

**Distribution limited**

**WHC-2000/CONF.202/17  
Paris, 18 August 2000  
Original : English/French**

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

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

**BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
Twenty-fourth session**

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters (Room IV)**

**26 June – 1 July 2000**

**REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR**

## Table of Contents

I	OPENING SESSION.....	1
II.	ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA, THE ANNOTATED AGENDA AND THE TIMETABLE.....	1
III.	REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT SINCE THE TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE.....	1
IV.	STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST.....	4
V.	INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE LISTS AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST .....	33
VI.	REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS .....	50
VII.	REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE .....	57
VIII.	DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE BUREAU (23-24 NOVEMBER 2000, CAIRNS, AUSTRALIA).....	61
IX.	DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE (27 NOVEMBER - 2 DECEMBER 2000, CAIRNS, AUSTRALIA).....	61
X.	OTHER BUSINESS .....	61
XI.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT .....	61
	BUDAPEST PROPOSALS.....	79

### List of Annexes

I.	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	63
II.	SPEECH BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL	77
III.	BUDAPEST PROPOSALS	79
IV.	STATEMENT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE OF UNEP ON THE MINING SPILL IN ROMANIA	80
V.	PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH EXTRA-ORDINARY SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	81
VI.	PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	82

## **I OPENING SESSION**

**I.1** The twenty-fourth ordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held in Paris, France, from 26 June to 1 July 2000. It was attended by the following members of the Bureau: Mr. Abdelaziz Touri (Morocco), as Chairperson of the Committee, Ms Anne Lammila (Finland) as the Rapporteur, and Australia, Greece, Hungary, Mexico and Zimbabwe, as Vice-Chairpersons.

**I.2** The following States Parties to the Convention, who are not members of the Bureau, were represented as observers: Argentina, Austria, Azerbaidjan, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ecuador, France, Germany, Grenada, Honduras, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Slovak Republic, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America and Venezuela. The Observer Mission of Palestine to UNESCO, non State Party to the Convention, also attended the session in the capacity of an observer.

**I.3** Representatives of the advisory bodies to the Convention: the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended. The meeting was also attended by the following non-governmental organisations: Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation (Australia), Environment Centre NT Inc. (Australia), Australian Conservation Foundation (Australia), Friends of the Earth (Australia), Green Earth Organisation (Ghana), Tibet Heritage Fund (Tibet Autonomous Region, China), CraTerre (France) and International Union of Technical Associations and Organizations UATI (France). The full list of participants is given in Annex I.

**I.4** The Chairperson opened the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee by welcoming the members of the Bureau, the advisory bodies, observers and all participants to the meeting. The Chairperson then invited the representative of the Director-General of UNESCO to deliver his opening remarks.

**I.5** Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, Assistant Director-General of the Sector for Culture a.i., in his capacity as Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO, reiterated the Director-General's esteem for the work of the Bureau and his continuing support to the Convention. (His speech is included as Annex II to this report). The Chairperson thanked Mr Bouchenaki on behalf of the Bureau members.

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

**II.1** The Chairperson, referring to documents WHC-2000/CONF.202/1, WHC-2000/CONF.202/2, WHC-2000/CONF.202/3 and to the Provisional List of Documents, WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.1, requested the Bureau to adopt the Provisional Agenda, the Provisional Annotated Agenda and the Provisional Timetable. He invited the Bureau members to suggest any changes and pointed out that, in view of the heavy workload facing the Bureau, the speakers were requested to respect the limited time available. The agenda, the annotated agenda and the timetable were adopted without any changes.

## **III. REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT SINCE THE TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**III.1** The Chairperson invited Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, Director of the World Heritage Centre, to present the Secretariat's Report on activities undertaken since the last session of the World Heritage Committee.

**III.2** In his capacity as the Secretary of the Committee, the Director reported on activities carried out by the Secretariat over the last six months. In giving his presentation, Mr Bouchenaki recalled the contents of the report and referred to Information Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.3. He then gave his presentation with audio-visual aids drawing the attention of the members of the Bureau to the most significant activities.

**III.3** The Director of the Centre recalled that the Committee established a Task Force, and requested the establishment of two working groups and an expert group at its last session. He then referred to the relevant working documents reflecting the work of those bodies: A) Task Force on the Implementation of the Convention, chaired by Dr Christina Cameron (Canada) with Mr Kevin Keeffe (Australia) as Rapporteur; B) Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List, chaired by H. E. Mr Olabiyi B. J. Yai (Benin) with H. E. Mr Matthew Peek (Australia) as Rapporteur; C) Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee, chaired by H. E. Mr Jean Musitelli (France) with Mr David Mašek (Czech Republic) as Rapporteur; and D) Expert Meeting for the Revision of the Operational Guidelines, chaired by Dr Christopher Young (UK) with Ms Karen Kovacs (USA) as Rapporteur.

**III.4** The Director of the Centre gave a brief summary of the work accomplished by the two Working Groups, the Task Force and the Expert Meeting in Canterbury. The report will be presented to the Bureau under item 6. He then recalled the evaluation of international assistance undertaken by the French company C3E selected by the Bureau of Programming & Evaluation of UNESCO. As approved by the Committee in December 1999, the evaluation of training activities is being carried out by ICCROM.

**III.5** The Director of the Centre mentioned that the total number of States Parties to the Convention reached **160** with the acceptance of Namibia and Kiribati in the first part of 2000. With regard to new nominations, the Director of the Centre mentioned that a record high of **87** nominations had been received for examination by the Bureau in 2000, including five site extensions and one renomination. He highlighted the fact that a majority (58%) of the nominations came from European and North American countries thus accentuating the imbalance of the World Heritage List. He took the opportunity to comment on the increased workload of the Bureau, the Committee, the Secretariat as well as the advisory bodies which was due in great part to the increase in the number of nominations received in the last two years.

**III.6** The Director of the Centre highlighted important activities of the Secretariat in relation to the Global Strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List by referring to some of the regional thematic meetings organized since the last Committee session. He also described various regional approaches to improving the representation of cultural and natural properties on the World Heritage List, particularly in Central and Eastern Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America. Examples of the meetings referred to by Mr Bouchenaki include: a meeting on "Cultural Landscapes: Concept and Implementation" held in Italy in March 2000; a "Workshop for Protected Area Management Decision-makers from Southeast and East Asia" held in Tokyo and Yakushima Island, Japan in February 2000; a "Global Strategy Expert Meeting on Central Asian Cultural Heritage" in Ashgabat and Merv in May 2000 with the support of the Government of Turkmenistan; a Workshop on "Assessing Natural Heritage of Coastal and Marine Areas of Africa" held in Maputo, Mozambique in March 2000; a Regional thematic expert meeting on the Natural Heritage of the Caribbean, Suriname, February 2000, and a Meeting on "Authenticity and Integrity in an African Context" organized at the Great Zimbabwe National Monument in May 2000.

**III.7** With regard to the action for the protection of World Heritage sites, the Director of the Centre presented new sites (three natural, one cultural) inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger by the twenty-third session of the Committee. He explained the Centre's activities to monitor the state of conservation of sites that were under considerable threat due to on-going public and private works. However, the Director noted positive developments due to decisions taken at the highest level of the Government to improve the state of conservation of El Vizcaino (Mexico) and the Group of Monuments at Hampi (India).

**III.8** The Director of the Centre continued by giving a brief summary of the periodic reporting process carried out in the Arab States for the application of Article 29 of the Convention. He highlighted several activities organized in the first half 2000 in preparing the report and in organizing regional training activities. National workshops for the preparation of the periodic report have been planned for Morocco, Algeria, Syria, Mauritania, Libya, Oman and other States Parties. A regional synthesis report is due to be presented to the Committee in December 2000. Furthermore, the Director gave examples of some

activities organized for periodic reporting in Africa. Questionnaires were sent to the African States Parties and training seminars will be organized respectively for French and English-speaking African States Parties.

**III.9** Concerning international co-operation activities with States Parties, international and regional bodies and other organizations, the Director highlighted the increased co-operation with the UN Foundation for natural World Heritage sites that are of significance for biodiversity conservation. The Centre and IUCN are cooperating with the Vietnamese Government for launching projects in support of the conservation and management of the World Heritage site of Ha Long Bay and a donors' meeting will be organized to strengthen the capacity of the site administration. The Centre and IUCN are also collaborating for the organization of the Fifth World Congress on Protected Areas to be held in Durban, South Africa in September 2002. The Centre, IUCN and the International Council on Mining and the Environment (CME) have been organizing meetings to address mining issues and impacts on integrity of World Heritage sites. The Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS participated in a conference on "The Cultural Landscape: planning for a sustainable partnership between people and places" held in the UK in May 2000, which reviewed the revised drafts of the *European Landscape Convention*.

**III.10** The Director of the Centre referred to co-operative activities with the Bhaktapur Municipality (Nepal) and the Directorate of Cultural Heritage of Norway for the organization of a meeting on cultural heritage management and tourism in April 2000. The Centre and UNEP (Paris) are in the process of finalizing the publication of a guide for site managers in Asia on tourism management. The Centre also developed co-operation with the World Bank for the preparation of guidelines concerning the World Bank loans in favour of World Heritage cultural sites. Co-operation activities are under discussion with Japan Bank for International Co-operation and the French Agency for Development. These activities aim to strengthen co-operation in the effective application of paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines concerning the examination of infrastructure development plans impacting on World Heritage sites. Furthermore, the Director expressed appreciation for the European Union and national and local authorities in Europe for the conservation and development of World Heritage sites in Asia through specific projects. The Director brought to the attention of the Bureau the France/UNESCO Co-operation Agreement for the Protection of Monumental, Urban and Natural Heritage to implement activities related to capacity building, legal protection, management and conservation skills for sites on the World Heritage List or on the Tentative Lists of States Parties to the Convention.

**III.11** The Director of the Centre informed the Bureau on the status of production of basic information material (including the World Heritage Map and an updated Information Kit) and publications such as The World Heritage Review, a brochure on periodic reporting (in English, Spanish and French) and a publication on the Regional Thematic Expert Meeting on Cultural Landscapes in Africa. He also highlighted the success of the Centre's Internet pages and new web pages for the

Global Strategy with links to thematic and comparative studies of the advisory bodies. Furthermore, the Director of the Centre informed the Bureau of the latest results arising from the self-financing programme on partnerships with the media and publishers and referred to new projects, including those related to TV films and publications that are being developed by outside partners in co-operation with the Centre. The Director informed the Bureau that the International Task Force on Capacity Building for World Natural Heritage (CONNECT) was held in April 2000. The Task Force developed a strategic plan and a programme of work (2001-2005) aimed at strengthening co-operation, outreach, networking, education and training for the conservation of natural World Heritage sites.

**III.12** The Director of the Centre also presented the Centre's work in relation to UNESCO's Special Project: "Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion" highlighting some of the activities undertaken in 2000 such as the sub-regional workshops for teachers in Belize, Ecuador, Fiji, India, Jordan, Malawi, Mexico, Oman, Palestine, Russian Federation, Thailand, Uzbekistan and Yemen. The translation and production of the World Heritage Educational Resource Kit for Teachers- "*World Heritage in Young Hands*" have been completed in Japanese and is underway in Armenia, Austria, China, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya and other countries. He also mentioned that additional World Heritage Youth Fora would be held in Peru (October 2000) and Australia (late November 2000). The Director informed the Bureau that a Newsletter for the Special Project had been produced and distributed to States Parties in May 2000 and the evaluation of the project is underway.

**III.13** The Director of the Centre informed the Bureau on the dramatic increase in the number of requests for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund since 1998. By June 2000, the total International Assistance budget is almost exhausted. The Director encouraged States Parties to utilize the World Heritage Fund in a catalytic manner and to actively seek other outside sources for funding.

**III.14** The Director of the Centre informed the Bureau of the staffing situation of the Centre in the first part of 2000. He also expressed appreciation to the Governments of Austria, Germany, Italy and Japan for providing the services of Associate Experts to UNESCO to assist the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. He also thanked the Government of Finland for its intention to put at the disposal of the Centre an associate expert for natural heritage from the beginning of September 2000.

**III.15** The Director of the Centre underlined the fact that only 46% of contributions due to the World Heritage Fund for the year 2000 had been received from States Parties as of 31 May 2000. He urged States Parties who had not yet settled their arrears for previous years to do so, in order to ensure that the status of the Fund remains healthy. He then briefly explained the development of the Information Management System at the Centre, and confirmed that a master plan for information technology use and

information circulation is due to be completed by September 2000.

**III.16** The Director of the Centre concluded that this Bureau is especially important because the substance of discussions will guide towards a process of change that is likely to impact the Convention's implementation as well as the working methods and procedures of the Committee and the Bureau.

**III.17** The Chairperson thanked the Director for his report on the activities of the World Heritage Centre since the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee.

**III.18** The Delegates of Greece, Hungary and Zimbabwe congratulated the Director and the staff of the World Heritage Centre for the significant achievements registered since the twenty-third session of the Committee. The Delegate of Greece requested a clarification concerning the selection of participants for the Expert Meeting for the Revision of the Operational Guidelines in Canterbury, U.K.

**III.19** The Director of the Centre stated that a balanced regional approach for both cultural and natural heritage experts was used in identifying participants for this meeting. The Observer of the United Kingdom further confirmed that his Government was pleased that such a productive and successful meeting took place in his country.

**III.20** The Chairperson elaborated that experts and delegates from many countries would have liked to participate in such a meeting. On behalf of the Bureau, he thanked the UK Government for the organization of this meeting. The reason for the limited number of international participants who could be invited was related to budgetary constraints. The Chairperson thanked all the countries that had expressed their strong interests in this expert meeting.

