 Simen National Park (Ethiopia)**

The Committee recalled that at its last session (Merida, 1996), it included this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger, on the basis of the findings of a technical mission to the site and IUCN reports, and approved a sum of US\$ 30,000 for a meeting with stakeholders and donors, scheduled to be held in April 1997. The Bureau, at its twenty-first session in June 1997, learnt that the Regional Authorities in Bahr Dar, where Simen National Park is located, had disagreed with the Committee's decision to declare Simen as a World Heritage site in Danger; hence, they had indefinitely postponed the meeting of the stakeholders and donors and called upon the Central Government authorities in Addis Ababa to organise a discussion forum with UNESCO with a view to reversing the Committee's decision.

The Centre discussed the matter with the Ambassador of Ethiopia to France and the Permanent Delegate of Ethiopia to UNESCO, and sought his assistance in encouraging the Ethiopian authorities to view the Committee's decision in a positive light and to proceed with the convening of the meeting of the stakeholders and donors. The Permanent Delegate was in agreement with the fact that the Committee's decision must be viewed positively, and had agreed to discuss the matter with relevant authorities during his visit to Ethiopia during September-October 1997. No written information was received by the Centre, the Permanent Delegate however informed Centre staff orally that there had been no change in the views of the Regional Government in Bahr Dar to date.

In the absence of any further information, the Committee decided to retain Simen National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger and urged the Centre to continue to pursue its efforts to resolve this deadlock.

#### **VII.17 Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire)**

The Committee recalled that at the time of its last session (Merida, 1996), UNESCO's Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs Office was considering a proposal for setting up an "International Foundation for Mount Nimba". The Bureau, at its twenty-first session in June, 1997, was informed that such a foundation cannot be created by UNESCO but could be set up under the national legislation of a suitable State Party, following the example of the Foundation established for the Banc d'Arguin, (Mauritania) in Switzerland. However, the Bureau noted that the mining companies expected to contribute to the Fund are not yet ready to launch the initiative and the Minister of Environment of Guinea had requested that Mount Nimba be retained in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee furthermore noted that technical assistance for an amount of US\$ 20,000 was provided to the site in 1997.

The Committee decided to retain Mount Nimba in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the State Party and the Centre to contact relevant mining companies to know more details of their interest and willingness to set up an international foundation.

### **VII.18 Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)**

The Committee, at its last session (Merida, 1996), included this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger, and requested the State Party to implement the eleven-point corrective action plan that had been endorsed by the Minister for the Environment of Honduras. The Sub-Secretary for the Environment of Honduras, via letter of 12 September 1997, has provided a description of the proposed use of the US\$ 30,000 approved by the Bureau in 1996. These funds will form a component of the larger GTZ-KFW (Germany) project, which in its first year preparatory phase foresees the elaboration of a management plan as a priority activity.

The Committee commended Honduras, with support from the GTZ and WWF, for launching a large scale programme for strengthening the conservation of Rio Platano. The Committee retained the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Centre, in collaboration with IUCN, to plan a site visit during early 1999 to review the state of conservation of Rio Platano.

### **VII.19 Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The Committee took note of the site visit to Manas, jointly undertaken by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF) of India and the World Heritage Centre, between 20 and 23 January 1997 and of the report on the state of conservation submitted to the Bureau at its twenty-first session in June 1997. MOEF and the State Government of Assam had elaborated a 2-3 year rehabilitation plan, at a total cost of US\$ 2,135,000, of which US\$ 235,000 was requested as emergency assistance from the World Heritage Fund. The Bureau at its twenty-first session approved an initial grant of US\$ 75,000, for the purchase of three vehicles, two boats and 55 wireless communication sets and recommended that the Committee consider approving additional amounts of the US\$ 235,000 requested by the Indian authorities subject to satisfactory use of the US\$ 75,000 provided, and written documentation on counterpart Indian funds disbursed for strengthening the conservation of Manas Wildlife Sanctuary. The Centre and the Observer of India informed the Committee that this information has been provided by facsimile of 10 November 1997.

The Committee took note of this information on progress with regard to the implementation of the emergency assistance project and referred the discussion concerning the approval of additional amounts of the US\$ 235,000 requested by the Indian authorities as emergency assistance to Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda (International Assistance). The Committee decided to retain Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **VII.20 Air-and-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)**

The Committee recalled that the Delegate of Niger, at the twenty-first session of the Bureau, was of the view that the state of conservation of the site had considerably improved and the site may be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger and that a monitoring mission to the site was foreseen for autumn 1997. The Centre informed the Committee that this mission did not take place due to time constraints. IUCN informed the Committee that a number of activities are underway to resume the IUCN/Danish/Swiss Cooperation project at this site.

In the absence of further information, the Committee decided to retain Air-and-Ténéré Reserve in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

## **VII.21 Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)**

The Committee recalled that at its last session (Merida, 1996), it found that the construction of two dams had limited freshwater flow, dramatically increased the salinity of the lake and marshes and led to sharp reductions of migratory bird populations. In 1996, the Committee decided to declare Ichkeul as a World Heritage site in Danger and requested the Tunisian authorities to provide a programme of corrective measures to reverse the degradation of the site and alerted them to the possibility of the deletion of Ichkeul from the World Heritage List, if rehabilitation of the site is not possible. IUCN informed the Bureau at its twenty-first session in June, 1997, of the following recommendations of a Ramsar mission to the site in January 1997: Tunisian authorities provide a clear indication of the measures they plan to take based on several scientific studies already carried out; establishment of an agreement on the release of water from the dams; setting up of a central authority addressing all management issues, including the long term management of the Tindja sluice; repair of the sluices; filling up of the Joumine Canal to restore the Joumine Marsh; and continuous scientific monitoring of the Park's ecology. The Bureau at its twenty-first session recommended that the Committee establish a three-year time table to review efforts of the restoration of Ichkeul and, in the meantime, retain the site in the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

The Centre informed the Committee that on 14 October 1997 a "Report on the action programme for the safeguarding of Ichkeul National Park" was provided by the "Ministere de l'environnement et de l'aménagement du territoire" and was transmitted to IUCN and the Ramsar Convention Secretariat for review. IUCN informed the Committee that this report does not provide a sufficient response to the recommendations of the Ramsar mission indicated above and that the serious threats to the integrity of the site are not adequately addressed.

The Committee decided to retain Ichkeul in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Centre to write a letter urging the State Party to implement the recommendations of the Ramsar mission and submit a threat mitigation status report to the twenty-third session of the Committee, in 1999.

## **VII.22 Everglades National Park (United States of America)**

The Committee recalled that at its last session (Merida, 1996), it noted significant progress made with regard to acquisition of land, refinement of ecological indicators, and generous Federal and State allocations of financial and human resources, but decided to retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger due to continued prevalence of threats. In response to the Committee's call to the State Party to share knowledge and experience gained through the restorative effort, the Park authorities convened an international seminar, in November 1997, to which all western hemisphere World Heritage site managers were invited.

The Centre informed the Committee that a site monitoring report on the Everglades National Park was provided by the State Party on 25 November 1997, which indicated progress in the organization, planning and implementation of the ecosystem restoration projects in the region since the last report reviewed by the Committee in December 1996. In addition, significant amounts for ecological research and the purchase of land were made available by the Government.

After discussing whether the site could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Committee noted that the Delegate of the United States of America indicated that the site is still under threat despite significant progress made. The Committee congratulated the Government of the United States on its progress and commitment and decided to retain Everglades National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **VII.23            Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)**

The Committee recalled that at its last session (Merida, 1996), it commended the initiative of the President of the State Party to remove the potential mining threat to Yellowstone National Park, by offering a mutually agreed upon trade of land valued at US\$ 65 million, and requested the State Party to outline, before 15 September 1997, the steps and schedule for threat mitigation which could be followed. Since then a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Proposed Cooke City Mineral Withdrawal was issued and circulated for public comment. The Final Version of the EIS and its Summary were published in July 1997. Subsequently, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Lands and Minerals Management and the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Natural Resources and the Environment have both signed, on 12 August 1997, the decision authorising the withdrawal of a mineral permit from 22,065 acres near Cooke City, Montana.

The Centre informed the Committee that a report was received on 25 November 1997, which indicates that significant progress has been made on some of the issues noted by the Committee in December 1995, such as the proposed mine. However, there remain serious threats to the natural resources and values. The Delegate of the United States informed the Committee that US\$ 65 million have been made available to acquire the Crown Butte mining interests and to preserve the Park.

The Committee commended the Government of the United States on its progress and commitment. Following discussion as to whether the site could be removed from the Danger List, the Committee decided to retain Yellowstone National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

## **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

### **VII.24            Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin)**

Having taken note of the amount of work accomplished at the site:

- i) collection and analysis of documentation;
- ii) elaboration of a maintenance plan for the buildings;
- iii) training of craftsmen in co-operation with representatives of the Royal families;
- iv) consideration of the anthropological dimension of the site;
- v) site of living culture, international meeting "Present-Past-Future" on the Royal Palaces of Abomey which was held in Abomey in September 1997, bringing together international and governmental organizations;
- vi) request for international assistance presented by Benin in November 1997 for the elaboration of the conservation plan,

the Committee invited the Benin authorities on the one hand, to continue their efforts to present to the twenty-second session of the Committee the draft conservation and

enhancement plan of the whole site, taking into account the report's recommendations and conclusions of the above-mentioned meeting, and on the other, to co-ordinate international technical and financial support from which the site could still benefit.

#### **VII.25 Angkor (Cambodia)**

The Secretariat reported on the efforts made by the Royal Government of Cambodia and progress made in the safeguarding activities of this site, including those co-ordinated by UNESCO and funded by France, Indonesia, Italy and Japan. The Secretariat reported that the safeguarding activities, which had been interrupted due to the unrest in the region of Angkor in July 1997, had recommenced and were progressing normally. The Delegate of Japan indicated that the second phase of the Japanese project for the safeguarding of Angkor would begin upon the completion of the first phase in November 1998.

With regard to the continuation of the looting of monuments and illegal traffic in cultural property in the region, the necessity to strengthen international support was emphasized. Although international support from UNESCO, ICOM and the media has resulted in many stolen objects being returned to Cambodia, international pressure is still necessary to dry up the market for stolen and looted cultural property.

The Chairperson expressed the wish of the Committee for enforcement of existing legal instruments to strengthen the capacity of the Cambodian Local Authorities in their efforts to protect the cultural heritage of Angkor and in their fight against illicit traffic of cultural properties. The Committee expressed its gratitude to the Cambodian Authorities, the International Co-ordination Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of the Historic Area of Angkor, and UNESCO for their efforts deployed for the safeguarding of Angkor. In order to increase the international support to the site of Angkor, the Committee decided to maintain the site on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.26 Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)**

The Delegate of Croatia informed the Committee that considerable progress had been made in the reconstruction and restoration of Dubrovnik and that an expert committee will meet in January 1998 to review the state of conservation of the city and that the Croatian authorities will inform the Bureau and the Committee of its findings.

The Committee decided to defer the examination of the state of conservation of Dubrovnik and requested the Croatian authorities to submit a report on the state of conservation by 15 April 1998 for examination by the twenty-second session of the Bureau.

**VII.27 Timbuktu (Mali)**  
**Mosques of Sankoré, Djingareyber, Side Yahia**

In accordance with paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, the Committee invited the Mali authorities to:

- i) co-ordinate international aid for the mosques and the City of Timbuktu;
- ii) inform the World Heritage Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat of their intentions to undertake or authorize in a zone protected by the Convention, major restoration work or new constructions, which could modify the value of the World Heritage site, and
- iii) evaluate in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre the effectiveness and sustainability of the work undertaken on the three mosques;
- iv) prepare a conservation plan for the three mosques;
- v) report to the Committee as its twenty-second session.

**VII.28 Bahla Fort (Oman)**

The Committee decided that full information on the work undertaken would be submitted to the Bureau, in June 1998, based on the report of the expert mission which visited the site in October 1997.

**VII.29 Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)**

The Secretariat informed the Committee that it had received, on 27 November 1997, a report from the Peruvian authorities on the actions and programmes implemented between 1985 and 1997 for the conservation and management of the site, as well as on tourism infrastructure and educational activities. It also informed the Committee of the recommendations of an ICOMOS expert mission regarding the need to establish a management plan, the importance of the Earthen Architecture Research Centre at Chan Chan and the need to carefully monitor the phenomenon El Nino and its impact on the site.

The Delegate of Peru stressed that all actions undertaken by his Government were performed in accordance to national law and the Government's commitments under Article 5.d. of the World Heritage Convention. With regard to recovery of the intangible zone, he reported that the re-location of illegal occupants was well underway. On the preventive emergency measures vis-à-vis the El Nino phenomenon, he informed that the Government of Peru had allocated a special fund of US\$ 200,000 for this purpose. In this context, he thanked the Committee for the emergency assistance of US\$ 50,000 that had been approved by the Chairperson as a contribution to these measures.

ICCROM stressed its interest in a continued collaboration with the Peruvian Government in the preservation and management of the site as a follow-up to the course on the conservation and management of earthen architectural and archaeological heritage that took place in Chan Chan in 1996 in co-operation with ICCROM, the Getty Conservation Institute, CRATerre and the National Institute for Culture, and which developed a new approach to the management of adobe sites.

The Committee took note of the information provided by the Secretariat and the Delegate of Peru. It expressed its concern about the possible impact that the El Nino phenomenon might have on this fragile site and commended and supported the efforts of the Peruvian Government to take the necessary emergency measures for its protection.

The Committee urged the Government of Peru to proceed with the preparation of a management plan for Chan Chan and to submit a progress report by 15 April 1998 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-second session.

The Committee decided to retain the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **VII.30            Wieliczka Salt Mines (Poland)**

The Committee noted that the installation of the dehumidifying equipment for the site, for which the Committee allocated an amount of US\$ 100,000 in 1994, was being completed. The Delegate of Poland thanked the World Heritage Committee and the Government of the United States of America for their support to safeguard the salt mines and informed the Committee that the effectiveness of the dehumidifying system could only be assessed in the second half of 1998. An assessment report will be presented to the next Committee session.

The Committee decided to retain the Wieliczka Salt Mines on the List of World Heritage in Danger awaiting the assessment report from the Polish authorities.

## **C.                    REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES                           INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**VII.31**            The Bureau at its twenty-first extraordinary session examined reports on the state of conservation of fifty-one properties inscribed on the World Heritage List (nineteen natural, three mixed and twenty-nine cultural). The Committee examined twenty-one of them (nine natural, one mixed and eleven cultural properties) and noted the decisions of the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau on the remaining properties as reflected in working documents WHC-97/CONF.208/4B (Report of the Bureau) and WHC-97/CONF.208/8B.Rev.

### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

#### **a)            Natural Properties which the Committee decided to inscribe on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

### **VII.32            Manovo-Gounda-St.Floris National Park (Central African Republic)**

The Committee recalled that it inscribed this property on the World Heritage List in 1988, following assurances given by the State Party in respect of its commitment to improve the conditions of integrity of the Park, notably with regard to poaching and illegal grazing. A 10-year project, financed by the European Union (EU) at a cost of US\$ 27 million, and launched soon after the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List, was expected to show positive results in the future.

The Committee was seriously concerned that uncontrolled poaching by heavily armed groups, from within and outside of CAR has resulted in security problem, leading to the deaths of four

Park staff in early 1997. According to IUCN, 80% of the Park's wildlife has been illegally harvested for commercial purposes. Deteriorating security conditions have brought tourism to a halt and the 10-year EC Project appears to have generated very few tangible benefits for the conservation of the site. The efforts of the Government of CAR to assign site management responsibility to a private Foundation were welcomed and the Foundation was encouraged to continue its efforts to raise funds and strengthen management of this vast World Heritage area.

The Committee decided to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Centre and IUCN to contact the State Party and the private Foundation to prepare a detailed state of conservation report and a rehabilitation plan for this site.

### **Democratic Republic of the Congo:**

#### **VII.33 Okapi Faunal Reserve**

At its last session in June 1997, the Bureau, noted that equipment and facilities in this site had been looted and wildlife poached. Fortunately, the staff in this site did not suffer any harm although they had not been receiving any salaries. The Bureau was informed by IUCN that recently a US-based conservation foundation has come forward with financial assistance to pay staff salaries. There are reports of illegal gold mining in the Park occupied by the militia, and the staff have neither facilities nor resources to manage the Park.

#### **VII.34 Kahuzi Biega National Park**

The Committee recalled the fact that this site has been significantly impacted by the influx of refugees. There are reports of a large presence of militia groups and illegal settlers in the Park which has led to fires, increased poaching, illegal removal and burning of timber. IUCN informed the Bureau at its twenty-first session that it has received several pleas from the staff of the Park for international aid for rebuilding Park infrastructure and staff morale. The Bureau noted that IUCN's monitoring report on this site included fifteen measures for implementation in and around the Park and eight actions for co-operation among international conservation organisations, which together could form a basis for the future rehabilitation of the Park.

In the light of the serious threats to the integrity of these two sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo which have arisen as a consequence of armed conflict in the eastern parts of the country, the Bureau, at its twenty-first session in June 1997, recommended that the Committee include both Okapi and Kahuzi Biega in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested UNESCO to undertake a high-level mission to the country. The Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has invited a high-level UNESCO mission to his country. UNESCO is intending to field such a mission as soon as the security conditions permit.

Furthermore, the Minister has submitted an emergency assistance request to the consideration of the Committee for purchasing one field vehicle for each of the four endangered sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo: i.e. the Okapi Faunal Reserve and the Kahuzi Biega National Park and the other two sites of Virunga and Garamba National Parks, already included by the Committee in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee noted that IUCN's Regional Office for Central Africa is also planning site visits in 1998.



Preoccupied by the serious threats and dangers affecting these sites and the urgent measures required, the Committee included both Okapi Faunal Reserve and the Kahuzi Biega National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger, and invited the Director-General of UNESCO to write to the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, calling for his direct intervention to enable UNESCO to undertake the proposed high-level mission and plan rehabilitation measures for all World Heritage sites in Danger. The Committee requested UNESCO to field a mission, and invited the Chairperson to lead it, to the capital city of Kinshasa for meetings with the high-level authorities, even if visits to sites are deemed impossible due to the prevailing security situation in the eastern parts of the country. The Committee took note of the emergency assistance requests by the Democratic Republic of the Congo (see Section International Assistance of this Report) and requested the Centre to co-operate with international NGOs in rehabilitating the endangered World Heritage sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

b) **Reports on the state of conservation of natural properties examined by the Committee**

**VII.35 Iguacu National Park (Brazil)**

The Bureau at its twenty-first session learned that a local organisation had started a campaign to re-open a road, closed in 1986 to strengthen protection of the Park, and that in early May 1997, 800 people had invaded the Park and set up camp to begin unauthorised work to clear that road. IUCN informed the Bureau that the road has been closed, but plans to rehabilitate damaged areas were uncertain and political pressure to re-open the road still prevailed.

The Centre informed the Committee that a facsimile was received from the Brazilian authorities on 28 November 1997 with information from the Brazilian Institute for the Protection of the Environment (IBAMA) concerning the state of conservation of the site. The Delegate of Brazil stated that several actions have been undertaken, including socio-economic studies in the buffer zone, environmental awareness programmes and a revision of the Master Plan of the Park.

The Committee requested the Centre to write to the Brazilian authorities to invite the Government to continue its efforts with regard to the permanent closure of the road and future steps for rehabilitating damaged areas.

**VII.36 Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon)**

The Committee noted with concern that logging activities, carried out under commercial, as well as sustainable forestry schemes, are contributing to the growing biological isolation of the Reserve and are not welcome by the local people. An IUCN project is aiming to minimise the degree of the Reserve's isolation through the establishment of a buffer zone and a protected corridor linking Dja with adjacent forests. New logging roads facilitate access for hunters, and concessionaires have logged forests up to the boundary of the Reserve. Staff belonging to some foreign logging companies had threatened Reserve staff with violence when apprehended inside the Reserve for transporting poached wildlife. Conservationists in Cameroon have called for a moratorium on logging in the area and on the opening up of new access roads.

The Committee invited the State Party to study the extent to which sustainable and commercial forestry schemes around Dja are leading to the biological isolation of the reserve and to increased poaching of Dja's wildlife. The Committee supported the request for financial

assistance, submitted by Cameroon, for organising an in-situ workshop, and encouraged the State Party to use the workshop as a forum for discussing, with representatives of donors sponsoring commercial and sustainable forestry activities, IUCN and others concerned, ways and means to minimise the possibility that such activities would isolate Dja from adjacent forests. The Committee invited the Centre and IUCN to report on the recommendations of the workshop, and advise the next session of the Bureau, in mid-1998, whether or not Dja needs to be declared as World Heritage in Danger.

### **VII.37 Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada)**

The Committee noted with concern the potential threats to the integrity of this site due to the proposed Cheviot Mine Project, designed to exploit a large, open-pit coal mine, located 1.8 km from the Jasper National Park portion of this World Heritage area. Despite the fact that during the environmental assessment process conservation organizations and Parks Canada expressed concern regarding the negative impacts, e.g. loss or alienation of wildlife habitat, impacts on essential wildlife travel corridors etc., which the proposed mining project would have on the integrity of the World Heritage site, the Federal Government of Canada and the Provincial Government of Alberta subsequently approved the project and published a full EIA in favour of the project. At present the proposed mining project is being legally challenged by conservation groups. IUCN stressed that an increasing number of World Heritage sites (a total of nine, including this case) are threatened by proposed mining projects.

The Committee expressed its serious concerns regarding the impacts that the proposed mining project would have on the integrity of the Canadian Rocky Mountain National Parks and invited the Federal Government of Canada to consult with the Provincial Government of Alberta and to re-consider the decision on the proposed mining project with a view to seeking alternative sites in the region which would have less damaging effects. The Committee requested the Canadian authorities to provide detailed information on the proposed mining project, its expected impacts on the World Heritage site, and proposed measures for mitigating those impacts, to the Centre, before 1 May 1998, for review by the Bureau at its next session in mid-1998. The Delegate of Canada indicated that his Government would be happy to provide such a report.

### **VII.38 Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)**

The Committee took note of the detailed report provided by the Government of Ecuador on 15 November 1997 concerning the situation of the Galapagos Islands as well as of further information by IUCN. The Committee decided the following:

- 1) Noting the relevant decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 19th and 20th sessions, and by the Bureau of the Committee at its 20th and 21st sessions in June 1996 and June 1997 respectively;
- 2) Commending the recent efforts and commitment of the Government of Ecuador to address the complex threats to the integrity of the Galapagos World Heritage site and Marine Area;
- 3) Noting that the draft "Special Galapagos Law" currently before the Ecuadorean Congress, where it has been approved in a first debate, is the centrepiece of an effective conservation strategy for the site;

- 4) Invited the Government of Ecuador to notify in a timely fashion the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee of the final enactment and entering into force of the law referred to above;
- 5) Decided not to inscribe the Galapagos World Heritage site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, at this time;
- 6) Decided that if, by the opening date of the next scheduled session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, the Government of Ecuador has not notified the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee of the enactment and entry into force of the Galapagos Special Law as stipulated in Paragraph 4 above, Galapagos Islands be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
- 7) Requested the State Party, in accordance with the recommendation made by IUCN at the June 1997 meeting of the Bureau, to provide the Committee with an annual progress report up to the end of 2002.

### **VII.39 Kamchatka Volcanoes (Russian Federation)**

IUCN summarised its recent report, prepared by two experts who visited this site at the invitation of the Russian Federation for Environmental Protection. IUCN reviewed a proposed mining project, whose location was determined to be about 5 km outside of the World Heritage area. The location of the mine may not pose a major environmental or aesthetic problem but would disrupt migratory wildlife of the region and fisheries resources. While the question of whether or not mining and conservation can co-exist in the area is yet to be answered, the Organization financing the mining company has placed the maintenance of the integrity of the World Heritage site as one of the conditions for the granting of the loan for the mining operations to commence. The Committee noted with interest that the setting up of an International Review Panel to monitor the environmental impacts of the proposed mining project had been proposed by IUCN.

The Committee invited the State Party to provide detailed information on the proposed mining project, EIAs carried out and other pertinent information and requested IUCN and the Centre to maintain links with the proponents of the mining project and the regional authorities to explore opportunities to link the proposed mining project's environmental impact mitigation actions to the conservation and management of Kamchatka Volcanoes World Heritage site.

### **VII.40 Canaima National Park (Venezuela)**

The Committee recalled that, when it inscribed this site on the World Heritage List in 1994, it requested that IUCN and the State Party discuss and agree upon boundaries for the World Heritage site. Since then, although the boundaries of the World Heritage site still remain to be finalised, the national electricity company (EDELCA) has proposed to erect a series of power transmission lines across about 160 km of the Park. An adequate environmental impact study has not been conducted and traditional Pemon communities inhabiting the area are opposed to the project. The Venezuelan authorities have declined the Bureau's recommendation, made at its last session in June 1997, to invite a high level UNESCO mission to discuss alternative routes for erecting the power lines and resolve the question of the boundary of the World Heritage site. The IUCN Representative noted that the proposed transmission lines will cut through parts of undisturbed forests and that alternative routes, along a highway which will be less damaging, can be proposed for the erection of the lines.

The Committee invited the Director-General of UNESCO to write to the President of the State Party asking for his intervention to search for possible alternative routes for the erection of the power transmission lines and to initiate negotiations with IUCN and the Centre to determine the appropriate boundaries of the World Heritage site.

c) **Reports on the state of conservation of natural properties noted by the Committee**

**VII.41** The Committee noted the decisions of the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau as reflected in the Report of the Bureau session (Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/4B Section III.A.c), on the following natural properties:

Great Barrier Reef (Australia)  
 Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)  
 Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves/La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica/Panama)  
 Shirakami Sanchi and Yakushima Island (Japan)  
 Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaíno (Mexico)  
 Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)  
 Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)  
 Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation)  
 Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)  
 Durmitor National Park (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)).

**MIXED (NATURAL AND CULTURAL) PROPERTIES**

a) **Reports on the state of conservation of mixed properties examined by the Committee**

**VII.42 Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)**

The Committee, having examined the report of IUCN and ICOMOS, expressed its concern about the deficient management arrangements for the Sanctuary and urged the Peruvian authorities to establish an adequate management structure for the site. It furthermore recommended them to prepare a comprehensive master plan as an overall guiding instrument for conservation, planning, infrastructural interventions, tourism development, etc.

The Committee requested the Peruvian authorities to examine the report with great attention and to transmit its views, and follow-up actions foreseen in response to the conclusions and recommendations contained therein, to the Secretariat by 15 April 1998 at the latest, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-second session.

b) **Reports on the state of conservation of mixed properties noted by the Committee**

**VII.43** The Committee noted the decisions of the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau as reflected in the Report of the Bureau session (Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/4B Section III.B.c), on the following mixed properties:

Kakadu National Park (Australia)  
 Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia).

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

### a) Cultural property which the Committee decided to inscribe on the List of World Heritage in Danger

#### VII.44 Butrinti (Albania)

The Committee took note of the report of the UNESCO-ICOMOS-Butrint Foundation assessment mission to the World Heritage site of Butrinti, Albania. It expressed its serious concern about the damages caused to the World Heritage site and about its conditions in terms of protection, management and conservation.

The Committee noted that the Minister of Culture of Albania, by letter dated 20 November, fully endorsed the report and requested the World Heritage Committee to inscribe Butrinti on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee welcomed the Minister's assurance that the Albanian Government is deeply concerned and committed to the preservation of the site.

The Committee, considering that the criteria that are stipulated in paragraph 78 of the Operational Guidelines were met, decided to inscribe Butrinti on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to collaborate with the Albanian Government in the development of a programme of corrective action and to undertake the necessary co-ordination with the Government of Albania, other international organizations and agencies such as the World Bank and the European Union and non-governmental organizations, particularly the Butrint Foundation, for its implementation.

The Committee allocated an amount of US\$ 100,000 as emergency assistance, of which an amount of US\$ 47,000 to be used for the implementation of the immediate actions proposed in the mission report. The remaining funds are to be allocated, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Committee, for the development and implementation of the programme of corrective action.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to submit a progress report on the actions taken to the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

b) **Reports on the state of conservation of cultural properties examined by the Committee**

**VII.45 Islamic Cairo (Egypt)**

**Al-Azhar Mosque**

Anxious to preserve the authenticity of the Al Azhar Mosque in Cairo, the Committee recommended

- 1) that the concerned national authorities immediately halt all work in the Mosque;
- 2) that UNESCO seeks the co-operation of the Organization for the Islamic Conference;
- 3) that the World Heritage Centre in agreement with the national authorities concerned designate an expert to identify the conservation activities to be undertaken; and
- 4) that a meeting be organized to sensitize the persons responsible for the management of the religious monuments of the region:

- on the importance of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for humankind, and
- on the importance of maintaining their authenticity.

**VII.46 Rock-hewn Churches of Lalibela (Ethiopia)**

At the request of the Chairperson, the consultant who visited the site in April-May 1997, provided a synthetic report on the situation at this site, which is the object of an international safeguarding campaign. Recalling the principal characteristics of the Rock-hewn Churches of Lalibela which should be considered with an overall approach, he emphasized the importance given to their preservation and informed the Committee that the European Commission is prepared to release important funds for the construction of temporary shelters to protect the five churches from degradation due to heavy rains. In this respect, he underlined the need to find temporary solutions which safeguard the integrity of this monolithic ensemble in the framework of an integrated overall conservation plan. Furthermore, as this site is the object of increased tourism development, a long-term management plan will also have to be foreseen. The Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage expressed UNESCO's appreciation for the contributions from the European Commission which shall initiate hydro-geological, geophysical, geological and structural studies, and from Finland (FINIDA) for Lalibela. He also recalled the interest of the Observer of Germany, former Chairperson of the Committee and former Ambassador to Ethiopia, in this site. Mr Winkelmann confirmed the continuing interest of the Committee with regard to the conservation and enhancement of the whole site which deserves also full attention from both the local population and international opinion. He emphasized the temporary character of the shelters which shall be constructed, and supported the conservation plan which would be in accordance with traditional techniques.