**III.21** IUCN noted that the Director of the Centre had rightly emphasized the growing demands made on the advisory bodies with the increasing number of nominations. This is aggravated by the growing number of missions, meetings and other activities that involve the advisory bodies. IUCN was happy to support the effective operation of the *World Heritage Convention* but drew attention that all these activities and additional responsibilities proposed by the Task Force and Working Groups occur at a cost to IUCN which significantly exceeds the resources made available from the World Heritage Fund. IUCN requested that increasing expectations of involvement need to be accompanied by a realistic allocation of resources. With regard to the Fifth World Protected Areas Congress planned to be held in Durban, South Africa in September 2002, IUCN noted that it coincided with the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the World Heritage Convention. IUCN welcomed co-operation with the Centre in ensuring that World Heritage has an appropriate profile at this major once-in-10 year Congress.

**III.22** The Delegate of Hungary informed the Bureau that an Integrated Urban Conservation Training Workshop and Seminar for Central European Historic City Managers

took place recently in Budapest. He proposed that the Budapest Proposal be included in the report. (The Budapest Proposal is attached as Annex III to this report.)

**III.23** The Delegate of Zimbabwe requested the Bureau to take note of the next ICOMOS General Assembly that will be held in October 2002 in his country, and which also coincides with the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention*.

#### **IV. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

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

**IV.1** The Bureau examined document WHC-2000/CONF.202/4 that included reports on the state of conservation of eighteen natural and five cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and made the following observations and recommendations.

#### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

##### **IV.2 Iguacu National Park (Brazil)**

The Bureau noted that the Ministry of Environment of Brazil had taken all possible measures to close the Colon Road. In particular: (a) a technical report prepared by the Brazilian Environment Agency (IBAMA) on the environmental impacts caused by the illegal opening of the Colon Road and its continuing use has been submitted to the Courts; and (b) the Federal Court of Parana has ratified the Brazilian Government's decision to close the road and to impose prison sentences on those who continue to refuse to comply with the Government's decision. The Supreme Court of Brazil has ordered the road closed and will impose a fine of US\$ 500 on any vehicle using the road.

IUCN informed the Bureau that it was collaborating with the WWF Offices in Brazil and Argentina and with several other national organisations to develop a long-term strategy for biodiversity conservation in the broader Atlantic Forest Eco-region. IUCN noted that a workshop was held in Iguacu National Park of Brazil from 25 to 28 April 2000, which noted that the main issues concerning the state of conservation of this site continue to be related to the closure of the road, effective and co-ordinated planning for the conservation of the area involving all countries concerned and local communities in the management of the site.

The Observer of Brazil agreed with the observations of the Centre and IUCN and said that his Government is doing its best to close the illegally opened road despite resistance from local communities against its complete closure. He expressed the hope that his Government would be able to enforce the legal decision to close the road by the time of the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in Cairns, Australia, during November-December 2000.

The Bureau commended the State Party for its persistence to strictly enforce the legal decision to close the Colon Road and encouraged it to continue its efforts and to provide an up-to-date progress report to the Centre on the impacts of the decisions of the Supreme Court and the Federal Court of Parana on the effective closure of the Colon Road by 15 September 2000. The Bureau recommended that, if the State Party confirms the effective closure of the road before the next session of the Committee, then the Committee might consider initiating steps to remove the Iguacu National Park of Brazil from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

##### **IV.3 Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)**

The Bureau noted that a workshop held from 25 to 27 September 1999 at this site had brought together twenty-eight participants from Government institutions, staff of the Reserve and NGOs. The workshop focused on linking the applications of the World Heritage Convention, Ramsar Convention, Biosphere Reserve concept and other Europe-wide initiatives, such as those of BirdLife Network, Natura 2000 and the European Habitat Directive, to the conservation of Srebarna Nature Reserve. The workshop also explored possibilities to involve the local population in the conservation of the site and to orient management to improve the living standards of the local people resident in and around the Reserve.

The Bureau was informed that investigations conducted by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences on the potential effects of a recent cyanide spill in the River Danube on the conservation of Srebarna had revealed that:

Cyanide levels in Danube water samples near Srebarna were not higher than 0.012 mg/l; such levels are considered to be dangerous only in cases of long-term, chronic pollution;

Srebarna Lake is linked to the River Danube via a channel with two locks which were closed at the time of the cyanide spill; at that time the water level in the Lake was also higher than that in the River, and hence the chances of cyanide seepage into the Lake were further curtailed; and

Pollution due to heavy metals, chlorinated hydrocarbons and other pollutants originating from lands immediately surrounding the Lake are potentially of greater concern than the impact of the cyanide spill to the long-term conservation of Srebarna.

The Bureau noted that monitoring of cyanide levels in the Lake had commenced in February 2000 and suggested that the State Party continue to monitor the impact of the cyanide spill as well as that of other major pollutants entering the Lake. On the overall impact of the cyanide spill, also refer to paragraph IV.45.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau encouraged the State Party and the relevant national authorities to continue their efforts to link the different initiatives at the national, European and international level to mitigate threats to the site. The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a state of conservation report by 15

September 2000, addressing amongst others, effectiveness of the rehabilitation programme currently being implemented by the State Party. The Bureau asked the Centre and IUCN to review that report and propose to the twenty-fourth session of the Committee, a process and a time-table for an assessment of the results of the restoration of Srebarna and its possible removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2001.

#### **IV.4 Manovo-Gounda-St.Floris National Park (Central African Republic (CAR))**

The Bureau expressed its concern that the President of the State Party had not yet responded to letters from the Director-General and the Chairperson, transmitting the recommendations of the twenty-second (Kyoto, Japan, 1998) and the twenty-third (Marrakesh, Morocco, 1999) sessions of the Committee. The letters invited the President's urgent intervention for the preparation of a detailed state of conservation report and a rehabilitation plan for the conservation of the site. The Bureau noted the information reported by IUCN that poachers entering CAR from other countries in the region continue to have serious impacts on this site and that the CAR Government has sent a number of armed military personnel into the area to mitigate the poaching threat.

The Bureau, once again, reiterated the Committee's decision, taken at its twenty-second and twenty-third sessions, and invited the President of the State Party to directly intervene in favour of the conservation of the site to prepare a state of conservation report and an emergency rehabilitation plan. The Bureau instructed the Centre to cooperate with the Ambassador of CAR in France and the Permanent Delegate of CAR to UNESCO, as well as with site representatives who may attend the periodic reporting workshop for West and Central Africa to obtain an official response from the President of CAR to the aforementioned letters. This Workshop will be convened by the Centre in Senegal during early July 2000. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.5 Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)**

**Virunga National Park  
Garamba National Park  
Kahuzi Biega National Park  
Okapi Wildlife Reserve  
Salonga National Park**

The Bureau was informed that, as requested by the Committee at its last session in Morocco (November – December 1999), the Director-General of UNESCO had written to the Heads of States of the DRC and of the neighbouring states implicated in the war in Eastern DRC, namely Rwanda, Sudan and Uganda, drawing their attention to the need to respect the international law protecting the five World Heritage sites in the DRC and soliciting their support to create an environment enabling resident site staff to effectively protect the sites. The Minister for the Environment of the Government of the DRC had responded to this letter affirming his Government's commitment to the conservation of the five sites. The Bureau was informed that the Permanent

Delegate of Sudan to UNESCO, via a letter dated 29 April 2000, had informed the Director-General that his country is not party to the war in Eastern DRC. The letters sent to the Rwandan and Ugandan authorities have not yet elicited a response from authorities concerned.

In his letters addressed to the Heads of States mentioned above, the Director-General had informed them of the imminent launch of the UN Foundation (UNF) financed project for the conservation of biodiversity in the five World Heritage sites in the DRC. The project will pay salaries and allowances to site staff, meet their essential equipment and training needs, undertake monitoring activities to update knowledge on the state of conservation of key species in the five sites and support local community activities benefiting World Heritage site conservation. Furthermore, the Director-General has written to the UN Secretary General, the Director General of FAO and the Paris-based Ambassadors of all States Parties to the Convention requesting their support to influence the leaders of the DRC and the nearby States implicated in the war in Eastern DRC, calling upon the need to provide a safe working environment for site staff and to strengthen conservation of the five World Heritage sites. The Director General of FAO has acknowledged the letter of the Director-General of UNESCO and informed that his organisation was studying the question of co-operation with UNESCO in the implementation of the UNF project.

The Bureau was pleased to note that the final version of the document of the UNF financed project for biodiversity conservation in the World Heritage sites in the DRC, was signed by the Government of the DRC, UNESCO and UNFIP on 5 May 2000 during a ceremony held at UNESCO, Paris, and attended by the Minister of Environment of the DRC. Subsequently, UNFIP has transferred the first year's funds of about US\$ 959,000 to UNESCO on 7 June 2000. The Bureau was informed that the Centre and the Division of Ecological Sciences of UNESCO participated at a meeting of the Core-Group, that co-ordinates the execution of this project and comprises UNESCO, UNF/UNFIP, ICCN and its partners and representatives from all five sites, held in Naivasha, Kenya from 6 to 9 June 2000. The Representative of the IUCN Central African Regional Office also attended the meeting. At the Core-Group meeting, UNESCO and the executing partners, namely GTZ (Germany), IRF, GIC, WWF and WCS discussed administrative and co-ordination arrangements that will enable an early launch as well as effective execution of the first year of activities of the 4-year project. Activities financed by the UNF project will begin in July 2000.

In accordance with another recommendation made by the twenty-third session of the Committee in Morocco (November-December 1999), the Chairperson had approved, in April 2000, a sum of US\$ 48,000 as emergency assistance in support of the following actions: (a) organisation of an intermediary mission to the DRC and neighbouring States (US\$ 27,000); and (b) providing pension benefits to staff due to retire from services in the Central and Northern sectors of the Virunga National Park (US\$21,000). The intermediary mission was fielded from 8 May to 11 June 2000 and was carried out by a two-

person team comprising Drs. Jean-Pierre d'Huart (Belgium) and Terese B. Hart (USA). The Bureau reviewed a summary report of the mission based on a brief presentation made by Dr. Jean Pierre d'Huart and the document WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.14 and noted the following conclusions of the mission:

1. The situation in the World Heritage sites of the DRC, though variable from site-to-site, is alarming and the decision of the World Heritage Committee to place them in the List of World Heritage in Danger is fully justified. The overall situation in some sites (Kahuzi Biega, Garamba) appears to be improving slowly, while in other sites (Virunga and Okapi), it is, on the contrary, deteriorating. If peace returns quickly (within a maximum period of 12 months), it is hoped that the UNF Project could significantly contribute towards reversing such deteriorating trends in the sites referred to above. On the contrary, if the conflict situation persists, the degradation caused to the biological diversity of the sites, coupled with the anarchical trends in the country and the weakening of ICCN staff, could constitute severe constraints on the Project's ability to attain its objectives.
2. Despite the fact that the threats and responsibilities for the damage caused, to the sites are attributed by the government authorities (formal and rebel) to a wide range of groups, it appears that the UNF Project could count on the understanding and support of all persons met by the mission team. Each of them, within the limits of their responsibilities and ability to act, committed to respond positively to specific requests for action which they would have to carry out to contribute to the protection of the sites and to the execution of the Project.
3. Similarly, possibilities for certain specific types of support were offered by the United Nations Agencies (including the United Nations Organisation Mission in the Congo (UNOMC)) or by bilateral and multilateral development co-operation agencies. They viewed the launch of the UNF/UNESCO Project for the whole of DRC, currently divided into regions controlled by three different governance regimes, as an innovative pilot initiative and the organisational, administrative and financial aspects of the execution of the UNF project might present a model that could eventually contribute to resolving some of the problems that the implementation of other UN programmes currently have. The interest to search for synergies between the projects of different UN agencies enables the envisaging of a number of collaborative actions that require specific follow-up.
4. Rapid follow-up on all specific actions requested and offers of support received by the intermediary mission must be ensured in a co-ordinated manner. A concerted and urgent approach to enable close co-ordination of this Project that concerns five different sites and a multitude of actors must be put into place urgently.
5. The responsible authorities in regions neighbouring the World Heritage sites have a poor understanding of

the problems of the sites and their present and future consequences and the national and international legal obligations of their government. This appears to directly result from the low importance assigned by site managers in the past for establishing regular formal and informal contacts with such authorities in the neighbouring regions.

6. With the UNF project supporting the network of five World Heritage sites about to commence, the total lack of communication and co-ordination between authorities responsible for ICCN and the sites is a serious concern. The operations in these sites are actually under the authority of individuals who are part of three different governance regimes (Salonga - : Government of the DRC, Kinshasa; Garamba, Okapi and the northern sector of Virunga - rebel authorities based in Bunia and Beni; and the southern sector of Virunga and Kahuzi Biega - rebel authorities based in Goma and Bukavu). Improving co-ordination between certain key persons shall benefit the protected areas of the DRC and ICCN in general, and the UNF Project in particular. The case of the Virunga National Park is illustrative: it is divided into two sectors by the boundary separating the zones of influence of two different rebel groups. The two zones are also occupied by two different foreign armed forces. The two sectors of the Park are under different management and exploitation regimes and there are no communications between ICCN staff from the North and South, or with their Headquarters in Kinshasa.
7. GTZ (Germany) project's institutional support to the ICCN Directorate appears very efficient in the development of new plans, programmes and procedures emanating out of Kinshasa. The Project may have to give greater attention to a re-examination of the deployment of personnel in relation to the functions, problems and challenges confronting ICCN.
8. Despite the large number of personalities met by the mission and the volume of actions undertaken, support at the highest level needs to be re-ascertained and strengthened with a view to concretising the willingness for collaboration expressed into actions on the ground. The follow-up of the several requests addressed to the Governments of the DRC, Uganda and Rwanda by the mission justifies that a high-level, diplomatic mission of UNESCO is fielded to the three capitals as soon as possible.