The Committee

- 1) thanked the Ethiopian authorities for having requested the European Union to inform the World Heritage Centre of the International Competition foreseen for the erection of five shelters in Lalibela;
- 2) noted the results of the meeting held on 30 September 1997 at UNESCO between the European Union, the World Heritage Centre and UNESCO's Division of Cultural Heritage;

- 3) recommended that the Competition File be reviewed to integrate the points of view of the World Heritage Centre consultant and ICOMOS with a view to preserving the World Heritage value of the site;
- 4) endorsed the conservation programme prepared by the UNESCO-WHC consultant;
- 5) underlined the importance of an integrated preservation and long-term management plan on a site endangered by new environmental contingencies and requested the World Heritage Centre to organise a mission to Lalibela before the end of January 1998, to review the situation with the Ethiopian authorities and the European Union, in order to: (a) ensure a long-term protection of the monuments within the context of the ecosystem; (b) integrate the problems of the growth of Lalibela and, (c) draw up a plan of action of the approved conservation programme which should be requested by the Ethiopian authorities under the European Union Programme to support initiatives in the conservation field (PSIC).

#### **VII.47 Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)**

The Committee examined in detail the third report on the state of conservation of Potsdam submitted by the Minister for Science, Research and Culture of the Land Brandenburg.

The Committee also listened to the observations made by the UNESCO expert who undertook various missions to Potsdam for extensive discussions with German authorities on the Federal, Land and local levels. The expert informed the Committee that when he started the discussions, the planning for the so-called 'Potsdam Center' was already concluded. The expert considered the concept agreed upon by the City of Potsdam, responsible authorities and investors to be contradictory to the main features of the Potsdam cultural landscape. After extensive discussions, the German authorities accepted to tender an international competition for the area (with the exception of the building areas 9-12 where construction was halted at ground zero level) to elaborate a new and more adequate concept. The winning project respects in a better way the characteristics of the Potsdam topography and history. The expert analysed the effectiveness of different means of protecting a vast zone, e.g. through monument protection or through a planning mechanism such as a master plan. He concluded that a master plan for the City of Potsdam including the protected areas, would be the most effective and should be elaborated in a constructive dialogue between the German authorities and the World Heritage Committee. The expert stressed the effectiveness of the involvement of the World Heritage Committee and the Centre in planning processes such as for Potsdam, particularly if they would be involved in the early planning phases as stated in the Operational Guidelines.

The Committee made the following observations on the various issues addressed in the reports.

##### **1. Extension of the World Heritage site**

The Committee noted with satisfaction that the German authorities would proceed with the application for the extension of the site and that, as informed by the Observer of Germany, this would be submitted at the beginning of next year. The Committee regretted, however, that, contrary to the original proposal (as submitted in the first report on Potsdam to the Committee at its twentieth session) this extension would include only a small part of the « Städtchen » between the Pfingstberg and the New Garden in the World Heritage site. The Committee urged the authorities to reconsider this matter. The Committee welcomed the inclusion of the village of Bornstedt as an integral part of the World Heritage site, but was concerned that the



rural character might further be affected pending the extension and the adoption of a master plan. The Committee strongly recommended that measures be taken to avoid further negative developments.

## 2. Elaboration of a master plan for the Potsdam cultural landscape

The Committee commended the commitment of the city of Potsdam to elaborate a master plan for the Potsdam cultural landscape and expressed the hope that it will provide an adequate mechanism and provisions for the protection of the World Heritage site and the Potsdam cultural landscape. It understood that a certain time will be required for the preparation of a master plan if it is to reflect a proper urban vision. In the meantime, the Committee requested that a first phase of such a plan be submitted to the Bureau at its twenty-second session. The Committee invited the authorities not to take any irreversible measures which could have a damaging impact on the Potsdam cultural landscape until the entry in force of the master plan.

## 3. Results of the urban development competition « Grüne Mitte-Alter Markt/Lustgarten »

The Committee welcomed the competition and its outcome. However, it considered that further steps be taken to rebuild the historic centre and to define its role. The Committee encouraged the City of Potsdam to continue this process.

## 4. Results of the urban development competition for the « Quartier am Bahnhof »

The Committee commended the German authorities and investors for having reversed the decisions concerning the so-called « Potsdam-Center », which would have had a severe impact on the Potsdam World Heritage site. The Committee considered the winning design of the urban competition for this area, which is now called « Quartier am Bahnhof », to be an acceptable compromise that will allow for the project to be better integrated into the cultural landscape of Potsdam. It expected that the plans for the building areas 9-12 will be reviewed in the light of their compatibility with the results of the competition.

## 5. Other building projects

The Committee reiterated its concern that other building projects pose potential threats to the Potsdam urban and cultural landscape, especially new buildings in Babelsberg (« Potsdam Fenster »), Gewoba-Buildings (Alt-Nowawes), and housing and business buildings at the Ribbeckstrasse, Bornstedt.

## 6. Conclusion

According to the recommendation of the Bureau made at its twenty-first session, the Committee examined if the threats to the World Heritage site still persist. The Committee concluded that although considerable improvements have been made, threats were still persisting. Therefore, the Committee decided to defer the discussion whether or not Potsdam should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger until its next session. The Committee requested the German authorities to submit a new report on the above issues by 15 September 1998 for examination by the Committee at its twenty-second session.

## **VII.48 Roman Monuments, Cathedral and Liebfrauen Church in Trier (Germany)**

As requested by the Bureau at its twenty-first session, the Minister for Culture, Youth, Family and Women of the Land Rheinland-Pfalz submitted a report on the protection and management mechanisms for the Roman Amphitheatre and its surroundings.

The Committee took note of the report given by the Representative of ICOMOS concerning a workshop which took place in Trier on 28 November 1997 concerning the archaeological remains and current construction works in the vicinity of the Roman amphitheatre.

The Committee welcomed the initiative of the German authorities for extending the protected area to include the vineyards at the east side of the Amphitheatre.

The Committee expressed serious concerns about new adjacent constructions north of the theatre which may affect its authenticity, and urges the City of Trier to negotiate with the investors the location and density of the envisaged constructions.

The Committee expressed its interest in the results of the archaeological excavations which have revealed a part of the Roman wall and a water system. These precious remains should not be destroyed and the Committee hoped that it would be possible to revise the plan so that these remains can be harmoniously integrated.

The Committee requested the State Party to submit by 15 April 1998 a report on the following issues:

- revision of the plans respecting the authenticity of the monument;
- conservation and integration of recently discovered Roman remains;
- adoption of an enlarged protective zone.

#### **VII.49 Collegiate Church, Castle and Old Town in Quedlinburg (Germany)**

In response to the request of the World Heritage Bureau, the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Land Sachsen-Anhalt submitted a report on the state of conservation and development plans for the City of Quedlinburg. At the same time and as requested by the Bureau, ICOMOS undertook a mission to Quedlinburg.

The mission reported favourably on the effectiveness of the measures already in place and the competence and commitment of those responsible for the management of the historic town. It also stressed the importance of the preparation and implementation without delay of a management plan for the World Heritage site.

The Committee commended the Ministry of the Federal State of Sachsen-Anhalt for the first report on the state of conservation of this World Heritage site.

The Committee commended the German authorities and institutions - especially the City of Quedlinburg - for their strong commitment to save this unique World Heritage site from destruction and further demolition despite a dramatic economic situation.

Being aware of these tremendous economic difficulties and of the need of attracting investors, the Committee nevertheless urged the respective authorities not to permit any new building which could damage or destroy the historic ensemble of Quedlinburg.

It took note furthermore of the architectural competition for six open areas and the development of a master plan which shall also reflect the boundaries of the World Heritage site.

The Committee recommended its Chairperson to offer technical assistance on request for the completion of the master plan.

Having thoroughly examined the report submitted by the Representative of ICOMOS, the Committee requested the German authorities to submit by 15 September 1998 for examination by the twenty-second session of the Committee, a second report on the: (1) progress made in safeguarding the historic heritage; (2) results of the architectural competition and (3) adoption of the urban master plan.

#### **VII.50 Sun Temple of Konarak (India)**

The Committee took note of the report of the Secretariat and requested the Government of India to report on the findings of the structural studies to be undertaken with the World Heritage Fund emergency assistance grant at its twenty-second session of the Bureau in June/July 1998. Furthermore, it requested the Government of India to keep the Secretariat informed in the meantime, to enable UNESCO to mobilize additional international co-operation to ascertain the present condition of the property to undertake corrective measures as required.

The Observer of India, thanked the Committee for its support in the efforts made by the Government of India and the Department for Archaeology in safeguarding this site, and assured the Committee that the report on the structural studies would be submitted, as requested.

#### **VII.51 Tyre (Lebanon)**

Noting that the Directorate General of Antiquities had already carried out a series of conservation activities, but concerned with regard to existing threats, the Committee commended the Lebanese authorities for the quality of the protection work carried out successfully and recommended that particular attention be paid to the rapid preparation of a master plan covering all the archaeological zones of Tyre and its surroundings, including the City of Tyre. The Committee reminded the Lebanese authorities that the Secretariat had already stated its willingness to contribute technically to the preparation of similar master plans for all other World Heritage sites in Lebanon.

## **VII.52 Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)**

The World Heritage Committee at its seventeenth session in 1993 expressed deep concern over the state of conservation of the Kathmandu Valley site and considered the possibility of placing this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, following discussions on the findings of the 1993 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Review Mission (hereafter referred to as the 1993 Mission).

Since then, H.M. Government of Nepal has given priority to responding to the sixteen points of concern raised by the 1993 Mission. However, the Bureau, at its twenty-first session (June 1997), decided to consider recommending the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-first extraordinary session (November 1997), in view of the continued deterioration of the monument zones of Baudghanath and of Kathmandu (two of the seven monument zones protected under the Convention).

The Committee examined the state of conservation report submitted by H.M. Government of Nepal, summarized together with comments from the UNESCO International Technical Advisor in WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.14. This report provides full information on the progress made on each of the sixteen points of the 1993 Mission recommendations.

The Committee emphasized the need for addressing the problems faced in the preservation of urban historic fabric, such as those of Kathmandu Valley, in the context of rapid urban development in Asia and urged the World Heritage Centre to take initiatives in conducting a research in this field, in co-operation with ICOMOS and ICCROM.

The Observer of Nepal, the Honourable Minister of Youth, Sports and Culture, thanked the Committee and the Secretariat for their consistent support since 1993. He expressed appreciation for the Committee's recognition of the great efforts made by the Government, particularly the Department of Archaeology and the municipalities of Bhaktapur and Patan (Latipur), and stated that his Government is taking strong actions to address the outstanding problems in the Kathmandu and Baudghanath monument zones. He welcomed the recommendation for a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-Nepali Government mission to conduct a thorough study and to elaborate a programme of corrective measures for safeguarding Kathmandu Valley. He also shared the view concerning the need to address the problems of preserving historic cities in rapidly developing Asian cities.

The Committee took note of the information provided by H.M. Government of Nepal and the Secretariat concerning the implementation of the sixteen-point recommendation of the 1993 UNESCO-ICOMOS Review Mission.

The Committee expressed appreciation to H.M. Government of Nepal in establishing the Development Control Unit and in its efforts to ensure enhanced management of the Kathmandu Valley site as well as in mobilizing international assistance from the World Heritage Fund and other sources. The Committee took note of the special efforts made by the Municipalities of Bhaktapur and Patan in safeguarding the monument zones under their authority.

However, in view of the continued deterioration of the World Heritage values in the Baudghanath and Kathmandu monument zones, affecting the integrity and inherent characteristics of the site, the Committee requested the Secretariat, in collaboration with ICOMOS and H.M. Government of Nepal, to study the possibility of deleting selected areas

within some monument zones, without jeopardizing the universal significance and value of the site as a whole. This review should take into consideration the intention of H.M. Government to nominate Kokhana as an additional monument zone.

The Committee authorized up to US \$ 35,000, from the World Heritage Fund technical co-operation budget for a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-H.M. Government of Nepal team to conduct a thorough study and to elaborate a programme for corrective measures in accordance with paragraphs 82-89 of the Operational Guidelines. The detailed budget for this activity is to be submitted to the Chairperson for approval.

Furthermore, the Committee requested H.M. Government of Nepal to submit a report to the Secretariat for presentation to the Bureau at its twenty-second session in June/July 1998, on the progress made with the on-going or new international assistance projects funded by the World Heritage Fund and other sources, and on further progress in implementing the sixteen-point recommendation.

Based upon the information from the study and the report from H.M. Government, and recommendations from the Bureau, the Committee could consider whether or not to inscribe this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-second session.

#### **VII.53 Alhambra, Generalife and Albayzin, Grenada (Spain)**

Following the session of the Bureau in June 1997, the work on the Rey Chico festivities hall situated between the Alhambra and the Albayzin on the left bank of the Rio Darro had been halted and a UNESCO-ICOMOS mission was undertaken in November 1997.

The conclusions of the mission were the following:

1. the building as such does not pose major problems,
2. however, the use of the building as a festivities hall for 1000 people is incompatible with the site (access roads, traffic, noise etc.). It is recommended, therefore, that the use of the building be reviewed;
3. areas adjacent to the building should be declared 'non-constructable' to enable an appropriate landscaping of the valley of the Rio Darro;
4. the management plan for the Alhambra, the Generalife and Albaycin should be revised and incorporated in an overall comprehensive management plan for the site. This should be supervised by a scientific committee involving UNESCO, as was recommended by the Bureau at its session June 1997.

Having examined the above information, the Committee endorsed the recommendations made by the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission and urged the Spanish authorities to implement them. The Committee requested the Spanish authorities to submit a report on the progress made in their implementation by 15 April 1998 for examination by the twenty-second session of the Bureau.

#### **VII.54 Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam)**

The Committee took note of the information provided by the Secretariat concerning damage caused by the 24 September 1997 typhoon to the historic buildings of Hué; and of continued building violations in the buffer zones which may undermine the integrity of this site. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the agreement for decentralized co-operation between the Province of Hué, the City of Lille and UNESCO, which should enable a thorough

review of the land-use and building regulations of the protected area and the buffer zones of the site and the establishment of the Heritage House - an advisory service for the local population attached to the provincial municipal urban planning office. The Committee requested the Government to submit to the twenty-second session of the Committee, a written report on the options being considered for the upgrading and construction of roads affecting Hué, and on measures being undertaken to stop building violations. The Committee also requested the Government to provide the Secretariat with a technical report on the impact of the typhoon on the site.

c) **Reports on the state of conservation of cultural properties noted by the Committee**

**VII.55** The Committee noted the decisions of the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau on the following cultural properties as reflected in the report of the Bureau session, Working Documents WHC-97/CONF.208/4B Section III.C.c):

Joya de Ceren Archaeological Site (El Salvador)  
 Le Canal du Midi (France)  
 Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France)  
 Ashanti Traditional Buildings (Ghana)  
 Maya Site of Copan (Honduras)  
 Agra Fort, Taj Mahal, Fatehpur Sikri (India)  
 Quseir Amra (Jordan)  
 Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic)  
 Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico)  
 Ilha de Mozambique (Mozambique)  
 Moenjodaro (Pakistan)  
 Baroque Churches of the Philippines (Philippines)  
 Old Town of Segovia and its Aqueduct (Spain)  
 Cultural World Heritage sites in Sri Lanka  
 Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic)  
 Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)  
 Itchan Kala, Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan)  
 Shibam and Zabid (Yemen).

**VII.56** During the examination of the state of conservation, delegates raised the question of delisting properties from the World Heritage List. The Committee noted that while the procedure for the eventual deletion was outlined in paragraphs 46 to 56 of the Operational Guidelines, more detailed criteria would be required to evaluate if a property has lost all the values for which it was inscribed.

**VII.57** The Delegate of Zimbabwe observed that the number of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger is increasing and that many of them are located in Africa. Many of them were inscribed in the seventies and eighties when proper management plans were not always in place. He wondered what pro-active actions could be taken to solve the problems at

these sites. He suggested that assistance be provided for the preparation of management plans and that more emphasis should be placed on capacity-building even before sites are nominated.

**VII.58** The Delegate of Japan expressed his great concern about the safety of the cultural properties in Afghanistan. With regard to threats to the cultural heritage of Afghanistan, the Committee unanimously adopted the following resolution submitted by Italy:

*The World Heritage Committee*, convened in Naples from 1 to 6 December 1997 at its twenty-first session,

*Concerned* at news reports about threats to the cultural and natural heritage of Afghanistan, particularly the Buddhist statues in Bamyan,

*Stressing the need* to consider this heritage, for its inestimable value, not only as part of the heritage of Afghanistan but as part of the heritage of humankind,

*Recalling* the appeal made by the Director-General of UNESCO in September 1997 in Islamabad for international solidarity for the protection of the Afghan cultural heritage,

*Bearing in mind* the rights and duties of all State Parties to the Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage,

1. *Reaffirms* the sovereign rights and responsibilities, towards the International Community, of each State for the protection of its own cultural and natural heritage;
2. *Calls upon* the International Community to provide all the possible assistance needed to protect and conserve the cultural and natural heritage of Afghanistan under threat;
3. *Invites* the authorities in Afghanistan to take appropriate measures in order to safeguard the cultural and natural heritage of the country;
4. *Further invites* the authorities in Afghanistan to co-operate with UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee with a view to ensuring effective protection of its cultural and natural heritage;
5. *Requests* the Secretariat of UNESCO to take appropriate steps to foster international awareness of the outstanding value of Afghan cultural and natural heritage and to co-operate with the SPACH (Society for Preservation of Cultural Heritage of Afghanistan) and other partners for safeguarding that heritage;
6. *Decides* to remain actively seized of the matter.

## **VIII. INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE LISTS AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

### **A. NATURAL PROPERTIES**

**VIII.1** The Committee examined eight natural nominations and two mixed sites received for review by IUCN. The Committee noted that two sites had been withdrawn by States Parties: Fossil Forest of Dunarobba (Italy) and Vodlozero National Park (Russian Federation) before the twenty-first session of the Bureau. The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its twenty-first session had decided not to examine the nomination of Biogradska Gora National Park (No. 838) submitted by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) as well as the nomination of Central Karakorum National Park (No. 802) submitted by Pakistan.

**VIII.2** Concerning the nomination of Central Karakorum National Park (No. 802), the Committee recalled that the Bureau at its twenty-first session had deferred the examination of this nomination and had requested IUCN not to proceed with the evaluation.

**VIII.3** The Observer of Pakistan requested the Committee to take up this matter and to send an IUCN evaluation mission to the site. His full statement is contained in Annex IV.1. The Observer of India explained that the site is located in an area which is legally a part of India and that the question should be first solved by the two countries. His full statement is contained in Annex IV.2. The Committee considered the matter and decided to send a letter to the Permanent Delegations of Pakistan and India to the effect that the Committee has decided to bring up and decide about this matter at the next session of the Bureau.

#### **A.1 Properties included on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

**VIII.4** The Committee examined the state of conservation reports contained in Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/8BRev and decided to include the following natural properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

- Okapi Faunal Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo)
- Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo)
- Manovo-Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic)

#### **A.2 Property removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger**

**VIII.5** The Committee examined the state of conservation reports contained in Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/8A and decided to remove the following natural property from the List of World Heritage in Danger:

- Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)



### **A.3 Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

| <b>Name of Property</b>           | <b>Identification number</b> | <b>State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention</b> | <b>Criteria</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| <b>Heard and McDonald Islands</b> | <b>577Rev.</b>               | <b>Australia</b>   | <b>N(i)(ii)</b> |

The Committee inscribed this property under criteria (i) and (ii). It noted that this site is the only volcanically active sub-Antarctic island and illustrates ongoing geomorphic processes and glacial dynamics in the coastal and submarine environment and sub-Antarctic flora and fauna, with no record of alien species. The Committee repeated its request by the sixteenth session for further documentation on the marine resources of the site.

|                         |                 |                  |                  |
|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Macquarie Island</b> | <b>629 Rev.</b> | <b>Australia</b> | <b>N(i)(iii)</b> |
|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|

The Committee recalled that it had referred this nomination back to Australia in order that new material can be assessed. In presenting its revised evaluation, IUCN stated that the nomination had been submitted for its geological and not for its biological values, and that the sixteenth session of the Committee declined the nomination requesting Australia to consider Macquarie Island for its biological values and had noted its potential as part of an international World Heritage site with the Subantarctic Islands of New Zealand. Australia reported that it had consulted with New Zealand in 1996 and had found that New Zealand was not ready for a joint nomination. The Committee was informed that New Zealand had subsequently nominated its Subantarctic Islands for review by the twenty-second session of the Bureau. IUCN felt that the basis for the nomination of Macquarie Island was too narrow and recommended deferral of the nomination.

The Committee recalled that the Bureau discussed: (1) geological and biological values; (2) the sovereignty of States Parties to nominate properties and (3) the outstanding universal value of the nominated property, and that the Bureau by consensus decided to recommend the Committee to inscribe the property under criteria (i) and (iii).

The Committee decided that the site provides an unique example of exposure of the ocean crust above the sea level and of geological evidence for sea-floor spreading, and is an exposure of the oceanic plate boundary between the Pacific and Australian/Indian plates, exposed with active faults and ongoing tectonic movements.

The Committee decided to inscribe the site under criteria (i) and (iii) and took note of the reservations expressed by the Delegate of Thailand concerning criterion (iii). The Committee encouraged the Australian authorities to consider for the future a renomination with the Subantarctic Islands of New Zealand and to consider adding biological criteria in a future renomination. Australia indicated that the Australian Government was willing to consider both proposals.

**Sundarbans** **798** **Bangladesh** **N(ii)(iv)**

The Committee recalled that the Bureau had suggested that the initial nomination was of insufficient size and encouraged the authorities of Bangladesh to consider enlarging the nomination to include the Sundarbans East and South Wildlife Sanctuaries. It commended the Government of Bangladesh for responding to this request to extend the boundaries of the site to now include all three wildlife sanctuaries.

The Committee inscribed the site under criteria (ii) and (iv) as one of the largest remaining areas of mangroves in the world, which supports an exceptional biodiversity with a wide range of flora and fauna, including the Bengal Tiger and provides a significant example of on-going ecological processes (monsoon rains, flooding, delta formation, tidal influence and plant colonisation).

The Committee furthermore encouraged the authorities of Bangladesh and of India to discuss the possibility for creating a transfrontier site with the adjoining Sundarbans National Park and World Heritage site (India).

**Cocos Island National Park** **820** **Costa Rica** **N(ii)(iv)**

The Committee inscribed Cocos Island National Park under natural criteria (ii) and (iv) because of the critical habitats the site provides for marine wildlife including large pelagic species, especially sharks. The Committee commended the Government of Costa Rica for its initiative to incorporate the marine environment into the Park and encouraged it to extend management from 8km to the 15km legal limit around the island.

**Morne Trois Pitons National Park** **814** **Dominica** **N(i)(iv)**

The Committee inscribed the Morne Trois Pitons National Park on the basis of natural criteria (i) and (iv) for its diverse flora with endemic species of vascular plants, its volcanoes, rivers and waterfalls, illustrating ongoing geo-morphological processes with high scenic value.

The Committee commended the authorities of Dominica for their response to the Bureau's request to provide a time frame for the revision of the management plan and for having submitted a technical assistance request for this revision. The Committee took note of the answer provided by the Dominican authorities that they have no plans for further hydroelectric power development in the Park and act to eliminate private holdings in the Park.

**Mount Kenya National Park/  
Natural Forest** **800** **Kenya** **N(ii)(iii)**

The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its twenty-first session expressed concern about illegal deforestation and encroachment on the slopes of Mt. Kenya and had recommended that the Kenyan authorities reduce the size of the nominated area by excluding heavily impacted forests. The Committee commended the Kenyan authorities for their response to the Bureau's request and the details provided on actions to be taken to improve the management of the

forest zone and a map of the revised boundaries of the property. The Committee encouraged the State Party to continue its efforts to better protect the Forest Reserve.

The Committee inscribed this property under natural criteria (ii) and (iii) as one of the most impressive landscapes of Eastern Africa with its rugged glacier-clad summits, Afro-alpine moor lands and diverse forests, which illustrate outstanding ecological processes.

**Sibiloi/Central Island National Parks**                      **801**                                      **Kenya**                                      **N(i)(iv)**

The Committee inscribed this property on the basis of natural criteria (i) and (iv) for the discoveries of mammal fossil remains in the site which led to the scientific reconstruction of the palaeo-environment of the entire Turkana Lake basin of the Quarternary Period. The Lake Turkana ecosystem with its diverse bird life and desert environment offers an exceptional laboratory for studies of plant and animal communities. The Committee expressed its concern and drew the attention of the Kenyan authorities to illegal grazing by large herds of domestic livestock in the Parks.

Concerning cultural criteria, the Committee noted that the comparative study of fossil hominid sites by ICOMOS has been completed and that it gives highest importance to Koobi Fora. The Committee, however, decided to defer the nomination under cultural criteria to allow the State Party to clearly delineate the cultural part of this nomination, which does not concern the same area as the natural part.

#### **A.4 Property which the Committee did not inscribe on the World Heritage List**

**The Valley of Vinales Pinar del Rio**                                      **840**                                      **Cuba**

The Committee noted that the site does not meet the natural criteria, lacked clearly defined boundaries and does not have sufficient legal protection. Hence, the Committee decided not to inscribe this site on the List. The Committee noted that the Cuban authorities may wish to consider nominating the area as a cultural landscape.



## C. CULTURAL HERITAGE

**VIII.6** The Committee was informed that all the cultural properties submitted for inscription were included in the Tentative Lists of the respective States Parties.

**VIII.7** In introducing the cultural properties nominated to the World Heritage List, the Representative of ICOMOS explained the procedure used for the evaluation of these properties. This involved the International Scientific and National Committees of ICOMOS, its individual members and associated scientific bodies. The large number of nominations that ICOMOS was currently being called upon to evaluate was imposing severe stress on its international Secretariat, given the present level of funding from the World Heritage Fund.

**VIII.8** On behalf of IUCN and ICOMOS, the Representative of ICOMOS formally requested the Committee to give consideration to promoting the presentation of new nominations to a higher place in the agenda of its meetings, so as to allow adequate time to be allocated for this purpose. At recent meetings, discussions on earlier agenda items had overrun, with the result that the presentations of new nominations had been severely curtailed.

**VIII.9** The Committee examined and inscribed thirty-eight cultural properties.

### C.1 Property included on the List of World Heritage in Danger

The Committee examined the state of conservation reports contained in Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/8BRev and decided to include the following cultural property on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

- Butrinti (Albania)

### C.2 Properties which the Committee inscribed on the World Heritage List

| Name of Property  | Identification number | State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention | Criteria   |
|---|-----------------------|---|------------|
| Hallstatt-Dachstein/<br>Salzkammergut<br>Cultural Landscape | 806                   | Austria   | C(iii)(iv) |

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv), considering that the Hallstatt-Dachstein/Salzkammergut alpine region is an outstanding example of a natural landscape of great beauty and scientific interest which also contains evidence of a fundamental human economic activity, the whole integrated in a harmonious and mutually beneficial manner.

**The Historic Centre of  
C(iii)(iv)(v)  
Sao Luis**                      **821**                      **Brazil**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv) and (v), considering that the Historic Centre of São Luis do Maranhão is an outstanding example of a Portuguese colonial town that adapted successfully to the climatic conditions in equatorial South America and which has preserved its urban fabric, harmoniously integrated with its natural setting, to an exceptional degree.

**The Old Town of Lijiang**                      **811**                      **China**                      **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the basis of cultural criteria (ii), (iv) and (v). Lijiang is an exceptional ancient town set in a dramatic landscape which represents the harmonious fusion of different cultural traditions to produce an urban landscape of outstanding quality.

**The Ancient City of  
Ping Yao**                      **812**                      **China**                      **C(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv), considering that the Ancient City of Ping Yao is an outstanding example of a Han Chinese city of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (14th-20th centuries) that has retained all its features to an exceptional degree and in doing so provides a remarkably complete picture of cultural, social, economic, and religious development during one of the most seminal periods of Chinese history.

**The Classical Gardens  
of Suzhou**                      **813**                      **China**                      **C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v), considering that the four classical gardens of Suzhou are masterpieces of Chinese landscape garden design in which art, nature, and ideas are integrated perfectly to create ensembles of great beauty and peaceful harmony, and four gardens are integral to the entire historic urban plan. The Committee, however, recommended that the State Party submit a nomination to extend the World Heritage protection to cover historic sectors of Suzhou and to take measures to maintain the integrity of this historic town, whose cultural value, marked by the linkage between its canal system and its gardens, extends beyond the four nominated gardens.

**The Episcopal Complex of the Euphrasian Basilica in the Historic Centre of Porec**      **809**      **Croatia**      **C(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv), considering that the Episcopal complex of the Euphrasian Basilica in the historic centre of Porec is an outstanding example of an early Christian episcopal ensemble that is exceptional by virtue of its completeness and its unique Basilican cathedral.

**The Historic City of Trogir**      **810**      **Croatia**      **C(ii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv), considering that Trogir is an excellent example of a medieval town built on and conforming with the layout of a Hellenistic and Roman city that has conserved its urban fabric to an exceptional degree and with the minimum of modern interventions, in which the trajectory of social and cultural development is clearly visible in every aspect of the townscape.

**San Pedro de la Roca Castle, Santiago de Cuba**      **841**      **Cuba**      **C(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (iv) and (v), considering that the Castle of San Pedro de la Roca and its associated defensive works are of exceptional value because they constitute the largest and most comprehensive example of the principles of Renaissance military engineering adapted to the requirements of European colonial powers in the Caribbean.

**The Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn**      **822**      **Estonia**      **C(ii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv), considering that Tallinn is an outstanding and exceptionally complete and well preserved example of a medieval northern European trading city that retains the salient features of this unique form of economic and social community to a remarkable degree.

**The Historic Fortified City of Carcassonne**      **345rev.**      **France**      **C(ii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv), considering that the historic town of Carcassonne is an excellent example of a medieval fortified town whose massive defences were constructed on walls dating from Late Antiquity. It is of exceptional importance by virtue of the restoration work carried out in the second half of the 19th century by Viollet-le-Duc, which had a profound influence on subsequent developments in conservation principles and practice.

**The 18th Century Royal Palace at Caserta, with the Park, the Aqueduct of Vanvitelli, and the San Leucio Complex**      **549rev**      **Italy**      **C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), considering that the monumental complex at Caserta, whilst cast in the same mould as other 18th century royal establishments, is exceptional for the broad sweep of its design, incorporating not only an imposing palace and park, but also much of the surrounding natural landscape and an ambitious new town laid out according to the urban planning precepts of its time. The industrial complex of the Belvedere, designed to produce silk, is also of outstanding interest because of the idealistic principles that underlay its original conception and management.