The Bureau learned that the remaining US\$ 21,000 of the US\$ 48,000 approved by the Chairperson as emergency assistance will be used for paying 70 staff members, at the rate of US\$ 300 per person, who are due to retire from services in the Central and Northern sectors of the Virunga National Park. Similar retirement benefits to staff in the Southern sector of Virunga National Park and in the other four sites will be provided by ICCN's partners, namely GTZ-Germany, WWF, IRF, WCS and GIC. These partners have been paying allowances and salaries to site staff during the last three to four years when ICCN has been unable to meet such demands due to the deteriorating economic situation of the country. The UNF grant of US\$

2,895,912 will in part be used for meeting salaries of site staff over the next four years and hence all the partners of ICCN will save considerable amounts of expenditure. These savings will be used by the partners to settle the problem of paying retirement benefits to staff whose departure from regular services has been long overdue. This step will not only open up new employment opportunities for youth in areas near all of the five sites; it will facilitate the re-integration of the retiring staff into local communities and continue to support the conservation of the five sites. Conscious efforts to re-integrate the retiring staff into local community life are considered an important management task; otherwise, the knowledge and skills of these retiring officers may easily be co-opted by other groups opposed to the conservation interests of the sites.

During the Core-Group meeting of the UNF Project held in Naivasha, Kenya, from 6 to 9 June 2000, it became clear that several other donors were willing to study the feasibility to provide support to consolidate the UNF project. The Bureau recalled the information reported at the last session of the Committee (Marrakesh, 1999) that while UNF has provided a grant of US\$ 2,895,912, the total cost of the 4-year project was estimated at US\$ 4,180,600. Hence, additional support, currently being discussed with the European Union, the Cabinet of Development Co-operation of Belgium and the GTZ, Germany, could assist in the raising of the additional amount of US\$ 1,284,666 needed and considerably increase the chances of success of the UNF Project.

Provision of direct support to site staff is helping to build staff morale in Garamba National Park where the impact of increased patrolling and surveillance has been monitored. The US\$ 30,000 approved by the twenty-third ordinary session of the Bureau in July 1999 for paying motivational allowances for staff in Garamba National Park has partly contributed to the staff spending a total number of 8,788 guard-days, or 796 patrol-days, in 1999. This resulted in 51 contacts with poachers and the recovery of 9 automatic weapons, 226 rounds of ammunition, 4 grenades and numerous other items illegally possessed by the poachers. IUCN has reported that contacts between staff on patrol and armed groups in Garamba have steadily fallen since the last quarter of 1998. An aerial census of the northern white rhinoceros, unique to this site, was carried out by the IRF (International Rhino Foundation) between 14 and 21 April 2000; results showed that there are at least 24 rhinos in the area and there may be as many as 31 individuals in the Park. This number compares well with the pre-war population of about 35 individuals. The aerial census also counted 7 new-born calves and hence the prospects for the continued survival of this unique sub-species of the African rhino appears to be encouraging at present, despite the on-going war in this region.

Although signs of improvements in staff morale are evident, ability of site staff to access all parts in many sites remain severely restricted as different warring and armed factions occupy selected sections of such sites. In Kahuzi Biega National Park, staff have access to only about 5-10% of the total area of the Park. In these accessible parts, 70 gorillas and traces of 5 elephants have been recorded.

In 1996, the census data showed the presence of 258 gorillas and 350 elephants in the whole of the Kahuzi Biega National Park. There are widespread concerns that elephant populations in the Park may have been severely poached and the loss of elephants may have indirect ecological consequences for the gorillas; elephants are thought to be responsible for opening up forests and areas of secondary-growth which are preferred feeding habitats of gorillas. Elephants may also play a role in the germination of certain plant species eaten by the gorilla. The ICCN-PARCID Project in Kahuzi Biega National Park regularly issues a newsletter that heightens awareness of the leaders and the public of the need to conserve flagship species such as the gorillas and the elephant in Kahuzi Biega. The Project also maintains an electronic mailing list for disseminating accurate information on the status of such flagship species and on the overall state of conservation and needs of the Kahuzi Biega National Park. These regular communications are beginning to have impacts on raising the interests of concerned conservation groups; for example the international Ape Alliance Group is launching an appeal to protect the gorillas of Kahuzi Biega National Park. In addition, regular communications also appear to have contributed to international pressure being brought upon one of the neighbouring country governments whose forces occupy the area; the movements of these forces into the Park area have considerably reduced, although the DRC rebel factions continue to occupy the Park.

The Bureau was concerned in particular about the cases of Okapi and Virunga where the mission team felt that the conditions were deteriorating more than in other sites. The separation of Virunga into a northern and southern sector, with each sector being controlled by different rebel groups under the influence of different foreign armies, is a major concern.

Salonga National Park, in the central parts of the DRC, and the only one of the five sites in the DRC still under the direct authority of the ICCN Office in Kinshasa, has also been experiencing increased poaching, particularly on the endemic bonobo chimpanzees. A centre for protecting orphaned chimpanzees is helping to protect these species. The war in the eastern parts of the DRC appears to have disrupted the flow of essential foods across the country and local people and armed factions appear to be turning increasingly towards wildlife as the main source of their protein supply. Salonga has also recorded significant increases in elephant poaching, a trend directly resulting from increased supply of arms and ammunition caused by the war in eastern DRC.

The Bureau expressed its satisfaction to note modest improvements in the conservation of Garamba but was deeply concerned with the continuing threats to the integrity of the other four sites. The Bureau recommended that the Centre, ICCN and its partners, IUCN and site staff do everything possible to ensure an early start and effective execution of the UNF-financed project. In addition, based on the findings of the two-person mission team, the Bureau made the following recommendations:

1. Requested that the Director of the Centre review the requests contained in the memorandum submitted by

the intermediary mission to the Chief of UNOMC and take decisions to ensure adequate follow up and assign a focal person for contacts between the UNF Project and UNOMC at Kinshasa.

2. Requested the Centre to take all necessary measures to recruit a Co-ordinator for the UNF project as soon as possible, in consultation with the United Nations Foundation and assure that the budget foreseen for the co-ordination of operations enables the delivery of the quality of services needed.
3. Requested the Centre to convene, as soon as possible, a meeting among the three appropriate technical authorities, representing the three different governance regimes within the territory of the DRC to discuss the best co-ordination and communication mechanisms to adopt with a view to optimising the work of ICCN. Such a meeting could be organised in Nairobi, financed under the budget of the UNF Project, and facilitated by a neutral person acceptable to the three parties. The agreements reached in such a meeting should ensure that activities in support of the conservation of the five sites are executed in a co-ordinated manner.
4. Invited the Director-General of UNESCO to field a high-level mission to the capitals of the DRC, Uganda and Rwanda. It is suggested that the programme of the high-level mission be limited to meetings with:
  - Heads of States and the members of their Governments concerned with the implementation (or ratification) of the World Heritage Convention and the protection of the World Heritage sites in the DRC; particular emphasis would be placed on the possible role and the impact of armed forces on the preservation of these sites;
  - Chief of UNOMC with a view to discussing possible synergies between the operations of UNOMC and the execution of the UNF Project; and
  - Representatives of other United Nations agencies, with a view to reiterating the need to co-ordinate the strategic approaches of their respective programmes and to reinforce the impact of the UNF Project.

The Bureau noted that if the high-level mission could have the participation of the Directors- General of UNESCO and UNEP then it could have a major impact on the Heads of States and other decision-makers who would be met during the visit of the high-level mission.

The Delegate of Zimbabwe underlined the importance of co-ordination among the ICCN staff from the different parts of DRC and the need to ensure that the funds made available by the UNF are spent on activities directly benefiting sites rather than for administrative activities distant from the sites. The Delegate of Australia concurred with the observations of the Zimbabwe Delegate and said that recommendations of the Bureau on the state of conservation of sites in the DRC should be realistic and have a good chance of being executed without any major difficulties.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain all five sites of the DRC in the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, as suggested by IUCN, it commended the staff at the site for their commitment to their work, and thanked the UNF for its generous financial assistance. The Bureau also invited the States Parties to undertake bilateral co-operative actions.

#### **IV.6 Sangay National Park (Ecuador)**

At its last session in Morocco (November – December 1999) the Committee expressed its agreement with the State Party's proposal that the effects of the inclusion of Sangay in the List of World Heritage in Danger should be evaluated. In accordance with that recommendation, the Centre and IUCN intend to invite a paper from the Ecuadorean authorities for presentation at a workshop on the "Role of the List of World Heritage in Danger in promoting international co-operation for the conservation of World Heritage sites". This workshop is planned to be convened at the time of IUCN's World Conservation Congress, from 3 to 10 October 2000, in Amman, Jordan. Several other States Parties that have experience in using the List of World Heritage in Danger as an instrument for international co-operation will also be invited to submit presentations at the workshop.

The Bureau was informed of a meeting involving Centre staff and the Minister for the Environment of Ecuador, and which took place in UNESCO, on 22 May 2000. The Minister informed the Centre that the Guamote-Macas road is now completed and his Government will explore the actions required to minimise impacts of this road. The Bureau concurred with the view of IUCN that the mitigation of impacts of the Guamote Macas Road and the effective implementation of the new management plan for the site are the priorities for improving the state of conservation of this site. The Representative of IUCN noted that the case of the Sangay National Park illustrated the usefulness of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to describe in detail, as part of the paper it will be invited to present at the Amman Workshop, positive and negative impacts of the inclusion of the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger and their relevance to the long-term conservation of the site. As part of the deliberations during that Workshop, the Bureau invited the Ecuadorean authorities, the Centre and IUCN to elaborate a plan, including the description of indicators and benchmarks, for the continuous monitoring of the state of conservation of Sangay and for the eventual removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide the twenty-fourth ordinary session of the Committee with a summary of its presentation due to be submitted at the forthcoming Workshop in Amman, and a plan for further monitoring leading to possible removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.7 Simen National Park (Ethiopia)**

The Bureau was informed of a meeting between the Permanent Delegate of Ethiopia to UNESCO and the Director and concerned staff of the Centre, convened on 16 February 2000, when the Director recalled the decisions of the Bureau and the Committee since the site's inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996. In particular, the Director of the Centre referred to the recommendation of the twenty-third session of the Committee (Morocco, 1999) that the Chairperson undertake a mission to Ethiopia to meet with relevant national and regional authorities and to re-establish a basis for regular exchange of formal communications between the State Party and the Committee. In accordance with the wish of the Permanent Delegate of Ethiopia, the Director sent a letter, dated 22 February 2000, to His Excellency the Ambassador of Ethiopia to France, proposing a 4-5 day mission of the Chairperson and suggesting possible dates for the mission. In addition, the letter suggested that: (a) the Director of the Centre accompany the Chairperson on the mission to Ethiopia; (b) the Ethiopian authorities organize consultations between the mission team and national as well as regional authorities responsible for Simen National Park; (c) the mission team be given the opportunity to visit the site and learn of the conditions that may have led to Simen being included in the List of World Heritage in Danger and of rehabilitation measures that are being implemented by the Ethiopian authorities; and (d) the Chairperson and the Director prepare a report for submission to the twenty-fourth session of the Committee to be convened in Cairns, Australia from 27 November to 2 December 2000. The Bureau noted with satisfaction that the Permanent Delegate of Ethiopia via a letter of 14 April 2000 had informed the Centre that his country, including the Regional authorities where the site is located, are ready to receive the visit of the Chairperson and the Director of the Centre.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau requested that the Centre co-operate with the State Party to field the mission to be led by the Chairperson and assisted by the Director of the Centre as soon as possible, and submit a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site, progress achieved in the rehabilitation efforts undertaken so far and additional measures needed for the restoration of World Heritage values of the site to the twenty-fourth session of the Committee.

#### **IV.8 Mount Nimba Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire)**

The Bureau was informed of a meeting between a representative of CEGEN (Centre for Environmental Management of Mount Nimba) and Centre staff during the Representative's visit to the Centre from 17 to 21 April 2000. The Bureau noted with satisfaction several initiatives currently underway to revive international co-operation for the protection of Mt. Nimba. The feasibility study phase of a GEF project has already commenced and is expected to be followed by a medium-sized (US\$ 300,000 or more) GEF grant. There are negotiations between GEF and other potential donors for mobilising additional resources for the long-term conservation of Mt.

Nimba. The Centre has had discussions with the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) on possible collaboration to develop a project concept to address impacts and pressures caused by refugees resident in and around this site that straddles the border between Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire. The Representative of the CEGEN informed the Centre that under the framework of the GEF project a sub-regional meeting of Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire, as well as Liberia which also has parts of the Mt. Nimba ecosystem, and all concerned stakeholders is likely to be convened in the near future and that CEGEN will invite participation of the Centre and IUCN at that meeting. The meeting will provide an opportunity for implementing the recommendation of the Committee, made at its twenty-second (Kyoto, 1998) and twenty-third (Marrakesh, 1999) sessions, that IUCN's West Africa Office undertake a mission to the site and prepare a detailed state of conservation report. Furthermore, the Bureau noted that the Centre has established contacts with Birdlife International and Fauna and Flora International (FFI) which is developing initiatives for conservation of the Mt. Nimba ecosystem in Côte d'Ivoire and encouraged the Centre to effectively use these opportunities to develop a harmonised transborder approach to the conservation of the Mt. Nimba ecosystem.

The Bureau noted with satisfaction that new opportunities for strengthening conservation of this transborder World Heritage area are emerging under the GEF project. The Bureau requested the Centre to co-operate with CEGEN and GEF as well as the relevant authorities in Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire in order to expedite the fielding of an IUCN mission to the site and the preparation of a detailed state of conservation report. In addition, the Bureau recommended that IUCN and the Centre co-operate with the States Parties and possible donors to re-explore possibilities for establishing a long-term financial mechanism, such as the setting up of a Foundation for Mt. Nimba, as suggested by the past sessions of the Bureau and the Committee, for the conservation of Mt. Nimba. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.9 Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)**

The Bureau was informed that the Centre staff, at a meeting held in early 2000, pointed out to the Permanent Delegate of Honduras to UNESCO the recommendation of the Committee that her Government consider inviting a UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site. Following that meeting and several formal and informal communications, the State Party, via a letter dated 21 June 2000 invited a Centre/IUCN mission and the Bureau was satisfied to learn that the mission is likely to be fielded in late September 2000. The Bureau was informed that a project of the German Technical Co-operation Agency, GTZ, is attempting to implement participatory resettlement programmes to minimize human impacts in the core zone of the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve. The project is supported by the GTZ and German Ministry for Economic Co-operation (BMZ) and the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW), at a total cost of 14 million German Marks.