**Residences of the Royal House of Savoy**      **823**      **Italy**      **C(i)(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iv) and (v), considering that the Residences of the Royal House of Savoy in and around Turin represent a comprehensive overview of European monumental architecture in the 17th and 18th centuries, using style, dimensions, and space to illustrate in an exceptional way the prevailing doctrine of absolute monarchy in material terms.

**The Botanical Garden (Orto Botanico), Padua**      **824**      **Italy**      **C(ii)(iii)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii), considering that the Botanical Garden of Padua is the original of all botanical gardens throughout the world, and represents the birth of science, of scientific exchanges, and understanding of the relationship between nature and culture. It has made a profound contribution to the development of many modern scientific disciplines, notably botany, medicine, chemistry, ecology, and pharmacy.

**Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto)**      **826**      **Italy**      **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (v), considering that the eastern Ligurian Riviera between Cinque Terre and Portovenere is a cultural site of outstanding value, representing the harmonious interaction between people and nature to produce a landscape of exceptional scenic quality that illustrates a traditional way of life that has existed for a thousand years and continues to play an important socio-economic role in the life of the community.



**The Cathedral, Torre Civica and Piazza Grande, Modena**      **827**      **Italy**      **C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), considering that the joint creation of Lanfranco and Wiligelmo is a masterpiece of human creative genius in which a new dialectical relationship between architecture and sculpture was created in Romanesque art. The Modena complex bears exceptional witness to the cultural traditions of the 12th century and is one of the best examples of an architectural complex where religious and civic values are combined in a medieval Christian town.

**The Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata**      **829**      **Italy**      **C(iii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv) and (v), considering that the impressive remains of the towns of Pompei and Herculaneum and their associated villas, buried by the eruption of Vesuvius in AD 79, provide a complete and vivid picture of society and daily life at a specific moment in the past that is without parallel anywhere in the world.

The Committee asked Italy to submit a progress report in time for the Bureau meeting in June 1998, on the management measures taken at Pompei, with particular reference to experience gained through planned partnerships between the State and private enterprises, as well as information concerning the protection of the environment surrounding the area.

**The Costiera Amalfitana**      **830**      **Italy**      **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (v), considering that the Costiera Amalfitana is an outstanding example of a Mediterranean landscape, with exceptional cultural and natural scenic values resulting from its dramatic topography and historical evolution.

**The Archaeological Area of Agrigento**      **831**      **Italy**      **C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), considering that Agrigento was one of the greatest cities of the ancient Mediterranean world, and it has been preserved in an exceptionally intact condition. Its great row of Doric temples is one of the most outstanding monuments of Greek art and culture.

**Villa Romana del Casale**      **832**      **Italy**      **C(i)(ii)(iii)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iii), considering that the Villa del Casale at Piazza Armerina is the supreme example of a luxury

Roman villa, which graphically illustrates the predominant social and economic structure of its age. The mosaics that decorate it are exceptional for their artistic quality and invention as well as their extent.

The Committee asked the State Party to provide a report on the conservation and management of the site and in particular on the monitoring of the climatic conditions within the protective structures and their impact on the archaeological remains.

**Su Nuraxi di Barumini**                      **833**                      **Italy**                      **C(i)(iii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of cultural criteria (i), (iii) and (iv), considering that the nuraghe of Sardinia, of which Su Nuraxi is the pre-eminent example, represent an exceptional response to political and social conditions, making an imaginative and innovative use of the materials and techniques available to a prehistoric island community.

**The Ch'angdokkung Palace Complex**                      **816**                      **Korea**  
**(Republic of)**                      **C(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv), considering that the Ch'angdokkung Palace Compound is an outstanding example of Far Eastern palace architecture and garden design, exceptional for the way in which the buildings are integrated into and harmonized with the natural setting, adapting to the topography and retaining indigenous tree cover.

**Hwasong Fortress**                      **817**                      **Korea**  
**(Republic of)**                      **C(ii)(iii)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii), considering that the Hwasong Fortress is an outstanding example of early modern military architecture, incorporating the most highly developed features of that science from both east and west.

The Delegate of the Republic of Korea thanked the Committee for having decided to inscribe the above two sites on the World Heritage List.

**The Historic Centre of Riga**                      **852**                      **Latvia**                      **C(i)(ii)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i) and (ii), considering that the historic centre of Riga, while retaining its medieval and later urban fabric relatively intact, is of outstanding universal value by virtue of the quality and the quantity of its Art Nouveau/Jugendstil architecture, which is unparalleled anywhere in the world, and its 19th century architecture in wood.

**Hospicio Cabanas,  
Guadalajara**                      **815**                      **Mexico**                      **C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), considering that the Hospicio Cabañas is a unique architectural complex, designed to respond to social and economic requirements for housing the sick, the aged, the young, and the needy, which provides an outstanding solution of great subtlety and humanity. It also houses one of the acknowledged masterpieces of mural art.

**The Archaeological Site  
of Volubilis**                      **836**                      **Morocco**                      **C(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)**

The Committee decided to inscribe the Archaeological Site of Volubilis on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi), considering that this site is an exceptionally well preserved example of a large Roman colonial town on the fringes of the Empire.

**The Medina of Tétouan  
(formerly known as Titawin)**                      **837**                      **Morocco**                      **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe the Medina of Tétouan (formerly known as Titawin) on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (v), considering that it is an exceptionally well preserved and complete example of this type of historic town, displaying all the features of the high Andalusian culture.

**Lumbini, the Birthplace  
of the Lord Buddha**                      **666rev.**                      **Nepal**                      **C(iii)(vi)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the basis of criteria (iii) and (vi). As the birthplace of the Lord Buddha, the sacred area of Lumbini is one of the holiest places of one of the world's great religions, and its remains contain important evidence about the nature of Buddhist pilgrimage centres from a very early period.

The Delegate of Thailand declared that apart from Lumbini, there are two other sites closely associated with Buddha which are in the process of preparation to be presented as serial nominations and that he hoped that the Committee would consider them in this context.

**The Mill Network at  
Kinderdijk-Elshout**                      **818**                      **Netherlands**                      **C(i)(ii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv) considering that the Kinderdijk-Elshout mill network is an outstanding man-made landscape that bears powerful testimony to human ingenuity and fortitude over nearly a millennium in draining and protecting an area by the development and application of hydraulic technology.

**The Historic Area of Willemstad, Inner City and Harbour**                      **819**                      **Netherlands**                      **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the basis of cultural criteria (ii), (iv) and (v), considering that the Historic Area of Willemstad is a European colonial ensemble in the Caribbean of outstanding value and integrity, which illustrates the organic growth of a multicultural community over three centuries and preserves to a high degree significant elements of the many strands that came together to create it.

**Rohtas Fort**                      **586rev**                      **Pakistan**                      **C(ii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv), considering that the Rohtas Fort is an exceptional example of the Muslim military architecture of central and south Asia, which blends architectural and artistic traditions from Turkey and the Indian sub-continent to create the model for Mughal architecture and its subsequent refinements and adaptations.

**Historic District of the Town of Panama with the Salon Bolivar**                      **790**                      **Panama**                      **C(ii)(iv)(vi)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of cultural criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi), considering that Panamá was the first European settlement on the Pacific coast of the Americas, in 1519, and the Historic District preserves intact a street pattern, together with a substantial number of early domestic buildings, which are exceptional testimony to the nature of this early settlement. The Salón Bolivar is of outstanding historical importance, as the venue for Simón Bolivar's visionary attempt in 1826 to create a Pan-American congress, more than a century before such institutions became a reality.

The Delegate of Thailand expressed his reservations on the application of criterion (vi).

**The Medieval Town of Torun**                      **835**                      **Poland**                      **C(ii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv), considering that Torun is a small historic trading city that preserves to a remarkable extent its original street pattern and outstanding early buildings, and which provides an exceptionally complete picture of the medieval way of life.

**The Castle of the Teutonic Order in Malbork**                      **847**                      **Poland**  
**C(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv), considering that Malbork Castle is the supreme example of the medieval brick castle that characterizes the unique architecture of the Crusading Teutonic Order in eastern Europe. It is also of considerable historical significance for the evidence that it provides of the evolution of the modern philosophy and practice of restoration and conservation.





*Considering* the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention and notably the relative criteria concerning the inscription of cultural heritage on the World Heritage List,

*Invites* the Consultative Body of the Committee to re-examine the criteria concerning the inscription of cultural heritage and notably criterion (i) as well as that of authenticity."

**VIII.12** During the debate, the Zimbabwe Delegation noted with serious concern the growing geographical imbalance between countries that are already over-represented on the World Heritage List and those that are grossly underrepresented. The fundamental problem is that despite the professed movement away from the emphasis on 'monumentality', criterion (i) is being used extensively. With the emphasis on 'masterpieces' of human creative genius supported by other criteria that emphasize architectural ensemble, the Global Strategy adopted by the World Heritage Committee is seriously undermined. A major achievement of the Global Strategy was that it sought the extension of the Convention to include the intangible heritage: in particular, criterion (vi), each property should be "directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas or with beliefs....". Moreover, the Delegate noted that while criterion (i) and other criteria are being used "willy-nilly", there is an injunction that criterion (vi) should be used sparingly. There is need for ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee to refocus on the Global Strategy and to implement its provisions if the imbalance is to be corrected.

**VIII.13** The Secretary General of ICOMOS noted that the discussions had raised several important questions. He considered that these in-depth debates were valuable and highly desirable. ICOMOS, in its capacity as advisory body to the Committee, was willing to contribute to these discussions with inputs from its professional network. On the one hand, clarification of the positions regarding the test of authenticity, the application of nomination criteria, and in general, the reference standards (Venice Charter and other texts) should be decided upon. On the other, from the fundamental viewpoint, concrete measures should be taken to improve representivity of the List, along the lines of pertinent interventions made by the Delegate of Zimbabwe. The questions were clearly posed and, in the framework of the Global Strategy, corrective measures have been taken. However, in reality, the proposals for nominations originating from States Parties continue, and even worsen, the imbalance. Other than the regional seminars to which ICOMOS is associated, it provides thematic studies of categories of under-represented properties and studies the various measures to limit nominations for submission to the consideration of the Committee.

**VIII.14** The Representative of IUCN indicated that IUCN has a broad regional representation of its own offices in Latin America, Africa and Asia which can assist countries in these regions. In addition, he specifically noted that the Pacific Island nations should receive more attention.

**VIII.15** The Chairperson announced that the issues raised during the debate will be examined by the Consultative Body, which will report to the twenty-second session of the Bureau in June 1998.

## **IX. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THEMATIC AND COMPARATIVE STUDIES**

The Committee took note of Information Documents WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.7, WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.8, WHC-97/CONF.INF.12 and WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.13.

**IX.1** The Global Strategy approved by the Committee in 1994 aims at improving the representivity of cultural heritage on the World Heritage List and redressing the imbalance due to the pre-eminence of Europe, Christianity and monumental architecture, as well as to encourage the nomination of properties illustrating archaeological, industrial and technical heritage from non-European cultures and, in general, of all living cultures, particularly traditional societies and their many continuing interactions with their natural environment.

**IX.2** In its presentation, the Secretariat did not repeat the information contained in Document WHC-97/CONF.208/11 relating to progress on the Global Strategy for cultural heritage, but took this opportunity to evaluate the activities undertaken in **Africa** since the adoption in 1994 of the Global Strategy. From 1995 to 1997, the World Heritage Centre, in close co-operation with ICOMOS, organized two expert meetings to which representatives of States Parties and non-States Parties to the Convention were invited, as well as two workshops during which the participants were able to practise the preparation of tentative lists and proposals for the inscription of properties. Although the methodology adopted had enhanced the knowledge of the procedures in force, and fifteen of the thirty States Parties had already prepared tentative lists and a calendar of proposals for inscription on the World Heritage List up until the year 2001 had been prepared, the Secretariat underlined the specificity of the situation and drew attention to the conditions for "preparatory assistance", for which many countries from the region could not apply until they have paid their outstanding dues to the World Heritage Fund. Furthermore, during meetings and workshops, African experts emphasized that the ceiling of "preparatory assistance" (US\$ 15,000) was insufficient to prepare nomination dossiers, because at many African sites, listed on the tentative lists, the costs for the gathering of documentation, preparation of conservation and management plans, was far superior to US\$ 15,000. Therefore, complementary measures appear indispensable to assist these countries in the efficient implementation of the Global Strategy. This situation implies a proposal for a coherent training policy in co-operation with ICCROM. To achieve this, the Secretariat also proposes to use UNESCO offices.

**IX.3** During the debate, the African delegates recognized the pertinence of the methodology proposed and suggested associating their efforts with those undertaken by the World Heritage Centre to encourage countries south of the Sahara to ratify the 1972 Convention. The Delegate of Benin suggested that the Director of the Centre be a member of the UNESCO Delegation participating at the Organization for African Unity (OAU) to inform as many States as possible about World Heritage. The Observer of South Africa proposed that the African States Parties should, in the same way, create national committees for the implementation of the 1972 Convention, so as to activate the process from the establishment of tentative lists through to the preparation of the nomination dossier. The delegates reiterated their support for the training strategy adopted at the twentieth session of the Committee (Merida, 1996). It was also recommended to invite experts from all Sub-saharan African regions to the expert meeting on African Cultural Landscape, scheduled in 1998, in Kenya. Finally, the suggestion to organize a meeting on Global Strategy in Western Africa was welcome and the Republic of Benin offered to host it in autumn 1998, instead of 1999, as it was originally foreseen.



**IX.4** Concerning the implementation of the **Global Strategy in the Pacific**, it was noted that there are still very few States Parties to the Convention in the Pacific. The Director of the Centre informed the Committee that the need to encourage greater adherence to, and implementation of the Convention in the Pacific has been included as part of UNESCO's new strategic approach called "Focus on the Pacific". The Delegate of Australia gave her encouragement and support for Global Strategy work in the Pacific stressing that the region's cultural and natural heritage is currently under-represented on the List. She made reference to the Global Strategy work already performed in the Pacific, most notably the meeting held in Suva, Fiji, in association with the Fiji Museum, which was already leading to tangible results (WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.8). She supported the proposal to hold a follow-up meeting for the Pacific in 1998, indicating that Australia would be active in assisting in the meeting and asked that a progress report on Global Strategy work in the Pacific be presented to the next session of the Committee. The Delegate of the Republic of Korea suggested that the Committee members of the region, Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea and Thailand, participate in the meeting together with experts, to undertake joint efforts regarding those small islands' Governments of the Pacific, especially noting that the main objective of the proposed Global Strategy meeting is to encourage those Pacific islands to accede to the Convention. IUCN asked that the meeting address both cultural and natural heritage as they are so intrinsically linked in the Pacific.

**IX.5** The Committee took note of the comparative studies which were undertaken by **ICOMOS** in 1997 on Fossil Hominid sites, Iberian Colonial towns in Latin America, Islamic military sites in Central and South Asia, and Castles of the Teutonic Order in Central and Eastern Europe.

**IX.6** The Committee recalled that the Global Strategy was originally devised with particular reference to cultural heritage and that in March 1996 an expert meeting in the Parc National de la Vanoise, France, affirmed the application of the Global Strategy for natural heritage.