The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to work with the relevant authorities of the State Party to field a site visit in September 2000 as foreseen and during the mission also obtain up-to-date information on the Patuca II project, including a copy of the EIA that has been prepared. The Bureau recommended that the report of the mission, including the recommendations for future action, be submitted to the twenty-fourth session of the Committee during November-December 2000. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.10 Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The Bureau learned that the Deputy Inspector General of Forests (Wildlife) of the Ministry of Environment and Forests in New Delhi, India, via his letter dated 10 April 2000, had informed the Centre that the second phase of the rehabilitation plan for Manas for which the twenty-first session of the Committee (Naples, 1997) approved a sum of US\$ 90,000, is currently being implemented. The Bureau recalled that the delay in utilising these funds for rehabilitation activities was caused by the unusually heavy rains experienced in 1998. Also, the need to revise the rehabilitation plan to minimise construction activities in parts of the site where security conditions were not yet optimal for maintaining permanent presence of staff and for executing some community support activities to improve collaboration between staff and villagers also caused delays.

The Bureau noted that implementation of this second phase of the rehabilitation plan is due to be completed by early 2001, and accepted the suggestion of the State Party that the Centre/IUCN mission to prepare a progress report, recommended by the twenty-third session of the Committee (Marrakesh, Morocco, 1999), be undertaken in 2001, instead in 2000 as previously foreseen. The Bureau urged that the Centre and IUCN, during the mission in 2001, take special efforts to review the status of the rhino population in Manas and the impact of rehabilitation measures implemented to counter poaching threats on the rhino. Reports received by IUCN indicate that recovery of the rhino population following the loss of more than 30 individuals during the peak of the Bodo militancy between 1989 and 1992 has been slow and continues to be a major concern for site management. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.11 Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger)**

The Bureau was informed that, as part of the implementation of the rehabilitation plan, adopted by the Bureau at its session in July 1999, the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife of Niger had organized a training workshop on the protection of natural heritage for Reserve staff from Forest, Wildlife and Fisheries Departments, and others from the National Museums, University of Niamey, border police, army, security services, tour operators, and others concerned with the control of trade in wildlife products and artefacts. The Workshop was convened from 20 - 23 March 2000 in Niamey. A detailed report on the outcome of the Workshop, and a progress report on the

implementation of the rehabilitation plan are currently under preparation and the main conclusions and recommendations of the Workshop will be presented to the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in Cairns, Australia from 27 November to 2 December 2000.

IUCN informed the Bureau that its network members have reported progress in the implementation of the rehabilitation plan for the site. IUCN and the State Party, under the terms of an MOU signed in 1999, are aiming to achieve the following results during the year 2000: (a) establishment of improved management mechanisms at the site; (b) strengthened operational capacity, including the reinforcement of support to partner organisations; (c) better conservation of natural and cultural values of the site; and (d) strengthened efforts to involve local communities.

The Bureau was pleased to note that the implementation of the rehabilitation plan, which it endorsed at its twenty-third session, is progressing satisfactorily. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party and submit a progress report on the implementation of the rehabilitation plan, including the State Party's views on when the site could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, to the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in Cairns, Australia. The report also should address, as per a suggestion made by the Delegate of Zimbabwe, progress made with regard to attaining targets set for the year 2000 and described in items (a) – (d) above. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.12 Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)**

The Bureau was informed that a four-person team representing IUCN, the Ramsar Convention and other international and regional organisations, visited the site from 28 February to 4 March 2000. The team reviewed the monitoring programmes currently in place and considered additional parameters and indicators that need to be included in an expanded programme to monitor the effectiveness of the rehabilitation measures currently being implemented by the State Party. The report of the mission team has been submitted to the State Party for comments.

The mission concluded that Ichkeul National Park would have to be retained in the List of World Heritage in Danger for a considerable number of years before a thorough assessment of the effectiveness of the rehabilitation programme currently being put in place by the Tunisian Government is feasible. There are several positive signs that indicate that the potential for the effective rehabilitation of the lakes and the marshes still exists. For example, germination tests have been carried out on seeds of *Potamogeton* collected in the sediments of the zone occupied by beds of this plant before 1996 (western part of the lake). These laboratory tests, carried out under optimal salinity conditions for germination, were successful and proved that the lake still maintains its potential to reconstitute the beds of *Potamogeton* which have currently been replaced by beds of *Ruppia* sp. The same is true for the restoration of rushes over large areas of marsh several years after the disappearance of the plants as they reappear

when marshes are flooded during the right period for germination and also in pools of rain water in little depressions.

In respect of establishing a programme for monitoring the effectiveness of the rehabilitation programme, the mission team recommended that the National Agency for Environmental Protection (ANPE): (a) maintain the current programme for monitoring water quality and quantity; (b) introduce a new component to monitor the development of bathymetry of the lake; (c) maintain the current programme of monitoring the submerged flora, and extend it further by strengthening the monitoring team through the recruitment of specialized multidisciplinary staff; (d) initiate a monitoring programme for the flora of the marshes; (e) improve the monitoring of bird populations by targeting key-indicator species and by setting up an institution with the ability to collect, store, analyse and check the ornithological data, and by training the necessary staff; and (f) introduce a programme to monitor the flora and fauna of the mountain, particularly with a view to detecting changes in grazing pressure due to domestic stock.

The mission team suggested that the integrated management plan for the Park and its surrounding area be updated and improved, using the Ramsar Guidelines on management planning for wetlands. Furthermore the team has recommended the establishment of an institutional structure with the means and powers necessary to implement this integrated management plan.

The mission team identified the need for implementation of three urgent measures: (a) restoration of the Joumine marsh; (b) studies on the siltation of the lake; and (c) consideration of water releases from the dams in the spring of 2000. Furthermore, the mission team encouraged that the data gathered and analysed so far for the safeguarding of the Ichkeul National Park be published in an appropriate scientific journal.

The Bureau commended the efforts of the State Party to set up a systematic monitoring programme for Ichkeul and invited the State Party to consider the recommendations of the mission with regard to continuing certain aspects of the on-going programme, as well as adding new elements to it. The Bureau drew the attention of the State Party to the need to urgently restore the Joumine marsh, undertake studies on the siltation of the lake, and initiate water releases from the dams. The Bureau emphasised the need to develop adequate institutional capacity to implement the activities linked to the systematic monitoring programme that is likely to be implemented over a period of several years. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a report to the Centre, before 15 September 2000, describing its response to the recommendations of the mission and the steps it has taken to implement the three urgent measures so that the report could be reviewed by the twenty-fourth session of the Committee. The Bureau agreed with the point of view expressed by the Moroccan Delegate that the State Party needs to be given all the encouragement possible to restore the site and that the results of the efforts to restore Ichkeul could set a precedent for monitoring the state of conservation of similar sites and restoration efforts

elsewhere. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.13 Rwenzori Mountains (Uganda)**

The Bureau learned that the Centre had been informed by the IUCN Regional Councillor for Africa that high risks linked to security conditions in and around this site continue to prevent the implementation of meaningful conservation actions. The high Mountain altitudes are occupied by the rebel group, Allied Defence Forces (ADF) and the lower elevations of the Mountain are under the control of the Ugandan Government Forces (UPDF). The UPDF is believed to be combing the habitats in the lower elevations to clear them of explosives planted by the ADF. The report further mentioned that the rebel group ADF recently descended from the Rwenzori Mountain National Park and killed one Park Ranger and other persons in the Queen Elizabeth National Park, a site adjacent to the World Heritage site that has been declared a Biosphere Reserve. The IUCN Regional Councillor observed that it will be some time before peace and stability in and around this World Heritage site can be hoped for.

The Bureau noted that the Park Headquarters continue to be located in the town of Kasese, outside of the Park, due to security considerations. Thirty rangers are in Ibanda, the Park Headquarters, where they try to co-operate with UPDF and other personnel to establish and maintain security. The Ugandan Wildlife Authority has reported to IUCN that it commenced rehabilitation work on tourist tracks in March 2000. However, there are insufficient resources and financial support for such rehabilitation work as well as for surveillance, monitoring, training, communications, personnel and other essential activities.

The Delegate of Zimbabwe made the observation that the situation in this site, related to rebel activity and security risks, was similar to the World Heritage sites in Danger in eastern DRC. Hence, the Delegate requested that the Centre, in co-operation with IUCN and others, attempt to initiate support programmes for this site similar to those developed for the sites in the DRC. He also mentioned the possibility to send a mission to the site.

A representative of IUCN, responding to the question posed by the Delegate of Zimbabwe, noted that information from some of its members in the country indicated that equipment purchased as part of a World Heritage-financed project in the past may not have reached the site. The Bureau expressed its concern regarding the possibility of inappropriate use of the resources of the World Heritage Fund and requested the Centre to contact the concerned authorities in the State Party to verify the status of the equipment purchased as part of the project under consideration and submit a report to the twenty-fourth session of the Committee.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau suggested that the Centre and IUCN explore possibilities to raise international awareness for the conservation of this site. Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that the Centre co-operate with the State Party and concerned UN units in the region to study ways and means, including the

development of an international financial assistance package financed by appropriate donors, to support staff responsible for the protection of the site and minimise threats posed by militant and armed groups occupying the site.

#### **IV.14 Everglades National Park (United States of America)**

The Bureau noted the findings of the IUCN review of the report submitted by the State Party, at the time of the last session of the Committee (Marrakesh, 1999) outlining the following: (a) the current status of the key threats to the site; (b) the mitigation measures being taken; and (c) requirements for the removal of threats. The report on Everglades addresses a number of threats, and in particular those posed by: (i) exotic species; and (ii) hydrological impacts, including the experimental water delivery project and its impact on endangered species.

The Bureau commended the approach taken by the State Party in preparing the report and noted that the approach could serve as a useful model for the preparation of state of conservation reports by other States Parties, particularly to identify measures to address threats and establish timelines for threat removal. The Bureau recommended that the Committee, in accordance with the wish of the State Party, retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau however, requested the Centre and IUCN to collaborate with the State Party to prepare a schedule of actions that would allow for the eventual removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau requested that a schedule of actions and a plan to monitor the implementation of the schedule of actions be submitted to the twenty-fourth session of the Committee.

The Observer of the State Party welcomed the recommendation of the Bureau and requested that the Bureau be more specific regarding the form of collaboration expected between IUCN, the Centre and relevant authorities in her country. The Bureau requested that the Centre and IUCN consult with the State Party to decide on the form of the possible collaborative effort, e.g. workshop, meeting or other such event with the participation of concerned authorities from the State Party, IUCN and the Centre, including the venue and timing of that event.

#### **IV.15 Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)**

The Bureau noted the findings of the IUCN-review of the report submitted by the State Party at the time of the last session of the Committee (Marrakesh, 1999) and outlining the following: (a) the current status of the key threats to the site; (b) the mitigation measures being taken; and (c) requirements for the removal of threats. The report of Yellowstone addresses the following threats: (i) mining activities outside the Park; (ii) brucellosis infection of the bison population; (iii) lake trout invasion; (d) impacts on water quality; (iv) road construction; and (v) regulation of visitor use of the site. The Bureau commended the approach taken by the State Party in preparing the report and believes that the approach could serve as a useful

model for the preparation of state of conservation reports by other States Parties, particularly to identify measures to address threats and establish timelines for threat removal. The Bureau recommended that the Committee, in accordance with the wish of the State Party, retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau, however, requested the Centre and IUCN to collaborate with the State Party to prepare for the twenty-fourth session of the Committee, a schedule of actions that would allow for the eventual removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger and a plan for monitoring the implementation of the schedule of actions.

The Observer of the State Party welcomed the recommendation of the Bureau and requested that the Bureau be more specific regarding the form of collaboration expected between IUCN, the Centre and relevant authorities in her country. The Bureau requested that the Centre and IUCN consult with the State Party to decide on the form of the possible collaborative effort, e.g. workshop, meeting or other such event with the participation of concerned authorities from the State Party, IUCN and the Centre, including the venue and timing of that event.

### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

#### **IV.16 Butrint (Albania)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it had received on 29 May 2000 a communication from the Minister of Culture of Albania confirming that the area along the coast about which the World Heritage Committee expressed concern at its twenty-third session, would not be developed and would be included in the protected area that was subject of the request for extension of the site. A map was submitted to this effect.

The Bureau congratulated the Government of Albania for the positive response to the Committee's recommendation that a part of the area along the coast be included in the World Heritage site. The Bureau noted that with this communication, the extension of the site as decided upon by the Committee at its twenty-third session would take effect immediately.

It requested the authorities to submit by 15 September 2000 a report on the implementation of the recommendations made by the UNESCO-ICOMOS-Butrint Foundation mission in 1997. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.17 Angkor (Cambodia)**

After the presentation on the state of conservation of the site, the Delegate of Hungary requested that the Activity Reports and additional information relating to the infrastructural work undertaken in the vicinity of Angkor, such as the National Road 6 implemented by The World Bank, the hotel complex and the extension of the airport of Siem Reap be made available. The Delegate of Greece supported this request and expressed her concern regarding the continuing illicit traffic of Khmers cultural heritage.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed the Bureau that the plenary session of the International Co-ordinating Committee for Angkor had recently completed their work at Phnom Penh and that the 1999 Activity Report was presented to H.E. the King of Cambodia on 27 June 2000. He added that the provisional version of this document was available to the members of the Bureau.

The Bureau took note of the deep concerns expressed by its members concerning the looting and illicit traffic of Khmer cultural property and recalled the recommendations taken by the Committee at its twenty-first (1997) and twenty-second (1998) sessions for the State Party to record and document the cultural properties in Angkor and in other sites on Cambodia's tentative list, and to enhance international co-operation to address this persisting problem. The Bureau also recalled the request made by the Committee to the State Party, and to UNESCO and the International Co-ordination Committee (ICC) presided by Japan and France, to monitor from the planning phase, all large-scale infrastructural projects for tourism development (rehabilitation of the National Road 6, extension of the Siem Reap airport, creation of a hotel complex) to ensure that they do not undermine the world heritage values of this exceptional site. In this regard, the Bureau requested UNESCO and the ICC to remind the State Party of paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines, and to inform the donor governments and institutions of Article 6 of the Convention.

The Bureau requested that the 1999 Activity Report of the International Co-ordination Committee for Angkor be submitted to ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN for review. It also noted that, to facilitate the monitoring of the infrastructure, a map showing the risks and rehabilitation of the National Road 6 was under preparation by The World Bank.

The Bureau also requested the State Party that in accordance with the afore-mentioned recommendations, a detailed report on the measures undertaken to combat illicit traffic and on the state of progress of major infrastructural and tourism development projects be submitted for examination by the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retains this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.18 Group of Monuments at Hampi (India)**

Following the decision of the Committee to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-third session, a UNESCO-ICOMOS Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission was undertaken in February 2000. The objectives of the mission were to hold discussions with the national and regional authorities concerned to remove the threats facing the site as identified by the Committee, and to provide technical assistance for the development of a comprehensive management plan. In spite of the information provided during the World Heritage Committee session that the construction of the two bridges within Hampi had halted, the mission witnessed continued construction and advancement of the works on the large-scale vehicular bridge as well as the footbridge. In view of the alarming situation on-site, the

UNESCO-ICOMOS Joint Mission formulated a 4-Point Recommendation for Corrective Actions to remove the threats facing Hampi. These Recommended Actions were transmitted to the State Government of Karnataka and the Central Government of India, during and after the Joint Mission.

The Bureau was informed that since the site's inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in December 1999, the Chief Minister of the State Government of Karnataka had constituted a Task Force in mid-January 2000 to examine the conditions of Hampi and to suggest long-term measures to preserve this World Heritage site. The Task Force examined closely the state of conservation of Hampi, on-going infrastructural development works within the site, and the 4-Point Recommendation for Corrective Actions of the UNESCO-ICOMOS Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission. In May 2000, the Task Force recommended that the two intrusive bridges should be relocated away from the World Heritage site. This Recommendation of the Task Force was unanimously accepted by the Council of Cabinet Ministers of the State Government of Karnataka in May 2000. On 16 May 2000, the Chairperson of the Task Force informed the Director-General of UNESCO on this decision taken by the State, which had been received favourably by the general public in Karnataka as well as within India.

However, the Bureau was informed that the Centre had received information in mid-June 2000 that the construction of the two bridges had again resumed on 31 May 2000.

The Delegate of Zimbabwe requested clarification on the intention of the Indian authorities on whether or not they wished to delete the site from the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Centre informed the Bureau that during consultations undertaken between UNESCO and the national and regional authorities concerned, both authorities had indicated their wish to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger as soon as the threats facing the site were mitigated. The Bureau was also informed that the Archaeological Survey of India, the Central Government Authority responsible for the site, had informed the Centre through the UNESCO New Delhi Office, of its intentions to organize a national World Heritage cultural site managers' workshop in Hampi in October 2000, to discuss the state of conservation of Indian World Heritage cultural sites and enhancing management of such sites, using Hampi as a case study.

The Observer of the United Kingdom requested clarification on the degree of irreversible damage caused to the site by the construction work and what actions could be taken to mitigate further threats to the site. The Bureau was informed by the Centre that there were historic structures, such as the *mandapa* near Anegundi Gate, which have been dismantled and reconstructed using a combination of original and new building material in a different location, which even if returned to their original location, would have lost a degree of authenticity. The negative visual impact of the bridges, dominating the extraordinary natural setting of the site, could be reversed and removed entirely if the State Government carried out its decision to relocate the bridges outside of the World

Heritage site. The Centre underlined that the greatest potential threat facing the site today was the damage expected to be caused by the dramatic increase in vehicular traffic once the large-scale bridge connects the two existing roads within Anegundi and Hampi which already pass through or adjacent to historic monuments of World Heritage value.

The Observer of Germany, recalling the request of the Committee and ICOMOS to the State Party since 1986 that a comprehensive management and development plan be elaborated for Hampi, underlined that the negative impact caused by the current development activities could have been mitigated if a comprehensive management plan had been prepared. The Observer of the United Kingdom drew the attention of the Bureau to the lessons to be learnt from the case of Hampi, and stated the need for the State Party to inform the Committee of such major public works prior to their construction, in accordance with the Operational Guidelines.

The Bureau examined the additional information presented by the Secretariat concerning the state of conservation of Hampi. The Bureau commended the Task Force for Hampi of the State Government of Karnataka for its work that led to the decision taken on 16 May 2000 by the State Government to relocate the two bridges outside the World Heritage site. However, the Bureau, deeply concerned with the new reports on the resumed construction of the two bridges within the World Heritage site since 31 May 2000, requested the Indian Authorities to implement the ICOMOS-UNESCO Recommended Corrective Measures to remove the threats facing the site, as identified by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-third session.

The Bureau, reiterating the Committee's recommendation to the State Party at the time of the site's inscription on the World Heritage List, requested the authorities concerned to develop a comprehensive management plan for the site. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to continue to assist the State Party in developing this comprehensive management plan, in close co-operation with the authorities concerned and the advisory bodies. The Bureau requested the authorities to submit by 15 September 2000, a report on the progress made in (a) relocating the two intrusive bridges outside the World Heritage site; (b) removing the threats facing the site, (c) implementing the Recommendations made by the UNESCO-ICOMOS Mission in February 2000, and in (d) preparing a comprehensive management plan for the site.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Observer of India expressed his appreciation to the Bureau and the World Heritage Committee for their interest in safeguarding this unique site of outstanding universal value, attesting to the rise and fall of the Vijayanagara Empire. He assured the Bureau that the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger is being taken seriously by the Central Government of India and the State Government of Karnataka. A high-level task force has been set up to examine the situation in Hampi. The Observer underlined that the recent decision taken by the State Government of

Karnataka to relocate the two bridges outside the World Heritage site would be implemented and that the authorities concerned were committed to protecting the site, following the Recommendations of the World Heritage Committee.

#### **IV.19 Bahla Fort (Oman)**

Following the presentation of the state of conservation of the site and reports on the regular missions of specialists from CRATerre and the World Heritage Centre, a discussion took place concerning the techniques used for the restoration of the Fort. The Delegates of Greece and Finland questioned whether it was a reconstruction of the site rather than a restoration. After discussions that mainly related to the restoration of the earthen buildings, it was suggested that an international seminar, with the participation of ICCROM and ICOMOS, be convened in Oman on earth construction and restoration. This would provide an opportunity to learn about the efforts being made by the Sultanate of Oman for its heritage and provide an exchange of experiences. The Representative of ICCROM welcomed the idea of a seminar and suggested that his Organization participate with a view to initiating a training strategy. This proposal was accepted by the Observer of the Sultanate of Oman.

The Bureau commended the Omani authorities for the work undertaken and encouraged them to elaborate a management plan of the Fort and the Bahla Oasis and to provide it to the World Heritage Centre for submission to the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session. The Bureau thanked the Omani authorities for having accepted to host an international seminar on the earthen constructions in 2001. The Bureau expressed its wish that at its next session it could recommend to the Committee the removal of this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.20 Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)**

As requested by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-third session, ICOMOS and ICCROM provided their views on the recently adopted Master Plan for this site.

ICOMOS commended the Government of Peru for the preparation and adoption of the Master Plan. It noted that the plan consists of nine volumes, is comprehensive and that its preparation was based upon the appropriate methodology. It suggested that to facilitate the use by on-site staff and to ensure its implementation: (1) a single volume summary of the plan be prepared that would actually constitute the Management Plan for the site (with the nine volumes providing background and reference material), and (2) the proposed actions be prioritised so as to ensure that, in case of limited financial and human resources, the most needed actions be undertaken first.

ICCROM informed the Bureau that it had been part of the planning process from the beginning. It considered the plan to be very comprehensive and addressing adequately management and conservation issues as well as social and economic ones. It noted that the first three volumes of the plan provide the summary and that the Government of Peru is considering producing a one-volume executive

summary. ICCROM emphasized that the plan had been prepared with the involvement of all stakeholders and that it counts with the full support of the President of the country. He furthermore informed the Bureau that the establishment of an implementation unit was being considered.

The Observer of Peru thanked ICOMOS and ICCROM for the observations and assured that he would transmit these to the authorities concerned.

In conclusion, the Bureau congratulated the Government of Peru for the adoption of the Master Plan and encouraged the State Party to implement it. It requested the State Party to submit a progress report on the implementation of the Master Plan by 15 September 2000 for examination by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

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

### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

**IV.21** The Bureau noted that following the Committee's discussion on World Heritage and mining, a number of activities have taken place, including the participation of representatives of the Centre and IUCN at the session organized by the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME) on "Mining and Biodiversity", at Kew Gardens/London, UK in March 2000. It served as a preparatory event for the technical meeting to analyse case studies on World Heritage and mining as requested by the Committee. The technical meeting will take place in IUCN from 18 to 21 September 2000 to develop recommendations for review and discussion by the twenty-fourth session of the Committee.

#### **IV.22 World Natural Heritage Properties of Australia**

The Bureau noted that progress reports on the Great Barrier Reef and the Wet Tropics of Queensland would be reviewed by the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.23 Shark Bay, Western Australia**

The Bureau reviewed the overall report entitled "Shark Bay World Heritage Area (Australia): Condition, Management and Threats", that provides a comprehensive assessment of issues at Shark Bay and noted that the Australian Government prepared a response dated 21 June 2000 which was transmitted to the Centre on 26 June 2000.

IUCN noted that the ACIUCN process for monitoring has continued and has produced the report on Shark Bay. It was hoped that subsequent reports could be submitted for the Wet Tropics and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage sites. IUCN pointed out that this has been a very successful process. However, ACIUCN currently has a

major budget problem which raises questions about the future of this monitoring process and discussions are taking place to resolve this issue. The ACIUCN's comprehensive monitoring exercise for this site involved a series of stakeholder consultations and extensive joint involvement of government and NGOs. The report identified five priority action areas:

1. The need to complete the strategic framework for the site as quickly as possible.
2. The need to ensure that, where any exploration and extraction of minerals and petroleum take place, they do not cause damage to the World Heritage values. IUCN noted that shell mining and salt extraction were existing activities at the time of the inscription of the site and the State Party agreement to the listing assumed their continuation. The Committee agreed to this at the time.
3. The need to ensure that any harvesting of biological resources is ecologically sustainable, such as in relation to aquaculture.
4. The need to eradicate or at least control invasive species and
5. The need to develop an overall visitor management strategy.

The Delegate of Australia commended the progress made with the ACIUCN monitoring process for this site and noted that the site is a complex one, inscribed under all natural criteria. It has also significant social and economic values.

The Observer of the United States pointed out that the component of the ACIUCN report relating to mining is based on the "WCPA Position Statement on Mining and Associated Activities in Relation to Protected Areas" and that this position statement was not adopted by IUCN, or the World Heritage Committee.

The Bureau noted the report provided and welcomed the fact that the State Party had prepared a consolidated response outlining proposed actions to implement the recommendations of the report. The Bureau requested IUCN to review this report and provide information to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.24 Heard and McDonald Islands**

IUCN acknowledged the comprehensive report from the State Party, which focused on fisheries impact, particularly in relation to Patagonian tooth fish and mackerel icefish. IUCN furthermore commended the recommendation to establish a marine protected area and urged action on this to complement the values of the existing World Heritage site.

The Bureau commended the State Party for preparing and submitting a thorough report that provided a sound technical basis for the establishment of a Marine Protected Area (MPA) and to enhance conservation of the Heard and McDonald Islands World Heritage site. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a progress report for information to the twenty-fifth ordinary session of the Bureau in 2001.

#### **IV.25 Fraser Island**

Concerning the reports received, IUCN noted that the IUCN Task Force on Management Effectiveness has outlined a programme to improve the monitoring of World Heritage sites and a proposal has been submitted for support of the UN Foundation. IUCN pointed out that this methodology is already being applied by the relevant Australian authorities in Fraser Island, and the State Party is to be commended for this approach. IUCN also proposed that the ACIUCN process be extended to include Fraser Island taking full account of the work undertaken on management effectiveness.

The Bureau invited the State Party to assist ACIUCN in the possible extension of the ACIUCN assessment and consultation process to include Fraser Island and to transmit this information for the periodic report of the State Party in 2002. The Bureau requested that a progress report be submitted for information to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 2000.

#### **IV.26 Central Eastern Australian Rainforest Reserves**

IUCN informed the Bureau that it had received information on private sector proposals for a 22km cableway which would, if implemented, cross part of the World Heritage area and have potential negative impacts. IUCN pointed out that similarities exist with the cable car proposal at Morne Trois Pitons National Park in Dominica, which was resolved satisfactorily through working in collaboration with the State Party.

The Delegate of Australia informed the Bureau that no decision concerning such a development had been taken. An Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared for public review and potential impacts are being evaluated.

The Bureau noted that the State Party will provide information to the Centre on the results of the Environmental Impact Statement for the potential Naturelink Cableway construction project, including any potential impacts on the World Heritage values and integrity of the site, and the legislative framework designed to protect these values. The Bureau requested that this report be submitted by 15 September 2000 for information to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.27 Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon)**

The Bureau noted the concerns expressed that a report on the implementation of the Sangmelima (1998) Workshop recommendations is yet to be received from the State Party. The IUCN Regional Office for Central Africa has been involved in assisting the efforts of the State Party to conserve this site since 1995, with financial support from the Government of the Netherlands. IUCN has informed the Centre that this support was concluded in December 1999. Since then there have been no new projects to support site management and additional resources from international donors and partners are urgently required. Illegal opening of roads for forestry activities and

poaching, particularly linked to the supply of the bush-meat trade are significant threats to this site.