The Committee noted that **thematic studies** (e.g. on tropical forests and wetlands, coastal and marine ecosystems) funded by an earmarked contribution from Australia, have commenced in co-operation with IUCN. The Committee was informed of a number of actions concerning **geological heritage**, including a thematic brochure on World Heritage sites of geological value and co-ordination meetings with the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS), the International Geological Correlation Programme (IGCP) and the UNESCO Division of Earth Sciences. The Committee noted that within the framework of the Global Strategy a study was carried out in 1997 on the "**Identification of potential natural heritage sites in the Arab Countries**" and was provided to States Parties in the Arab Region.

**IX.7** The Committee took note of the **preliminary Draft European Landscape Convention** (Resolution 53/97 of the Council of Europe) and Recommendation 31 of the Council of Europe's "Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe" (CLRAE) presented in Information Document WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.12. The Committee welcomed the complementarity of the World Heritage Convention and the proposed Preliminary Draft of the European Landscape Convention and the synergy of efforts. The Committee was informed of the "Intergovernmental Consultation Conference on the Preliminary Draft European Landscape Convention" organized by CLRAE and to be held from 2 to 4 April 1998 in Florence (Italy) and welcomed the initiative by CLRAE to enhance the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of European landscapes. The Delegate of France underlined that new instruments should find their place

among existing legal instruments, on the national, regional and international level and that a collaboration between the World Heritage Committee, the Centre and the new European instrument should be organized. The Committee recalled that at its twentieth session in December 1996, it approved US \$30,000 for an **Expert Meeting on cultural landscapes of the Andean Region** to guide States Parties in the identification, selection and presentation of cultural landscapes in the Andes. The meeting will be held in Peru in May 1998.

**IX.8** The Committee recalled that a preliminary consultation meeting took place in conjunction with the World Heritage Bureau session, on 28 June 1997, to further define the objectives and agenda for the **Global Strategy Expert Meeting on Natural and Cultural Heritage** to be held in 1998. The report of the consultation meeting was included as ANNEX XI of the report of the twenty-first session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (WHC-97/CONF.208/4A). The Secretariat informed the Committee that co-ordination meetings were held with the advisory bodies and with colleagues from the Culture and Science Sectors of UNESCO. These meetings reviewed replies to the circular letter on the Selection of National Experts, and refined the agenda items into more detailed terms of reference, noting in particular that the meeting should focus on an analysis of issues through case studies. The Committee also recalled that it approved US \$30,000 for this activity at its twentieth session in December 1996 and welcomed the offer by the Government of the Netherlands to host the Expert Meeting.

**IX.9** While referring to the Global Strategy meeting scheduled in **South East Asia** in 1999, the Committee stressed the importance of wood architectural heritage and its conservation. In addition, it emphasized the relation of this heritage to ritual ceremonies and therefore its link to intangible heritage. The Observer of India underlined the importance of living cultures and the suggested meeting in Central Asia and offered to host a Global Strategy meeting for **South Asia** in India in 1999.

**IX.10** The Committee reviewed the proposals for Global Strategy activities for 1998 and 1999. The Committee approved the following budget including the items for IUCN and ICOMOS, foreseen in Chapter II of WHC-97/CONF.208/13:

**Summary Budget for the Global Strategy, 1998 to 1999**

|                 |   |                     |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| <b>WHF 1998</b> | Expert Meeting on Cultural Landscapes in Africa, Kenya  | US\$ 40,000         |
|                 | Global Strategy Meeting for the Caribbean region, Martinique  | US\$ 35,000         |
|                 | Follow-up Global Strategy meeting for the Pacific, Vanuatu  | US\$ 30,000         |
|                 | Sub-regional meeting on Central Asian cultural heritage   | US\$ 20,000         |
|                 | Global Strategy meeting, Western Africa, Benin  | US\$ 50,000         |
|                 | Africa Revisited Publication  | US\$ 15,000         |
|                 | IUCN Ecosystem subregional and thematic studies for natural heritage  | US\$ 30,000         |
|                 | ICOMOS  | US\$ 23,000         |
|                 | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  | <b>US\$ 243,000</b> |
| <b>WHF 1999</b> | Global Strategy meeting, South-East Asia  | US\$ 40,000         |
|                 | Global Strategy meeting, South Asia, India (to be approved by the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee) |                     |
|                 | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  | <b>US\$ 40,000</b>  |

**X. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

**X.1** The Committee examined International Assistance requests submitted by States Parties and advisory bodies presented in Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/12Rev. In accordance with paragraphs 91-117 of the Operational Guidelines, the Committee took decisions concerning International Assistance requests for natural and cultural heritage above US\$ 30,000.

**X.2** The Committee's decisions and comments concerning International Assistance requests for natural and cultural heritage have been summarized in the following tables.

## NATURAL HERITAGE

| Requesting State Party or Advisory Body | Description | Amount (US\$) requested | Amount (US\$) approved by Committee | Comments |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
|---|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|

### 1. TRAINING

|                            |   |                |                |  |
|----------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|--|
| India                      | Meeting of Regional Training Centres and Selected Academic/ Training Institutions for Curricula and Training Materials Development, Wildlife Institute of India | 41,000.        | 30,000.        | The Committee requested the State Party to consider bearing the costs of the participation of Indian natural World Heritage site managers and specialists. |
| <b>Sub-total: Training</b> |   | <b>41,000.</b> | <b>30,000.</b> |  |

### 2. TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION

|  |   |                 |                 |  |
|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| India                                    | Strengthening Protection of the Kaziranga National Park | 50,000.         | 50,000.         | The Committee approved an amount of US\$ 50,000. for this project for 1998 to enable the construction of 10 guard camps (US\$ 25,000.) 5 highland wildlife shelters (US\$ 21,000.) and audio-visual equipment for the Park interpretation Centre at Kohara (US\$ 4,000.). With reference to Article 22(d) of the Convention, the Delegate of Thailand disassociated himself from this decision.  |
| Niger                                    | Purchase of equipment for W National Park               | 75,000.         | 50,000.         | After discussion of an intervention by the Delegate of Thailand, whether Article 22(d) of the Convention would exclude the construction of houses and guard posts, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO equipment unit and the State Party to purchase the equipment through competitive bidding and in the most cost effective manner. The Committee decided that the funds should not be used for construction purposes and maintenance of vehicles and requested the State Party to co-operate with the Centre and to submit to the 22nd session of the Bureau, a progress report on project implementation. |
| <b>Sub-total: Technical Co-operation</b> |   | <b>125,000.</b> | <b>100,000.</b> |  |

## NATURAL HERITAGE

| Requesting State Party or Advisory Body | Description | Amount (US\$) requested | Amount (US\$) approved by Committee | Comments |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
|---|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|

### 3. EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

|                              |  |                 |                 |   |
|------------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| Democratic Republic of Congo | Purchase of Vehicles for four World Heritage Sites   | 88,400.         | 45,000.         | The Committee approved, as a first step, US\$ 45,000. for 2 vehicles for any 2 of the 4 sites under consideration and requested the State Party to co-operate with the World Heritage Centre to submit a progress report on project implementation to the Bureau's 22nd session. In addition, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre to co-operate with conservation NGO's to ensure the safe delivery and proper use and maintenance of the vehicles. |
| India                        | Contribution towards the Implementation of an Emergency Rehabilitation Plan for Manas Wildlife Sanctuary | 160,000.        | 90,000.         | The Committee approved a sum of of US\$ 90,000. to cover the cost of 2 wooden fibre boats (US\$ 5,000.), purchase of 400 patrolling gear (US\$ 15,000.) and construction of buildings within the site (US\$ 70,000.) With reference to Article 22(d) of the Convention, the Delegate of Thailand disassociated himself from this decision.  |
| <b>Sub-total: Emergency</b>  |  | <b>248,400.</b> | <b>135,000.</b> |   |

|                                |                 |                 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Total: Natural Heritage</b> | <b>414,400.</b> | <b>265,000.</b> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

| Requesting State Party or Advisory Body | Description | Amount (US\$) requested | Amount (US\$) approved by Committee | Comments |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
|---|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|

### 1. TRAINING

|                            |   |                 |                 |  |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Austria                    | Training course for the Examination and Conservation of Architectural Surfaces  | 35,000.         | 35,000.         | A Delegate questioned whether or not requests from developed countries should be submitted, considering the limited resources of the World Heritage Fund. He furthermore, requested that participants for this course should include those from the developing countries. ICCROM clarified that this training activity would mostly address participants from Central and Eastern Europe, where conservation of architectural surfaces is particularly necessary, but where the countries faced difficulties in addressing this issue. |
| Brazil                     | Inter-regional Postgraduate Course in the Conservation of Monuments and the rehabilitation of Historic Cities (CECRE) | 50,000.         | 50,000.         |  |
| Ghana                      | Ashanti Traditional Buildings   | 47,000.         | 47,000.         | The Committee requested the State Party to clarify the target audience of this training activity while developing its programme.   |
| ICCROM                     | Development of a training strategy and procedural framework   | 50,000.         | 40,000.         | The Committee approved a sum of US\$ 40,000 to finance the expert meeting to refine the Overall Strategy and for the survey of Latin America Development Strategy.   |
| <b>Sub-total: Training</b> |   | <b>182,000.</b> | <b>172,000.</b> |  |

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

| Requesting State Party or Advisory Body | Description | Amount (US\$) requested | Amount (US\$) approved by Committee | Comments |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
|---|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|

### 2. TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION

|  |   |                 |                 |  |
|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Mexico                                   | Special course on the World Heritage Convention for Latin America and the Caribbean | 30,000.         | 30,000.         |  |
| Vietnam                                  | Revision of urban planning regulations of the Complex of Hué                        | 35,000.         | 35,000.         |  |
| Zimbabwe                                 | Preparation of a conservation plan for Khami Ruins National Monuments               | 76,900.         | 36,900.         |  |
| <b>Sub-total: Technical Co-operation</b> |   | <b>141,900.</b> | <b>101,900.</b> |  |

### 3. EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

|                             |          |                |                 |   |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------------|-----------------|---|
| Albania                     | Butrinti | 47,000.        | 100,000.        | The Committee allocated an amount of US\$ 100,000. as emergency assistance, of which US\$ 47,000. is for the implementation of immediate actions, as requested. The remaining funds are to be allocated, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Committee, for the development and implementation of the programme of corrective measures. |
| <b>Sub-total: Emergency</b> |          | <b>47,000.</b> | <b>100,000.</b> |   |

|                                 |  |                 |                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| <b>Total: Cultural Heritage</b> |  | <b>370,900.</b> | <b>373,900.</b> |  |
|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|--|

**XI. EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET FOR 1998, AND PRESENTATION OF A PROVISIONAL BUDGET FOR 1999**

**XI.1** The Chairperson presented the documents concerning this agenda item, which were :

- WHC-97/CONF.208/13
- WHC-97/CONF.208/13Add, which presented the financial statements of the World Heritage Fund audited by the External Auditor for the year ended 31 December 1996 ;
- WHC-97/CONF.208/13Corr. which showed the adjustments to the amounts of UNESCO's Regular Programme allocated to the World Heritage Centre as approved by the General Conference at its 29th session.

Furthermore, he recalled that the advisory bodies, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM, had submitted their activity reports for 1996 relating to the World Heritage Convention (Documents WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.6A, B and C).

**XI.2** The Director of the Centre then introduced the outline of Document CONF.208/13 as well as the list of decisions required to be taken by the Committee.

- to take note of the financial statements of the World Heritage Fund for the year ended 31 December 1996,

- to take note of the provisional accounts of the World Heritage Fund for 1997, as of 31 August 1997,

- to decide upon the budget ceiling for 1998,

- to allocate within this ceiling the amounts to the different budget chapters,

- to examine and approve the indicative provisional budget for 1999.

**XI.3** The Deputy Comptroller of UNESCO then introduced the financial statements of the World Heritage Fund for 1996 as well as the provisional accounts for 1997 as of 31 August 1997 of which the Committee took note.

One delegate drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the cash at bank of the Fund was in excess of US\$ 5 million and considered that this balance was unnecessarily blocked. He was informed that this balance should be reduced over time through the implementation of the increased budget. The Delegate of Italy stated that he considered the staff costs should not be included in the budget of the World Heritage Fund.

Several delegates raised the subject of the low implementation rate, particularly for preparatory assistance. The Director informed the Committee that the latest figures provided by the Administration Unit of the World Heritage Centre showed an improved implementation rate (almost 81.5% for one budget line in Chapter III).



**XI.4** Whilst noting that the overall presentation of the work plan and budget was clearly improved, the delegates recalled that the external auditor reported little progress had been made in the implementation of the recommendations of the financial audit. The reply by the Deputy Director of the Centre on the rigidity of procedures as well as on the follow up of operations were satisfactory : to date US\$ 300,000 of old obligations had been liquidated and a further amount of US\$ 200,000 would be liquidated or spent before 31 December 1997. A detailed chart of accounts and a database for monitoring of financial operations of the World Heritage Fund had been elaborated. Finally, the Centre is continuing with the implementation of the other recommendations of the External Auditor.

**XI.5** Several interventions concerned improving methods to increase the number of assistance requests that would better correspond to the needs of States Parties. Better communication, greater use of preparatory assistance, as well as co-operation with the States Parties in programme development were suggested. Delegates agreed that greater flexibility was required in the use of the allocated amounts for preparatory assistance.

In the same way, delegates raised the matter of Member States of UNESCO who had not ratified the Convention. Various solutions were made to yet encourage them to ratify to the Convention, including participation in regional and sub-regional meetings, creation of networks, etc. It was decided that all these questions should be discussed by the Consultative Body.

**XI.6** With regard to the budget ceiling, delegates requested that earmarked and non-earmarked funds should be included. After discussions on the amount of funds available, the amount of non-earmarked funds and the capacity of implementation by the World Heritage Centre, a revised budget ceiling amounting to US\$ 4, 137,083 was approved by the Committee for the budget of the World Heritage Fund for 1998. This new budget ceiling was based upon that proposed by the World Heritage Centre, to which were added US\$ 226,333 relating to earmarked activities and US\$ 200,000 relating to non-earmarked activities, as well as US\$ 350,000 for the meeting on Global Strategy in Western Africa, originally foreseen for 1999.

**XI.7** The Committee then examined the different budget chapters and components and took the following decisions:

**XI.7.1 Chapter I**

The amount proposed for participation in statutory meetings is available to all developing States Parties. The amount was increased from US\$ 70,000 to US\$ 80,000.

The amount proposed for co-ordination with other Conventions and programmes, etc. was approved. The Centre will make a report on the use of this amount at the Bureau meeting to be held in June 1998 which will decide upon its future use.

An amount of US\$ 50,000 was approved for the work of the Consultative Body. Zimbabwe and South Africa expressed their wish to participate in the work of this Body.

The budget for Chapter I amounted to US\$ 160,000.

**XI.7.2 Chapter II**

At the request of the advisory bodies and with the support of several delegates:

- contribution to ICOMOS for the implementation of the Convention concerning advisory services and Global Strategy financed by the World Heritage Fund, will be included in a single contract amounting to US\$ 350,000 (including US\$ 23,000 for thematic studies);

- a special budget line grouping the different activities of ICCROM will be established under this Chapter.