IUCN informed the Bureau of the urgent need to address the key conservation challenges, particularly those associated with logging; poaching and the need for alternative resource use options for local communities. IUCN's Central African Office and the State Party submitted a funding proposal for consideration by the United Nations Foundation, but this was unsuccessful, although IUCN has been advised that a broader regional proposal, focused on the bush-meat trade may be more successful.

The Bureau noted that the Secretariat has not received a response to the letter informing the State Party of the decisions of the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau. On 25 April 2000, a member of the Centre staff met and discussed the situation with the Second Secretary of the Permanent Delegation of Cameroon to UNESCO. It was agreed that the Delegation would do its best to ensure that the State Party communicates with the Centre as soon as possible on Dja.

Having considered the information provided, the Bureau reiterated its request, made at its sessions in 1998 and 1999, that the State Party submit a detailed report on the progress made to implement the recommendations of the Sangmelima Workshop. The Bureau further requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to identify alternative donors to support the development of institutional and local capacities for the management of the site.

#### **IV.28 Los Katios National Park (Colombia)**

The Centre informed the Bureau that the Workshop on the transfrontier Darien Ecosystem took place in Bogota on 25 and 26 May 2000 and that a representative from IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) participated. However, no field mission to the site was possible as no security clearance could be obtained from UNDP due to the continuing conflicts in the region. IUCN noted the continuing challenges in managing this area, but applauded the efforts of the Fundacion Natura and the State Party to attempt to implement co-management arrangements. IUCN pointed out that the Workshop noted the continued instability in the area and that activities are impacting the contiguous Darien World Heritage site in Panama. When the situation improves this may be an area for IUCN's Parks for Peace initiative – a joint project being developed by IUCN and the University of Peace (Costa Rica). IUCN noted the warnings from the UN Security Office dated 29 March 2000 about travel to Colombia. The Observer of Colombia informed the Bureau that her authorities are looking into new dates for a mission.

The Bureau reiterated the Committee's request for a mission to the site to obtain detailed information on the state of conservation and requested the State Party to inform the Centre on the possibility of an on-site field mission.

#### **IV.29 Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)**

The Centre highlighted a number of projects currently under way on the protection of the Galapagos Islands, including the UN Foundation project (US\$ 3,9 million), a UNDP/GEF project valued at US\$ 8 million and a loan project, to be financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), for about US\$ 20 million to address issues pertaining to marine resource protection, environmental management in the Islands, institutional strengthening and capacity building

IUCN noted the positive progress made, but highlighted a number of issues including (a) the need to develop regulations to the special law as soon as possible on tourism, fisheries, agriculture and Environmental Impact Assessment; and (b) such regulations need to be linked with appropriate education and community outreach activities to increase compliance. IUCN was delighted to host the Executive Council of the Charles Darwin Foundation linked with a workshop on sustainable financing for World Heritage sites – a topic relevant for many natural and cultural World Heritage sites. Guidelines will be published shortly on this issue.

The Observer of Ecuador welcomed the reports from the Centre and IUCN and underlined the commitment by his Government for all the projects. He also expressed his satisfaction to the World Heritage Centre for the progress made in the pilot project with UNFIP and hoped to see UNESCO and the Centre as partners in the implementation of the IDB loan. A renomination of the marine area is currently under preparation. His Government is also implementing all regulations, although it is sometimes difficult to accommodate the different interests involved. Thanks to the management plan for the site, the situation has improved.

The Bureau welcomed the positive developments for conservation at this site and encouraged the State Party to accelerate the development of special regulations, particularly for regulating tourism, fisheries and introduction of plant and animal species and to consider extending the World Heritage Area to include the marine zone. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to cooperate with the State Party to submit a progress report on the measures undertaken to enforce the Special Galapagos Law, including the zoning plan for marine areas, for consideration by the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 2000.

#### **IV.30 Komodo National Park (Indonesia)**

The Centre informed the Bureau that the UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site, recommended by the twenty-third session of the Bureau, had been postponed and could now proceed in September 2000.

IUCN pointed out that it is looking forward to participating in the mission, which will focus on practical means to address destructive fishing practices for local communities and viable development such as ecotourism. IUCN also noted that the UN Foundation has approved a project with the aim of improving the global coverage of marine World Heritage sites.

The Bureau urged the Centre and the State Party to cooperate in preparing the mission to the site and to provide a report including mitigation measures against threats caused by dynamite and cyanide fishing in time for the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee.

#### **IV.31 Mount Kenya National Park/Natural Forest (Kenya)**

The Bureau noted that IUCN has received a report on 'Aerial Survey of the Destruction of Mt. Kenya, Imenti and Ngare Ndare Forest Reserves, February-June 1999' prepared by the Kenya Wildlife Service and dated August 1999. The results of the survey, which have been substantiated by other sources, have established that the whole of Mt. Kenya and the Imenti Forests are heavily impacted by illegal activities leading to serious destruction below the bamboo/bamboo-podocarpus belt. Results from this survey have noted severe impacts associated with: illegal, unsustainable logging of indigenous tree species; past and on-going extensive charcoal production; expansion of human settlements and associated crop cultivation, which have restricted elephant migration from the mountains; cultivation of marijuana extending over more than 200 hectares; illegal hunting; and increased incidence of fire associated with encroachment of human settlements.

These factors are contributing towards significant negative long-term impacts, such as: disruption of wildlife habitat; loss of biodiversity; and deterioration of watershed services provided by the Mountain. All these impacts impair tourism development, retard poverty alleviation efforts and lead to increasing human/wildlife conflicts.

The Bureau further noted that discussions on improving the management of the site are in progress following the receipt by the Secretariat of a letter dated 29 May 2000 from the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, in which the State Party proposes to extend Mount Kenya World Heritage site to include the current National Park, entire natural forest and the plantation areas.

The Bureau noted with concern the reported impacts on this site, and requested the State Party to provide to the next Committee session a plan of actions to alleviate the threats identified in the August 1999 report of the Kenya Wildlife Services. The Bureau also recommended that the State Party consider inviting a UNESCO/IUCN mission to consider whether this site needs to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.32 Whale Sanctuary of El Vizcaino (Mexico)**

The Centre informed the Bureau that following the announcement by the President of Mexico on 2 March 2000 to halt the proposed salt-works at the World Heritage site of El Vizcaino, letters have been written by the Director-General of UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre and the Chairperson welcoming the President's decision. The President, in his reply, commented that the decision was made to protect the integrity of the site and that solutions have to be reviewed for the sustainable development of the region. The Centre informed the

Bureau that El Vizcaino is included in a UN Foundation proposal on sustainable tourism development at World Heritage sites.

IUCN strongly supported and commended the State Party for its decision that transmits a clear message to the world about the importance of conserving natural values within World Heritage sites. This also demonstrated the values of focused missions such as the 1999 UNESCO-IUCN mission to this site. The Chairperson expressed his satisfaction with the decision and thanked the Mexican authorities.

The Bureau commended the State Party for all its efforts to ensure the conservation of the World Heritage values of the Whale Sanctuary of El Vizcaino. The Bureau suggested that the Committee commend the Mexican Government for its actions to implement the World Heritage Convention and encourage the authorities to collaborate with the Centre and other interested partners to design, develop and implement on-site projects to demonstrate possibilities for generating employment and income for the local communities.

#### **IV.33 Te Wahipounamu – South West New Zealand (New Zealand)**

The Centre informed the Bureau that it had not received the detailed report on the management of the introduced mountain “thar” the State Party was requested to submit before 15 April 2000. The Delegate of Australia commented that according to his information the document was submitted to the Centre.

The Bureau requested the Centre to contact the State Party to obtain the detailed report on the management of the introduced mountain thar by 15 September 2000.

#### **IV.34 Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)**

The Bureau was informed that in May 2000, IUCN undertook a mission to the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary, with the participation of the Centre. Issues covered in the mission report include: the status of the Arabian Oryx population where the report noted that poaching was severe from 1996 to 1999, but has been stopped over the past sixteen months, particularly with the input from ‘The Sultan’s Special Forces’; and that, as regards the adequacy of the management plan, sharper boundaries are being developed, and questions of oil and gas exploration, off road vehicles and overgrazing should be taken into consideration. IUCN further informed the Bureau that the above issues are covered in more detail in the mission report. Overall, IUCN observed that the efforts being made represent good progress but significant challenges remain.

The Bureau noted that a Co-ordination Committee for the Conservation of the Arabian Oryx has been recently formed and that the first meeting of this Committee was held in Muscat in January 2000, during which a working secretariat to be hosted by Abu Dhabi (UAE) was formed to address the subject of illegal trade of the Arabian Oryx.

IUCN further informed the Bureau that it has provided input to the planning of a World Heritage Regional

Capacity Building Workshop to be held from 24 to 27 September 2000 for which the twenty-second session of the Committee approved a sum of US\$40,000 and recommended that this be a small workshop, focused on key issues raised in the mission report. IUCN observed that this Workshop could provide an opportunity for Oman to adopt and launch the Management Plan for this site. IUCN proposed the circulation of the mission report and further discussion on this site at the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee, in Cairns, Australia.

The Bureau requested that the report of the mission be submitted to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the World Heritage Bureau as Information Document.

#### **IV.35 Huascarán National Park (Peru)**

The Centre informed the Bureau that a mission to the site took place from 8 to 12 May 2000 and that the mission report is currently being finalized by IUCN.

IUCN commented that it had carried out the mission and that an initial draft report had been submitted to the Centre. IUCN highlighted the following preliminary points: (a) the site is assessed as not being in danger; (b) there is a positive co-operation with the mining industry and the site will be one of the case studies at the forthcoming World Heritage and Mining Workshop; and (c) there are a range of other site specific issues that should be discussed at the November session of the Bureau.

The Observer of Peru indicated that the draft report had been forwarded to his authorities for comments. He informed the Bureau that the Directorate of Cultural Heritage of Peru is currently examining the protection of the cultural values of the site.

The Bureau took note of the preliminary report of the mission to the site presented by IUCN and noted that this report had been provided to the authorities for comments. The Bureau requested the State Party, the Centre and IUCN to collaborate so that any responses and comments be transmitted to the forthcoming meeting on World Heritage and Mining to be held in September 2000. The Bureau requested that the outcome be reported to the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee.

#### **IV.36 Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation)**

The Bureau invited the State Party to inform the Centre on the proposed road construction project, including any environmental impact studies that may be underway, before 15 September 2000.

#### **IV.37 Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)**

The Centre informed the Bureau that no information had been received from the State Party despite a number of letters written concerning the site. The Director of the UNESCO Office in Moscow attended the last session of the Baikal Commission and had noted that progress is very slow.

IUCN fully supported the Baikal Law but highlighted concerns about the adequacy of its implementation, particularly in relation to discharge of waste into the Lake from the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill. IUCN considered that there is a need to look for innovative mechanisms for dealing with this matter which must involve substantial investment in re-profiling the existing pulp and paper mill. IUCN also noted that a Greenpeace meeting would take place in July 2000 on the Baikal Law which may result in useful recommendations and actions.

The Bureau expressed its concern that Federal Regulations related to the Baikal Law are not being effectively enforced and invited the State Party to take immediate steps to remedy this situation. The Bureau reiterated its request that the State Party provide an up-to-date report, by 15 September 2000 in particular focusing on issues raised by IUCN on the state of conservation of the site and that the report be submitted to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.38 Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal)**

The Bureau recalled that Djoudj Sanctuary was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1984 due to problems caused by the construction of downstream dams that interfered with the water regime of this wetland. Several interventions had been made to maintain the water balance in the wetland, some supported by financial contributions from the World Heritage Fund. Due to improvements in the state of conservation of the site, it was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1988.

The Bureau noted that the UNESCO Office in Dakar, Senegal, had informed the Centre of the invasion of a species of Hyacinth in the waters of Djoudj Sanctuary, and that an urgent meeting of the «Comite national de crise» was held on 19 April 2000 at the Ministry of Environment. Discussions at this meeting focused on the advantages of the mechanical and biological options (introduction of insects) for controlling the spread of the invasive species. The meeting decided to set up two separate commissions to study the pros and the cons of the two options. The two commissions were due to meet during 26 - 27 April 2000. UNESCO and IUCN Offices in Dakar are co-operating with the representatives of the Government of the Netherlands in Senegal who expressed interest in mitigating the threat posed by the invasion by the water hyacinth once the Government of Senegal has made its choice between the two options. The Bureau further noted that the Centre is in communication with the Ramsar Secretariat on this matter since Djoudj is also a Ramsar site. The Director of the Senegalese National Parks, via his letter of 25 April 2000, has requested that Djoudj be again included in the List of World Heritage in Danger, in view of the imminent danger of the invasion of the water hyacinth facing the site. IUCN informed the Bureau that it is willing to support the action, drawing on its Invasive Species Specialist Group.

The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to submit a detailed report on the threat posed by the water hyacinth invasion of the Djoudj Lake. The report should include an analysis of the severity

of the threat posed, remedial measures planned to mitigate impacts, a financing plan for implementing the remedial measures and the donor countries providing assistance to the Senegalese Government to protect the site. The report, to be submitted by the 15 September 2000, should also recommend whether or not the Committee needs to consider including this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.39 Doñana National Park (Spain)**

IUCN noted some improvements to the situation at the site, but had concerns about: (a) measures to ensure that toxic wastes, to be dumped into the old mine pit will not percolate into the surrounding aquifer; (b) the need for co-ordinating measures between various stakeholders including state and regional authorities. Such co-ordination is essential to address broader regional land issues and their impact on the site.

The Bureau noted the continuing efforts of the State Party to clean up the area, which indicate a gradual recovery of the Guadiamar River Basin. The Bureau urged the State Party to accelerate implementation of the Doñana 2005 restoration project and implement the review meeting as requested by the last session of the World Heritage Committee and to inform the Centre by 15 September 2000 on tentative dates and a programme for the review meeting.

#### **IV.40 Gough Island (United Kingdom)**

IUCN noted that it had received reports indicating that the Reserve boundaries have been extended to 12 nautical miles of territorial waters thus now matching the area of the World Heritage site. IUCN commented that the threat to the site posed by the invasive species *Sagina*, is being addressed through an eradication programme.