The amount proposed for this Chapter including the above-mentioned changes was approved.

### **XI.7.3 Chapter III**

The substantial increase foreseen for this Chapter will be brought to the attention of all UNESCO Member States as a means to raise interest and encourage them to ratify the Convention.

The non-earmarked resources amounting to US\$ 200,000 (of which US\$ 10,000 has been used for increases decided upon in Chapter I for participation in statutory meetings and US\$ 25,000 has been used for the radio programmes) is evenly divided between technical co-operation and training.

Support for promotional activities at sites is increased by US\$ 25,000 already approved for radio programmes. This new amount will be used to support, at the request of States Parties, for promotional activities in the States for radio as well as other media.

The amounts foreseen in the Chapter for the advisory bodies are to be indicated.

The budget for Chapter III amounts to US\$ 2,440,000.

### **XI.7.4 Chapter IV**

To respond better to the needs of States and to improve implementation, certain flexibility was agreed concerning the allocation of funds between the regions.

The amount proposed for this Chapter was approved without any changes. The training component for ICCROM is clearly indicated in Chapter III.

### **XI.7.5 Chapter V**

As this Chapter had already been discussed and approved earlier, it remains unchanged.

### **XI.7.6 Emergency Reserve**

The Committee decided that the emergency reserve fund should be replenished to US\$ 500,000 as of 1 January 1998.

Approved Budget for 1998 and Tentative Budget for 1999  
(in United States Dollars)

| Chapter and Component  | 1998      | 1999      |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>Chapter I - Overall Functioning of the WH Convention</b>                    |           |           |
| Attendance of Experts in Statutory Meetings                                    | 80,000    | 80,000    |
| Review of the Management   | 50,000    | 0         |
| Coordination with other Conventions and Programmes                             | 30,000    | 30,000    |
| Sub-Total Chapter I  | 160,000   | 110,000   |
| <b>Chapter II - Establishment of the World Heritage List</b>                   |           |           |
| Global Strategy (*)  | 243,000   | 100,000   |
| Advisory Services  |           |           |
| a) ICOMOS  | 327,000   | 330,000   |
| b) IUCN  | 237,750   | 240,000   |
| c) ICCROM  | p.m.      | p.m.      |
| d) Other Institutions and Individuals  | 40,000    | 50,000    |
| Sub-Total Advisory Services  | 604,750   | 620,000   |
| Sub-Total Chapter II   | 847,750   | 720,000   |
| <b>Chapter III - Technical Implementation of the World Heritage Convention</b> |           |           |
| Preparatory Assistance   | 300,000   | 300,000   |
| Technical Assistance   | 1,032,500 | 1032,500  |
| Training (**)  | 982,500   | 982,500   |
| Support to Promotional Activities in the Sites                                 | 125,000   | 125,000   |
| Sub-Total Chapter III  | 2,440,000 | 2,440,000 |
| <b>Chapter IV - Monitoring the State of Conservation of the Sites</b>          |           |           |
| Reactive Monitoring (***)  | 120,000   | 150,000   |
| Establishment of a Format  | 0         | 0         |
| Support to States Parties for Periodic Monitoring                              |           |           |
| a) Methodological Development  | 25,000    | ,000      |
| b) Africa  | 65,000    | 75,000    |
| c) Arab States   | 35,000    | 45,000    |
| d) Asia and Pacific  | 45,000    | 55,000    |
| e) Europe  | 25,000    | 35,000    |
| f) Latin American & the Caribbean  | 45,000    | 55,000    |
| Sub-Total Periodic Monitoring  | 240,000   | 265,000   |
| Sub-Total Chapter IV   | 360,000   | 415,000   |
| <b>Chapter V - Documentation, Information and Education</b>                    |           |           |
| Documentation  | 38,000    | 50,000    |
| Information Material   | 165,000   | 180,000   |
| Internet and WHIN  | 70,000    | 85,000    |
| Media and Publishers   | 10,000    | 10,000    |
| Services affected to Promotional Activities                                    | 226,333   | 156,000   |
| Education  | 70,000    | 80,000    |
| Sub-Total Chapter V  | 579,333   | 561,000   |
| Grand Total World Heritage Fund  | 4,387,083 | 4,246,000 |
| Chapter VI - Emergency Reserve Fund  | 500,000   | 500,000   |

(\*) of which US\$ 30,000 for IUCN & US\$ 23,000 for ICOMOS

(\*\*) includes contract of ICCROM & US\$ 32,400 for IUCN

(\*\*\*) of which US\$ 40,000 for each of ICOMOS & IUCN

**XI.8** The delegates expressed the wish that future work plans and budgets submitted to the World Heritage Committee be prepared based on precise forecasts of the resources and identified needs and priorities

**XI.9** A draft resolution prepared by the Italian Delegation and discussed earlier was distributed as amended by a working group created by the Chairperson for this purpose (Italy, Benin, Japan, Thailand, France, Lebanon and Germany). The text of this resolution approved by the Committee is the following:

**Resolution presented by Italy**

"The Committee,

*Underlining* its responsibilities assigned by the Convention for the Protection of the World Heritage,

*Taking into* consideration the need to have access to all the necessary means in order to fulfil its responsibilities,

*Invites* the World Heritage Centre and as well as any other unit of the Secretariat which might be concerned, to submit to its prior consideration every activity envisaged to be undertaken for the implementation of the Convention and funded by the Fund and by the Regular Programme."

**XI.10** The Deputy Comptroller of UNESCO, representing the Director of the Centre, reminded the Committee that the World Heritage Fund was set up as a Trust Fund of UNESCO and that Regular Programme funds were voted by UNESCO's General Conference. He stated that the Secretariat took reserve on the above decision recommending that the Legal Advisor should be consulted as to the legality of the Committee being required to give its advice before Regular Programme funds voted by UNESCO's General Conference could be spent. In addition, he pointed out the pragmatic problem of obtaining the Committee's views on Regular Programme funds budgeted for 1998, when the next Committee meeting would not take place until December of that year. He reiterated the proposal made earlier that, in the context of streamlining procedures as proposed by the External Auditor in the Management Review, the Consultative Body consider a mechanism whereby the Committee should be involved in the preparation of the World Heritage Centre's Regular Programme budget for the next biennium (2000/2001).

**XI.11** The Chairperson gave the following reply:

"The Chairperson takes note of the remarks made by the Deputy Comptroller, representing the Director of the World Heritage Centre, on the Resolution just adopted. These remarks are misconceived in point of law and policy. In point of law, there is no way that the World Heritage Committee may be considered as a "subsidiary body" of the "UNESCO supreme governing body" i.e. the General Conference. It should be clear that the World Heritage Committee is an intergovernmental body elected by the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, made up of sovereign states accountable to the General Assembly of States Parties. Therefore, the idea that the World Heritage Committee is not in a position to give opinions on activities, initiatives or programmes that affect the very object and purpose of the World Heritage Convention because of a perceived relationship of subordination of the General Conference is wrong. Its relation to the General Conference is one of co-operation

and co-ordination between institutions of equal standing both based on international treaties of equal hierarchical value. In point of policy, the object and purpose of the Resolution is that of building confidence and co-operation between the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO through appropriate mechanisms that will ensure transparency, communication and harmonisation of respective objectives. It is regrettable therefore that the remarks of the Representative of the Director of the Centre have challenged this legal status and overlooked these policy objectives."

**XI.12** Finally, the Delegate of Italy informed the Committee of his country's offer to further contribute to the implementation of the Convention. Italy would wish an appropriate joint effort between the Committee, ROSTE and ICCROM. The statement by Italy on this matter is included as Annex VII.

## **XII. WORLD HERITAGE DOCUMENTATION, INFORMATION AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES**

**XII.1** In introducing this agenda item on World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education activities carried out in 1997 and the examination of the proposal for the 1998 programme (as contained in the Document WHC-97/CONF.208/14) the Chairperson indicated the five major components of the document: A. Documentation, B. Information, C. Internet and World Heritage Information Network (WHIN), D. Self-financing Programme for Partnerships with the Media and Publishers, E. World Heritage Education Project.

**XII.2** The Secretariat began its presentation by recalling the information strategy submitted and adopted by the Committee at its twentieth session held in Merida stressing that this strategy, based on establishing partnerships with organizations and networks, has two basic objectives:

- to support the efforts of States Parties, relevant international organizations and non-governmental organizations to promote understanding of the World Heritage Convention and the sites under its protection ;
- to enhance general public awareness and support of the Convention and its activities for the conservation of World Heritage sites through direct contacts with the media to promote the production of World Heritage communication and information material for mass diffusion.

**XII.3** In implementing this strategy, the World Heritage Centre made a reappraisal this year of the main documentation and information objectives which was reflected in a self-evaluation to prioritize activities on the basis of the available human and financial resources of the Centre and made available to the Auditors to be reflected in the Management Review.

**XII.4** The Secretariat explained that one of the main areas felt to be the weakest and which required further development was the role of the Centre as repository of World Heritage documents to be made available to the Centre's partners : States Parties , universities, research and development institutions and development aid organizations among others.

**XII.5** Activities proposed under A and C were therefore aimed towards the attainment of these objectives. The Secretariat indicated that in addition to the nomination files and statutory meetings which are already being digitised, it would be useful to also digitise

existing scientific and expert reports. The Secretariat proposed to make, in 1998, an inventory of expert reports and to evaluate their value to enable the Committee at its twenty-second session to determine which are suitable for public or semi-public use. The Secretariat suggested the use of passwords in the revised World Heritage Internet web site to allow for access to restricted documents by entities deemed appropriate by the Committee.

**XII.6** Building on the success of the existing World Heritage web site, the new template of the World Heritage web site was designed to strengthen the outreach function to enhance public awareness through greater participation and to optimize the information already available so that the web site could cater for users ranging from children to experts.

**XII.7** Activities proposed under Section B. Information will continue to focus on the production of more conventional and basic World Heritage information material. Such material of institutional character are essential in order to support the public awareness-raising work being carried out by State Party partners, international organizations and NGOs. These products have contributed to mobilizing many partners to engage into more mass-based activities.

**XII.8** Activities listed under Section D. reflected the various partnerships between the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO Publishing Office and media and publishers. The partners are mainly of international reputation and according to their own estimates, the investment made for the World Heritage products is over US\$ 50 million. Regarding the quality control of these products which has been the subject of discussions in past Committee and Bureau meetings and with the Consultative Body, the Secretariat indicated that draft guidelines on the use of the emblem and the content validation with regard to information material had been proposed by the World Heritage Centre to the Consultative Body as requested. The Secretariat stressed the fact that partnerships with the media and publishers were not a matter of emblem lending and requested the guidance of the Committee on how best to ensure the quality of the products.

**XII.9** The self-financing programme on partnerships with the media will be financed from earmarked income for servicing fees to enable the Centre to employ one full time professional media relations consultant and to allow for punctual fee contracts with specialists as well as the costs involved in liaising with States Parties for content verification. In addition, the earmarked servicing income from the "Planetary Dialogues" contract will be used to employ one professional consultant and one assistant for this project. The Secretariat indicated that earmarked income in servicing fees is expected to be US\$ 226,333 and in addition, US\$ 204,333 in non-earmarked income in 1997.

**XII.10** A request for US\$10,000 from the World Heritage Fund in addition to the earmarked servicing income was made to finance activities for the promotion of the involvement of publishing firms and national television companies in developing countries in the International Film Consortium and the network of publishers producing World Heritage books and encyclopaedias.

**XII.11** A new international assistance chapter for «on-site promotion activities» was proposed by the Secretariat for a total budget of US\$ 100,000 which can be granted on the basis of project proposals submitted for the Committee's approval to carry out information and education activities by national and local authorities and site management agencies in developing countries.

**XII.12** Upon the completion of the Secretariat's presentation of sections A to D, many delegates expressed support for the new template of the World Heritage web site and for its aim to facilitate navigation by different types of users. However, although this was recognised as an important communication tool and means of diffusing digitised information, proposals were made by several members of the Committee to initiate a project based on the use of radio media, particularly for States Parties which do not have access to Internet. Several delegations also expressed concern that the World Heritage web site is available only in English and cannot yet be used world wide.

**XII.13** The Chairperson stated that both Internet and other communication tools such as radio, which was often suggested during the meeting, would be complementary and radio is certainly the most useful medium available before Internet receives global coverage. It was agreed that the Internet web site should be further developed as a core data bank for World Heritage information but the Secretariat should not neglect the use of this electronic information tool to promote other important mediums such as the radio. It was however stressed by a number of delegates that it was not for the Centre to produce radio programmes which need to be adapted to each national situation, but for the Centre to make available information to enable the national radio stations to produce such programmes. The Delegation of Mexico volunteered its co-operation to promote World Heritage on radio.

**XII.14** The Delegate of Thailand also asked that official documents for statutory meetings be made available in diskettes, even if they are available on the web site.

**XII.15** The Delegate of Canada raised the issue of budget priority, stating that technical assistance for the protection of World Heritage sites was more important than the promotion of the sites. Several delegations and ICOMOS agreed that the function of the Convention was primarily to protect the sites so they retain the World Heritage value but stated that public awareness and education activities to preserve World Heritage were also essential as a part of the conservation process. With regard to Section B. Information, the suggestion of the Canadian Delegate for the Secretariat to propose a policy based on cost-recovery was adopted. This would enable the Centre to produce information materials using the World Heritage Fund input as seed money and for the States Parties and other users with financial means to purchase these products.

**XII.16** With regard to partnerships with the media and publishing houses, the Committee expressed concern about the use of the emblem and quality control. The Committee requested the Consultative Body to submit to it recommendations on the use of the emblem and guidelines for fund-raising. This would allow the development of a policy for outside partnerships that the Centre would implement. The Delegates of China and Japan commended the efforts of the Centre in building partnerships with the media, stating that in their countries World Heritage films produced by Beijing Television and Tokyo Broadcasting System (TBS), respectively, has been diffused widely, informing large audiences of the importance of World Heritage. The delegate of Japan stated that more than half of the income from media contracts come from Japanese companies, showing how despite the late accession of Japan to the Convention, there is a tremendous public interest in World Heritage which is inspired by the media.

**XII.17** The Director of the World Heritage Centre acknowledged the comments and explained that the Centre is already working on a cost-sharing basis on some information products such as the World Heritage Diary. He also pointed out that funds invested to produce such materials are almost recovered through income generated from media partners

which is non-earmarked for the World Heritage Fund. He expressed his hope that all information activities would soon be self-financed. The Director welcomed the proposal by the Delegation of Mexico and stated that discussions with UNESCO's Office of Public Information on radio programming had begun and would be continued to meet the request of the Committee. He also stated that the World Heritage web site also exists in French and that the new template would also be made in French.

**XII.18** The Committee took the following decisions with regard to activities under Sections A to D:

1. Under Section A, the Committee agreed not to approve the request for the purchase of equipment under A.7 and A.8 from the World Heritage Fund as a matter of principle, indicating that equipment to be used by the Secretariat should be financed under the Regular Programme Budget. The Committee therefore decided to allocate US\$ 38,000 from the World Heritage Fund for 1998 for the documentation.

2. Under Section B, the Committee decided to allocate US\$165,000 from the World Heritage Fund in 1998, but requested the Secretariat to submit a proposal on means of cost-recovery for posters, maps and other material being produced under this section as well as the possibility of co-production of such material for mass distribution.