The Observer of the United Kingdom informed the Bureau that, to the best of his knowledge, the boundaries have not been officially confirmed as a formal legal process must be followed for this purpose. Concerning the invasive species, the eradication programme has been successfully completed.

The Bureau requested that the State Party and the St. Helena Government confirm the information reported by IUCN. Furthermore, the Bureau invited the State Party to now consider extension of the World Heritage boundary and to report on what it can do to protect the wider marine environment.

#### **IV.41 Ngorongoro Conservation Area and the Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania)**

The Bureau was read a letter of appreciation received from the Director General of Tanzania National Parks dated 20 June 2000 in which the State Party informed the Centre that the Tanzania National Parks received safely the two vehicles provided by the twenty-third session of the Bureau (July, 1999) for Kilimanjaro and Serengeti National Parks. The letter said that the vehicles are being used for the management of the Kilimanjaro and Serengeti

National Parks to improve the fire monitoring patrols, and resources such as the veterinary services, studies in quantity and quality of water for animals and ecological monitoring in general. This support for Serengeti as a vast park, has been a morale booster for the Park staff. The Director General of the Tanzanian Park Agency thanked the World Heritage Centre, and the Bureau for this assistance.

As regards the road to Ngorongoro, the Bureau noted that the Centre is in contact with the State Party to monitor progress in the process for investigating options available for the construction of an access road to Ngorongoro and that no new information has been received.

The Observer of Tanzania thanked the World Heritage Centre for the support provided to his country, and assured the Bureau that Tanzania will communicate with the Centre concerning the construction of the road.

Having been informed that IUCN understood that a feasibility study is underway in relation to the route of the road, the Bureau recommended that more information be sought from the State Party on this issue for the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.42 Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)**

The Centre informed the Bureau that the donor roundtable for developing projects to strengthen the capacity of the Ha Long Bay Management Department will take place on 19 and 20 July 2000 and that a feasibility study for a project to develop the Ha Long Bay Ecomuseum for US\$ 130,000 is being carried out by UNDP Hanoi.

IUCN informed the Bureau that it had carried out a detailed state of conservation report for this site following a field mission. A number of improvements in the management were noted. However, significant challenges remain which include over-fishing and solid and organic waste in Ha Long Bay. Key recommendations include the need for effective regional planning which considers the impact of activities within the region, as well as the need to strengthen the Ha Long Bay Management Department. IUCN suggested that this be reported to the next session of the Bureau.

The Bureau commended the State Party's efforts to continuously improve this World Heritage area located in an area of intense economic development activities. The Bureau invited the State Party to consider implementing the recommendations of the state of conservation report of IUCN. The State Party should also co-operate with the Centre and IUCN to negotiate with donors to launch programmes and projects to strengthen the long-term conservation of the World Heritage area with progress being reported back to the Bureau at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session.

#### **IV.43 Mosi-oa-Tunya/ Victoria Falls (Zambia/ Zimbabwe)**

The Bureau was informed that the Secretariat undertook a mission to Victoria Falls on 1 June 2000 and held discussions concerning recommendations of the last

session of the Committee with both the Zambian and the Zimbabwean authorities on both sides of the site. The mission was informed that national and bilateral meetings would be held in August 2000.

The Delegate of Zimbabwe, speaking on behalf of both States Parties, confirmed to the Bureau the organization of the meeting in August 2000 to finalize a number of issues concerning the management of the site.

The Bureau reiterated its earlier request that the States Parties organise the national as well as bilateral meetings as soon as possible, and submit a joint request for financial assistance for the organisation of the bilateral meeting.

#### **IV.44 World Heritage affected by a spill from Romania**

The Centre informed the Bureau that there have been four spills of cyanide and heavy metals from three mine sites in Romania since 30 January 2000. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) sent an expert assessment mission to evaluate the cyanide spill at Baia Mare (Romania) and the final report has been made available on the UNEP web site at <http://www.natural-resources.org/environment/BaiaMare/mission.htm>.

The Representative of UNEP informed the Bureau of the results of a mission undertaken by UNEP to the site. The statement of the representative from UNEP is attached as Annex IV to this report.

#### **IV.45 Hortobagy National Park, Hungary**

The Centre informed the Bureau that, although at present it is difficult to estimate the exact damage, there is evidence of damage to the site as a result of the cyanide and heavy metals spills in Romania. Emergency assistance for the site is under implementation.

ICOMOS highlighted that there is currently no impact on the cultural values, however they may occur in the long-term, and that ICOMOS supported the emergency request.

IUCN also supported assistance for this cultural landscape and shared concerns about the environmental impacts of the cyanide spill. IUCN pointed out that clear priorities for establishing a comprehensive monitoring and effective restoration programme need to be established.

The Delegate of Hungary thanked the Centre for processing the emergency assistance and expressed his gratitude for the Australian contribution of Australian \$ 300,000 for a comprehensive monitoring programme. He informed the Bureau that press reports that Ukraine would be involved in the cyanide spill are incorrect, which is clearly shown in the information provided by UNEP. The Delegate of Morocco drew the attention of the Bureau to the potential impact of toxic spills from the tributaries of the Danube into the Black Sea and the Mediterranean region in general.

The Bureau commended the efforts of the State Party and many other organisations for their quick response to this environmental disaster. The Bureau urged the State Party

to set up a comprehensive monitoring programme for all areas and ecosystems likely to be affected by the spills and give priority to the implementation of a monitoring and restoration programme. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a report on the state of conservation of the site and relevant mitigating measures by 15 September 2000.

## **MIXED HERITAGE (CULTURAL AND NATURAL)**

### **IV.46 Kakadu National Park (Australia)**

The Bureau took note of the following documents which were requested by the third extraordinary session of the Committee in July 1999: WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.6 entitled «Australia's Commitments: Protecting Kakadu National Park» and WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.7, a report from the Independent Scientific Panel (ISP) of ICSU concerning remaining scientific issues relating to the mining of uranium at Jabiluka. In addition, the Bureau noted the correspondence that the Centre had received, from the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation (GAC), expressing concerns over an accumulation of water in the Interim Water Management Pond (IWMP) at Jabiluka. The Bureau was informed that in a letter dated 17 April 2000 to the Director of the Centre, the Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO had pointed out that there is no imminent risk of overflow from the IWMP and that the Energy Resources of Australia (ERA) is now reassessing the water management system and that the final option adopted will ensure the continued protection of the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park.

The Bureau noted that a leak of tailings water contaminated with manganese at the Ranger Uranium mine (a mine operated by ERA in an enclave of Kakadu National Park) had been reported in early May 2000. In a statement issued on 3 May 2000, the Australian Government had emphasised that it treats reports of such incidences of leak of tailings water seriously and that full explanation had been sought from ERA and the Northern Territory regulatory authorities. According to the statement issued by the Australian Government, no tailings water had escaped the containment zone at the mine site and that the independent statutory authority, i.e. the Supervising Scientist, had advised that on examination of available information there was no evidence of environmental detriment outside the project area and the water quality downstream had not been affected. The same statement emphasised that there has been no downstream impact on the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park. The Supervising Scientist had been requested to undertake an independent assessment of the circumstances leading to the leak and of the likely environmental impacts. GAC, Australian NGOs and the Northern Land Council (NLC) had submitted reports on this subject to the Centre which were transmitted to the Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO; the Australian Government had responded to the concerns of all the reports in separate letters addressed to the Director on 21, 23 and 26 June 2000.

In mid-May, the Centre had received copies of the exchange of correspondence between Senator Hill,

Minister for the Environment and Heritage of Australia and Ms. Yvonne Margarula, Chairperson of the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation, concerning discussions on how to proceed with cultural heritage mapping and the development of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) for the Jabiluka Mineral lease.

The Bureau noted that the Australian authorities provided the two following reports to the Centre, during the course of its twenty-fourth ordinary session (i.e. on 27 June 2000):

- Investigations of tailings water leak at the Ranger uranium mine prepared by the Supervising Scientist, Environment Australia (June 2000); the Bureau noted that this report was being submitted to the Australian Parliament on the 27 June 2000; and
- Kakadu Region Social Impact Study (KRSIS) – Community Report. Report on Initiatives: November 1998 – June 2000, by Bob Collins, Chair, KRSIS Implementation Team (June 2000).

The Bureau was pleased to note that the Independent Scientific Panel (ISP) of the International Council for Science (ICSU) Mission to the site is to be fielded from 3 to 7 July 2000. The IUCN Representative informed the Bureau that an IUCN expert will join the team and IUCN hoped to have substantive discussions on natural heritage values of the Kakadu National Park during the mission. IUCN suggested that further discussions on substantive issues related to the conservation of natural heritage values await the completion of the mission and be addressed during the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau in Cairns, Australia, in November 2000.

The Representative of ICSU expressed her satisfaction with the collaboration between her Organisation and the Centre in facilitating the work of ISP, established by ICSU to address scientific issues of the Jabiluka mine. Prof. B. Wilkinson, the leader of the ISP and of the team to visit Kakadu from 3 to 7 July 2000, recalled the decision of the third extraordinary session of the Committee, made in July 1999, that called for the continuation of the work of the ISP of ICSU to address and resolve a certain number of outstanding scientific issues. He said that the progress report submitted by the Supervising Scientist has been helpful to reduce uncertainties with regard to some of the issues, while the resolution of others necessitated a field visit to Kakadu. He said that those remaining issues will be addressed during the ISP of ICSU mission to the site in consultations with the Supervising Scientist and his consultants, ERA, Park Manager and staff and some Australian scientists who continue to express concerns regarding the Jabiluka mine and the potential impacts it could have on the integrity of Kakadu. He also informed the Bureau that he has recently received information on leakage from the Ranger mine and concerns raised by that incident that are relevant to the management of the Jabiluka mine would also be discussed.

The Representative of ICOMOS noted and agreed with the position of IUCN and noted that ICOMOS would have to review the additional new reports before entering into substantive discussions on the state of conservation of Kakadu. He suggested that further discussions on Kakadu

be delayed until the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 2000.

The Delegate of Hungary noted that the ISP of ICSU mission would visit the site from 3 to 7 July 2000 and will gather new information concerning scientific issues relevant to the Jabiluka mine. He asked whether an archaeologist or an anthropologist was part of the ISP of ICSU mission. The Delegates of Zimbabwe, Finland and Greece agreed that, if feasible, it could be a useful addition.

Responding to a question raised by the Chair as to whether ICOMOS will be able to propose an expert in archaeology or anthropology to join the ISP of ICSU mission, the Representative of ICOMOS responded that the time available between the end of the Bureau session (1 July) and the departure of the mission team (3 July) is insufficient to find a suitable expert. He also suggested that since the ISP of ICSU mission is intended to address well defined scientific issues during a very-short period of 4 days, it would not be advisable to include a cultural heritage expert as part of that mission and that ICOMOS would be willing to consider other ways to participate in activities leading towards resolving cultural heritage issues pertaining to the management of Kakadu National Park.

The Delegate of Australia noted that his Government had provided several voluminous reports on several occasions and looked forward to receiving the ISP of ICSU mission due from 3 to 7 July 2000 to discuss the scientific issues that need to be resolved. He said that the ISP of ICSU visit is tightly focused around scientific issues and that Australia would not agree to any mission with an open-ended reference similar to that which visited Australia and Kakadu at the end of 1998.

The Australian Delegate informed the Bureau that his Government had nominated an independent person, an elder from the Aboriginal community, to be the lead person for coordinating discussions for the preparation of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) for Kakadu. The Australian branches of ICOMOS and ICCROM as well as representatives of the NLC have been invited to participate in these discussions. The Delegate noted that ERA has a legal obligation to prepare the CHMP and is required to ensure participation of the Mirrar people. He noted that the Gundjehmi, however, have not accepted the elder nominated by the Government to lead the discussions of the CHMP.

The Delegate of Australia also briefly addressed issues pertaining to the accumulation of water in the IWMP and expressed the view that there is no threat of leakage. With regard to the leak of tailings water reported from the Ranger mine he said that there is no threat to water quality in the region and that his Government had taken the issue seriously and called for a report from the Supervising Scientist. He pointed out that the report of the Supervising Scientist had been handed over to the Centre. He also said that ERA is still negotiating with the NLC on various matters concerning the Jabiluka mine and that no activities have been started to exploit the mine.

The Bureau noted the Report of the Australian Government on progress in meeting its commitments to the World Heritage Committee and the assurances that the recent leak at the Ranger Mine did not affect water quality in the World Heritage Area. The Bureau also noted that a Report by the Supervising Scientist that had been commissioned by the Government on the leak and related matters had been finalised and submitted to the Centre. The Bureau requested the Centre to submit the report of the Supervising Scientist to the advisory bodies for review and reporting at the twenty-fourth extraordinary session in November 2000.

The Bureau noted that the Independent Scientific Panel of ICSU would be visiting Kakadu in the week of 3-7 July for a site-visit to review the second report of the Supervising Scientist. The Bureau also noted advice that Australian authorities had invited ICOMOS to provide anthropological and cultural advice for the development of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan. It noted that Australia ICOMOS had accepted the invitation on 28 March 2000.

The Bureau recommended that at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session in Cairns, it considers the report of the Independent Scientific Panel of ICSU. The Bureau requested that all affected parties and the Australian Government work to find a constructive solution to addressing the economic, social and cultural expectation of the people of Kakadu while protecting the full range of World Heritage values.

#### **IV.47 Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)**

The Bureau noted that as in the case of Shark Bay, ACIUCN has established a collaborative process to prepare a report on the state of conservation of this site. It noted the view expressed by IUCN that the process will be complete and a report submitted in 2001 subject to ACIUCN receiving adequate resources. The Bureau noted that the issues addressed will include the management of areas of the Regional Forest Agreement (RFA) which are outside of the World Heritage site but which have been previously identified as having World Heritage value, proposals to develop helicopter landing sites and impacts associated with bush walking.