3. Under Section C, taking into account the comments of several Committee members on the need to use the radio medium, the Secretariat was requested to prepare a strategy and plan of action on how to support States Parties efforts to produce radio programmes on World Heritage. The Committee decided to approve the budgetary ceiling of US\$ 70,000 for Section C, stating that up to US\$ 20,000 can be used to prepare a strategy on radio programming instead of the proposed activity C.5.

4. Under Section D, the Committee decided to allocate US\$ 10,000 to be used to promote the involvement of publishing firms and national television companies in developing countries, in addition to the earmarked income for servicing generated from contracts with the media partners to enable the Secretariat to employ consultants and issue fee contracts for backstopping the contracts and carrying out content validation of the World Heritage information products being produced by the partners.

**XII.19** To enable the Committee to address outstanding issues related to information activities, notably on the guidelines on the use of the World Heritage emblem for information and the private sector fund-raising activities, as well as on content validation, it was decided that the Consultative Body would continue its work and submit its recommendation to the Bureau in June 1998 and to the Committee at its twenty-second session. It was agreed that the Consultative Body would also look into the information strategy especially with the view to



improving the target of the various information material being produced by UNESCO as well as by the media partners.

**XII.20** Under Section E on the Young People's World Heritage Education Project, the Secretariat recalled that the project was initiated in 1994 and is jointly administered through close co-operation between the Education Sector of UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre.

**XII.21** The overall aim of the project is to ensure that an increased awareness, knowledge and understanding of the importance of World Heritage properties and of World Heritage conservation is introduced into secondary school classrooms throughout the world (through UNESCO's Associated Schools Project Network, ASPNet). This is to be achieved by integrating World Heritage Education into secondary school curricula. This is being achieved with the support of the Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation (NORAD), the Rhône-Poulenc Foundation, the UNESCO Regular Programme as well as Committee approved allocations from the World Heritage Fund.

**XII.22** The Secretariat then reported very briefly on two of the main Education activities that have taken place in 1997. Following the three World Heritage Youth Fora held in 1995 and 1996 (Bergen, Norway; Dubrovnik, Croatia; and Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe), the first Asia and Pacific World Heritage Youth Forum was held in Beijing, China from 15-21 September 1997. The Forum was organized at the kind invitation of the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO. The Recommendations from the students who participated in the Forum were presented to the Committee in Annex I of Working Document WHC-97/CONF.208/14.

**XII.23** In 1997 the UNESCO World Heritage Teacher's Education Resource Kit entitled "World Heritage in Young Hands" was finalized in English and French. The Kit includes classroom and extra-curricular activities, photographs of World Heritage sites and of project activities held to date, a colour poster, stickers and the following main sections:

- Educational Approaches to World Heritage
- The World Heritage Convention
- World Heritage and Identity
- World Heritage and Tourism
- World Heritage and the Environment
- World Heritage and a Culture of Peace
- Resource Materials

**XII.24** The Secretariat informed the Committee that it proposed four main priorities for 1998:

1. the organization of regional and international World Heritage Youth Fora (including a Youth Forum for Francophone Africa in Senegal and an International Youth Forum in Japan with the support of the Osaka Junior Chamber of Commerce) and consolidation of the World Heritage Education in regions where Youth Fora have taken place previously (for example, in Europe);
2. to translate, distribute and experiment the World Heritage Education Teacher's Resource;

3. to develop human resources with expertise in World Heritage Education through teacher-training courses; and,

4. to establish an international, co-ordinating and evaluation structure, through the establishment of an International Steering Committee on World Heritage Education by the Director-General of UNESCO, to ensure the qualitative and quantitative development of the Project.

**XII.25** The Delegate of China made reference to the success of the Youth Forum held in Beijing, China and said that he was glad to see the rapid development and abundant fruits of the Young People's World Heritage Education Project. He expressed his delight in the news that Japan would host a Youth Forum in 1998 and said that China was ready to be involved.

**XII.26** After endorsing the statement of China, the Delegate of Zimbabwe acknowledged the resounding success of the Project. In referring to the tangible results of the Project, he reported that in Zimbabwe, World Heritage Education had recently been included in the national curriculum. In noting the importance of teacher training, he informed the Committee that in Zimbabwe the first diploma programme on World Heritage had been established by the University of Southampton, the University of Newcastle and the Zimbabwe National Museums. He stated that he expected the proposed involvement of the University of Newcastle in developing sub-regional teacher training courses would have good results.

**XII.27** The Delegate of Japan offered his congratulations on the successful Youth Forum held in China. He announced that an international Youth Forum would be held in Japan in 1998 and said that the Japanese Government welcomes the joint collaboration with the Osaka Junior Chamber of Commerce and the World Heritage Centre for this event.

**XII.28** The Delegate of Croatia also praised the project and informed the Committee that a World Heritage summer camp had been held in Roros in Norway in 1997. He also announced that Croatia would be organizing a summer workshop for secondary school students on the island of Hvar in 1998, to ensure follow-up to the Youth Forum that had been held in Dubrovnik in 1996.

**XII.29** It was suggested that the project also involve tertiary education and work in association with the Culture Sector of UNESCO which has already been involved in projects relating to heritage protection and universities. The Committee approved a total amount of US\$ 70,000 for the Young People's World Heritage Education Project in 1998. The Chairperson closed the debate by noting that the Committee had expressed wide praise and enthusiasm for the Project.

**Presentation of the Chapter V budget from 1998 to 1999**

|                     |   |                     |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|
| <b>WHF<br/>1998</b> | Documentation   | US\$ 38,000         |
|                     | Information   | US\$ 165,000        |
|                     | Internet and WHIN   | US\$ 70,000         |
|                     | Self-financing Programme for<br>partnerships with the Media and Publishers                                      | US\$ 10,000         |
|                     | Education - Special Project for Young<br>People's participation in World Heritage<br>preservation and promotion | US\$ 70,000         |
|                     | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  | <b>US\$ 353,000</b> |
| <b>WHF<br/>1999</b> | Documentation   | US\$ 50,000         |
|                     | Information   | US\$ 180,000        |
|                     | Internet and WHIN   | US\$ 85,000         |
|                     | Self-financing Programme for partnerships<br>with the Media and Publishers                                      | US\$ 10,000         |
|                     | Education - Special Project for Young People's<br>participation in World Heritage preservation<br>and promotion | US\$ 80,000         |
|                     | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  | <b>US\$ 405,000</b> |
| <b>RP<br/>1998</b>  | Documentation   | US\$ 10,150         |
|                     | Information   | US\$ 10,000         |
|                     | Education - Special Project for Young People's<br>participation in World Heritage preservation and<br>promotion | US\$ 85,000 **      |
|                     | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  | <b>US\$ 105,150</b> |

|                   |   |                     |
|-------------------|---|---------------------|
| RP<br><b>1999</b> | Documentation   | US\$ 10,150         |
|                   | Information   | US\$ 10,000         |
|                   | Education - Special Project for Young People's participation in World Heritage preservation and promotion | US\$ 85,000 **      |
|                   | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  | <b>US\$ 105,150</b> |

## Extrabudgetary

|            |   |                     |
|------------|---|---------------------|
| XB<br>1998 | Self-financing Programme for partnerships with the Media and Publishers                                   | US\$ 226,333 *      |
|            | Education - Special Project for Young People's participation in World Heritage preservation and promotion | US\$ 590,000        |
|            | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  | <b>US\$ 816,333</b> |

## Extrabudgetary

|            |   |                     |
|------------|---|---------------------|
| XB<br>1999 | Self-financing Programme for partnerships with the Media and Publishers                                   | US\$ 156,000 *      |
|            | Education - Special Project for Young People's participation in World Heritage preservation and promotion | US\$ 570,000        |
|            | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  | <b>US\$ 726,000</b> |

\* US\$ 226,333 earmarked income for servicing fee received from the media and publishing partners.

\*\* including US\$ 30,000 from the Education Sector.

### **XIII. WORLD HERITAGE AND THE PREVENTION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC OF CULTURAL PROPERTY**

**XIII.1** In introducing Item 13, the Secretariat noted the increasing problem of illicit traffic in all countries and its potential severity for World Heritage sites given that they often attract the particular attention of the public. Examples were shown of sites, which had had serious losses, and this included not only cultural heritage but also fossils, which are extremely popular collectors' items at present. Their defence depended on physical security of sites, the completion of inventories, at least to the minimum standard of the "Object ID"(developed by a consortium of international organizations and published by the Getty

Information Institute), the adequacy of national legislation and proper networking between police, customs and cultural officers.

**XIII.2** Collaboration with international organizations such as INTERPOL, ICCROM, WCO, (World Customs Organization), ICOM, IFAR, etc. as well as with UNESCO is essential. It is also important to make use of international co-operation through the three major illicit traffic treaties and the various regional instruments and losses should be publicised fast. UNESCO was providing help to "source" countries, through consultations of experts on legislation, regional training workshops for police, customs and cultural officials and by publications such as the new Handbook on the 1970 Convention for national workshops and a study on the antiquities trade.

**XIII.3** Delegates thanked the Secretariat for this information and underlined the importance of the topic. The Delegate of Morocco emphasised the importance of specifying concrete steps which could be taken by source countries, Italy mentioned its proposal for a fund for measures relating to illicit traffic and the Delegate of Benin the importance of the topic. Ecuador's long experience in this respect was offered for the benefit of other States and UNESCO and France expressed support for the work of UNESCO. During a short discussion certain amendments were proposed to the Recommendation in Document WHC-97CONF.208/15 (Annex VIII).

**XIV. DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**XIV.1** The Committee decided that the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee would be held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 22 to 27 June 1998.

**XIV.2** The Committee adopted the provisional agenda for the Bureau's session which is attached as ANNEX IX.

**XV. DATE AND PLACE OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**XV.1** The Committee decided that, following the invitation by the Government of Japan previously expressed at the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee, the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee would take place in Kyoto, Japan from 30 November to 5 December 1998 (to be preceded by an extraordinary session of the Bureau on 27 and 28 November 1998). The Committee expressed its gratitude for this generous invitation.

**XV.2** The Delegate of Morocco informed the Committee that his country would like to host the Committee in 1999. The Chairperson informed the Committee that he had received a verbal invitation from Lebanon who would like to host the Committee in 1999 and a written invitation had also been received from Finland who offered to extend their

hospitality to the Committee for 2001. The Delegate of Australia recalled that her country has offered to host the Committee session in the year 2000.

**XV.3** The Delegate of Benin declared that the Committee meeting had never been held in Africa.

## **XVI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**XVI.1** The Representative of the Assistant Director-General of the Culture Sector and the Delegate of Benin paid tribute to Mr R. Lemaire, who died earlier in the year. They recalled Mr Lemaire's noble and important work in the field of cultural heritage conservation.

**XVI.2** The Chairperson recalled that the mandate of the Consultative Body had been extended with the agreement of the Committee (see paragraph V.6). He announced that in 1998 the members of the Consultative Body would be Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, the United States of America and Zimbabwe.

**XVI.3** The Chairperson reported that an informal meeting of the new Consultative Body had taken place earlier in the week. At that meeting it had been agreed that Ms Teresa Franco (Mexico) would be the Vice-Chairperson of the Consultative Body and that four main issues would be examined by the Consultative Body in 1998. The Chairperson informed the Committee that each of the four issues would be researched and co-ordinated in the following way:

1. **Technical issues** - to include an analysis of the application of cultural heritage criteria (i) and (vi), the test of authenticity, the balance of the World Heritage List and the implementation of the Global Strategy. It was noted that the analysis of these issues might benefit from a further reflection on the first part of the Management Review Report. Co-ordinated by Australia in association with Benin, Canada, France and Mexico with input invited from ICOMOS and Greece.
2. **Communications and promotion** and their relationship to the objectives of the Convention - to include an examination of the potential of a cost-recovery policy for World Heritage information products and the need for a balance between the allocation of funds for management and conservation of sites and of promotional activities. Co-ordinated by Canada in association with Mexico.
3. **World Heritage Centre** - to examine the recommendations in the Management Review Report that relate to financial and personnel matters and to examine the point raised by the Delegate of Germany during the budget discussion, how can a balance be achieved between the Committee's desire to consider all activities relating to the implementation of the Convention, and the need for the Director of the World Heritage Centre to have some flexibility in financial decision-making? Co-ordinated by Italy, France and Germany working closely with the Director of the World Heritage Centre.
4. **Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines.** Co-ordinated by the United States of America and Japan.

**XVI.4** The Chairperson recalled that the Committee had approved US \$50,000 for the Consultative Body to perform its work in 1998 and concluded by stating that the Consultative Body would meet at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris at a date to be confirmed in April 1998,

and would then propose concrete recommendations and conclusions to the Bureau and the Committee at their twenty-second sessions in 1998.

## **XVII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

**XVII.1** The Rapporteur presented the draft report of the session to the Committee and thanked the Secretariat for their support in its preparation. Following the examination of the report, the Committee adopted it with the amendments noted and received in written form during its debate.

**XVII.2** The Delegate of Niger regretted that due to his late arrival he was not able to participate in the discussions on the state of conservation of properties. In referring to paragraph VII.20 concerning Air and Ténéré Reserve (Niger), he informed the Committee that a meeting between the Local Management Committee and the CNRS took place on 28 November 1997. At that meeting the possibility of removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger had been discussed. The authorities of Niger and IUCN (through its on-site project) agreed that it would be too early to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. He reiterated his Government's request for a monitoring mission to be organized in 1998.

## **XVIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

**XVIII.1** The Chairperson, Professor Francesco Francioni, thanked the Committee for its support, important discussions and spirit of co-operation. He continued by thanking the Italian authorities for the excellent hospitality, civic pride and organization of the meeting. The importance that had been attached to the Committee's work by the Italian authorities had, he said, contributed to the success of the twenty-first session. He referred to the substantial work of the Committee as having included the consideration of many state of conservation reports, the reaching of a consensus on periodic reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, the prolongation of the mandate of the Committee's Consultative Body and the consideration of the illicit traffic in movable cultural property in relation to the World Heritage Convention. He also expressed his happiness that the Committee had been able to remove Plitvice Lakes National Park in Croatia from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**XVIII.2** Several delegates expressed their gratitude and appreciation for the hospitality received from the Italian authorities and thanked the Chairperson for his effectiveness and efficiency.

**XVIII.3** The International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) thanked the Committee for the invitation to attend the meeting and expressed its continuing support to the World Heritage Convention.

**XVIII.4** Finally, the Director of the World Heritage Centre expressed his thanks and gratitude to the Italian authorities for their generous hospitality and for the smooth running of the meeting. He commented that the continuing work of the Consultative Body represented a new and constructive dialogue on issues that are fundamental for the future success of the World Heritage Convention. He acknowledged the importance of seeking a balanced World Heritage List as had been emphasised by the Committee. He referred to the new consensus on periodic reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties as representing a

significant reinforcement of the implementation of the Convention. The Director acknowledged the important and increasing tasks of the advisory bodies and referred to the need to ensure strengthened communication with the Chairperson, especially in relation to decisions concerning international assistance requests. The Director then expressed his thanks to the Committee for its guidance and concluded by thanking the Italian authorities, support staff, hostesses, interpreters, translators and staff of the World Heritage Centre.