The Bureau was informed that the Australian Government was aware of the delays in the preparation of the report by ACIUCN due to resource and time constraints. The Delegate of Australia informed the Bureau that his Government is working with ACIUCN to develop a systematic approach to monitoring this site that could be also linked to periodic reporting of World Heritage sites in the Asia Pacific to be submitted to the World Heritage Committee in the year 2002.

The Bureau, while recognising the resource and time constraints that ACIUCN is currently facing, requested ACIUCN to complete the process with the aim of submitting an up-to-date state of conservation report to the twenty-fifth ordinary session of the Bureau in 2001.

#### IV.48 Mount Emei Scenic Area including Leshan Giant Buddha Scenic Area (China)

The Bureau was informed that in accordance with the request of the twenty-third session of the Committee, the Ministry of Construction of China submitted a report on the state of conservation of this site. The report dealt particularly with the project to construct a monorail that had been completed. The Bureau noted that the project had been approved by the Ministry of Construction in China in September 1997, taking into consideration environmental protection and the scale of construction of a non-polluting source of transportation for tourists with an aerial view of the scenic area. The width of the monorail is 40 cm, the width of the carriage is 150 cm and each car is 6 meters long and the total length of the vehicle is less than 15 m. The total length of the monorail is 2100 m. The Ministry had opted for the construction of the monorail in preference to the construction of a new walkway which it considered would have damaged the natural environment. The monorail project came into operation in 1998; in March 2000, the Vice Minister headed a team that visited the site and found that the project did not have significant impacts on the natural values of the site. The Ministry is of the view that the monorail project has minimal impacts on the ecology of the site but, with a view to better conservation of the site, is willing to invite both international and national experts to visit the site, view the operations of the monorail and undertake a scientific analysis and recommend measures to further minimise environmental impacts.

The Bureau also noted that though the Centre had been notified of a World Bank Project to build a walkway close to the Giant Buddha, the report submitted by the Ministry of Construction does not make any mention of the project.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it was unable to assess the impact of the monorail project based on the report submitted by the Ministry of Construction of China since the report did not contain any photographic or other illustrative materials. IUCN was also of the view that it would not be able to comment on the impacts of the project and the report submitted by the Ministry of Construction without a site visit that would need to be separately funded.

The Observer of China thanked the Bureau and advisory bodies for their observations and comments and invited an IUCN/ICOMOS mission to visit the site to view the project and undertake a thorough review of the report submitted by the Ministry of Construction. ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it had foreseen a mission to the site in August 2000 and expressed the hope that IUCN could make an expert available at that time in order to field a joint mission.

The Bureau requested that IUCN and ICOMOS field a mission to the site as early as possible and submit a detailed report on the state of conservation with specific reference to the environmental impacts of the monorail project, environmental safeguards put in place by the State Party and additional mitigation measures that may be necessary and submit that report to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau in Cairns, Australia.

#### IV.49 Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that, upon the request of the Committee at its twenty-third session, the Peruvian authorities submitted a response to the recommendations of the UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS mission to Machu Picchu in October 1999. The Secretariat also informed the Bureau that it had received from the Peruvian Permanent Delegation a request for collaboration in the further undertaking of geological studies on the potential of landslides on the slopes of the mountain on which the Ciudadela is located. These studies would be undertaken in the framework of the UNESCO – Kyoto University project '*Landslide Hazard Assessment and Mitigation for Cultural Heritage Sites and other Locations of High Societal Value*'.

Both IUCN and ICOMOS acknowledged the efforts of the government to address the recommendations of the UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS mission. IUCN, however, referred to the observations made by a mission that was undertaken by the Social Affairs Committee of the Finnish Parliament, in the framework of the assistance provided by Finland (Programma Machu Picchu). This mission noted as key issues the problems with the management of water and solid waste, increased tourism pressure and the delays in the implementation of the Programma Machu Picchu. ICOMOS supported these observations and made particular reference to the need to control urban development in the village of Aguas Calientes.

The Bureau took note of the report submitted by the Government of Peru in response to the recommendations formulated by the UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS mission of October 1999 and endorsed by the World Heritage Committee at its session in December 1999. It commended the Peruvian authorities for the actions taken, particularly with regard to the operations of the Management Unit and the regulation for the use of the Inca Trail (Camino Inca). It requested the authorities to keep the Secretariat informed on any new development in the management and preservation of the area and to transmit relevant studies and plans as soon as they become available. The Bureau encouraged the authorities to continue the implementation of the recommendations of the UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS mission and to submit a progress report to this effect by 15 September 2000 for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session.

The Observer of Peru noted that the Government of Peru is committed to the preservation of the site and the undertaking of the actions recommended by the Committee. He thanked the Government of Finland for its support.

The Delegate of Morocco noted that eco-tourism seemed to be a common issue for several of the sites discussed at this session of the Bureau and that experiences could be of use for non-World Heritage sites and Biosphere Reserves. IUCN responded that it had established a *Task Force on Tourism and Protected Areas*. Guidelines on this topic were being prepared jointly with UNEP and the World Tourism Organization and would be available in 2001.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

### Progress on Periodic Reporting in the Arab Region

**IV.50** At the request of the Chairperson, Mr Abdelaziz Daoulatli, responsible for the co-ordination of the activity, informed the session of the four phases which he was carrying out with Mr H. Saliba, consultant with the World Heritage Centre: (i) preparation of documentation; (ii) regional meeting in Beirut; (iii) national meetings (in progress) and (iv) preparation of the regional synthesis to be submitted to the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee.

**IV.51** Fourteen Arab States participated in the regional meeting in Beirut. The exchanges and discussions were profitable and resulted in the following conclusions: (i) revision, systematisation and harmonization of the Tentative Lists; (ii) improved distribution of sites proposed for inscription - cultural as well as natural - so that a greater diversity of heritage in the Arab States be represented in a more balanced way; (iii) better recognition of the notion of authenticity as defined in the Nara Document, by respecting the specificities of heritage in the Arab region; (iv) systematic archiving by the Secretariat of all documents, and establishment of a database of all the inscribed or proposed properties, where priority would be given to the monitoring of the state of conservation and (v) need to revise and complete the old nomination forms of the sites of the Arab region and update them in conformity with the new 1997 format. Permanent monitoring organisms within the World Heritage Centre or in the States, administrations and sites should be created.

**IV.52** National meetings are being held and, to date, seven States Parties have requested expert assistance to help them to establish their periodic reports. The date of submission of the reports for the Arab region is 15 August 2000.

**IV.53** The regional synthesis, which is being prepared, has to examine an important number of documents (over 2,000 pages). It is to be noted that a better dissemination of information on the World Heritage Convention would permit a greater number of responsible authorities in the Arab States to become familiar with the Convention and its implications.

**IV.54** The participants at that meeting esteemed that the periodic reporting of the Arab region was one of the most important activities decided upon by the World Heritage Committee, and that the strategy for assistance to countries should be reviewed in the light of the results of this activity. They emphasized the importance of the establishment of an information system available to all which will be beneficial in encouraging an increased understanding of the importance of the Convention and the preservation of World Heritage.

**IV.55** The Delegate of Hungary praised the oral report made by Mr Daoulatli that he found extremely rich and interesting. He noted that this exercise would serve as the first model of periodic reporting. It is important to co-ordinate carefully the exercise, as the budget reserved for

it is very tight. He hoped that the periodic reporting would help to understand better the sites that have already been inscribed on the World Heritage List. He stressed the importance of training as part of the exercise and hoped that the advisory bodies could formulate their recommendations on it in time for the Committee meeting in Cairns. The Delegate of Morocco welcomed the excellent report of Mr Daoulatli.

**IV.56** The Representative of IUCN thanked the Hungarian Delegate for raising the important question on the role of the advisory bodies in the periodic reporting. He wished to be informed about the expectations concerning the advisory bodies' involvement. The Representative of ICCROM also stressed the role of training in the periodic reporting and the need to update training activities as a follow-up to the periodic reporting. He suggested that attention be paid to the relation between the periodic reporting and the reactive monitoring.

### **IV.57 Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria)**

The Bureau noted the advice of ICOMOS that the proposed construction of a sports stadium at some three kilometres from the World Heritage city of Salzburg would not have an adverse impact on the World Heritage site and that there would be no direct line of sight between the two. The Observer of Austria confirmed the view of ICOMOS. The Bureau, however, requested the Austrian authorities to submit this view in writing by 15 September 2000 so that at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session the Bureau could be informed accordingly.

### **IV.58 The Potala Palace, Lhasa (China)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that information from various sources was received concerning the on-going demolition of the traditional buildings in the Shöl area (administrative district of the Potala Palace) which forms part of the World Heritage protected area inscribed in 1994. The beautification of the more prominent buildings, as with many other historic areas in Asia, for conversion into souvenir shops and tourism facilities, was leading to the decrease of residential use and undermining the authenticity of the site.

The Bureau noted the efforts being made by the national and local authorities in promoting public awareness for the use of traditional building material and conservation methods to preserve the original architectural features of the site, as reported to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Bureau however, expressed concern over reports on the transformation of the historic characteristics of the Shöl area, the former administrative area whose history is inseparable from the Potala Palace. Whilst recognizing the importance of tourism and the need for adequate facilities for visitors, the Bureau requested the State Party to maintain the authenticity of the area and provide a report on the renovation plan of Shöl to the Secretariat by 15 September 2000 for examination by the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.59 Islamic Cairo (Egypt)**

In addition to the information available in the document WHC-2000/CONF.202/5, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that the rehabilitation work of the public areas (roads, pavements, etc.), financed by the Arab Fund for Social and Economic Development (FADES) was making good progress in Cairo Fatimide around the Beit Suhaimi as well as in Historic Cairo (or Copt) around the Roman Citadel, with the involvement of the Ministry of Tourism. With regard to the restoration of Beit Sinnari, halted for a short time due to lack of materials, work has now recommenced at a good rhythm. Finally, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that the authorities had approved the ICOMOS mission for the evaluation of the restoration work at the Al-Azhar Mosque; this mission will take place in mid-July 2000. The Bureau called upon the Egyptian authorities to facilitate the progress of the work and the task of the co-ordination staff in Cairo. Delays in this respect will increase the cost of the works and reduce the possibilities for revitalising Islamic Cairo. Furthermore, the Bureau requested ICOMOS to organize a mission to study the state of conservation of other monuments of Islamic Cairo.

#### **IV.60 Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Former Abbey of Saint-Remi and Palace of Tau, Reims (France)**

The French authorities had informed the Secretariat that the planning for the parvis of the Cathedral had encountered some delay because of the change of the Mayor of the town, but that the matter was now progressing in consultation with the appropriate institutions and authorities. The ICOMOS expert would be invited to participate in this process.

The Bureau recommended the French authorities to proceed with the preparation of the plan for the parvis with the participation of the ICOMOS expert and to keep the Committee informed on its progress and the results obtained.

#### **IV.61 World Heritage properties in France**

The Bureau thanked the Government of France for the detailed information received on the damages caused to World Heritage sites by the storms of December 1999. It expressed its sympathy with the French authorities and commended it for the actions it had taken to prevent further damage and to plan for the repair and restoration of the monuments and parks concerned.

#### **IV.62 Roman Monuments, Cathedral St. Peter and Liebfrauen-Church in Trier (Germany)**

The Bureau noted that it had not received the State Party's report that was requested by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session. The Observer of Germany expressed his regret for the delay. The Bureau reiterated the request for a report on the integration of the Roman water pipes and town ramparts in the plan for the buildings close to the Roman Amphitheatre. It requested the German authorities to submit this plan by 15 September 2000 for examination by ICOMOS and by the Bureau at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session.

#### **IV.63 Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)**

The Bureau noted the request from the German authorities that the deadline for the submission of a state of conservation report be extended and requested the authorities to submit such report by 15 September 2000 for examination by ICOMOS and by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session.

#### **IV.64 Hortabagy National Park (Hungary)**

See paragraph IV.45 above.

#### **IV.65 Sun Temple of Konarak (India)**

The Bureau was informed that since the preparation of the Working Document, the World Heritage Centre had still not received information concerning the structural study being implemented with financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund Emergency Assistance, made available in 1998 to the Archaeological Survey of India. The Centre reported that the Activity Financing Contract for this emergency structural survey has become null and non-disbursed money has been liquidated following UNESCO Administrative Regulations.

In February 2000, a reactive monitoring mission was undertaken by an ICOMOS expert, who examined the state of conservation of the site, reviewed the work carried out with the Emergency Assistance contribution from the World Heritage Fund, and held discussions with the Indian authorities concerning their intention to nominate the site as World Heritage in Danger.

The ICOMOS Mission found that there was no immediate threat to the monument due to structural instability. Although long term effects of the loosening of stone parts and water penetration need examination, the stones were found to be in good condition. The recent cyclone had extensively damaged the green belt of the site, which acted as a buffer zone as well as a screen against possible salt infiltration from the sea breeze. However, ICOMOS underlined the importance of carrying out further analysis of the structures to develop a strategy for removing the sand from within the Sun Temple.

The ICOMOS Mission witnessed ad-hoc development activities and illegal encroachment impacting negatively on the areas surrounding the site, and recommended that urgent actions be taken to ensure adequate building control and the development of a Comprehensive Development Plan. Enhanced site interpretation was strongly encouraged through the presentation of similar important architectural complexes in the nearby region which attest to the unique architectural character, lost within the Konarak Sun Temple complex. Although the ICOMOS Mission recommended that the site should not be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as the property is not threatened by serious and specific danger at this moment, implementation of previous recommendations of UNESCO Missions (1981, 1987) for enhanced protection and presentation of the site was urged.

The Observer of India informed the Bureau that the national authorities concerned were fully aware of the responsibilities of the State Party in adhering to the World Heritage Convention, and were committed to taking necessary measures to ensure the safeguarding and appropriate presentation of the World Heritage values of the Konarak site. The Observer expressed his appreciation to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for organizing the reactive monitoring mission, and informed the Bureau that the ICOMOS recommendations would be carefully examined and considered for implementation.

The Bureau examined the findings and recommendations of the ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the Sun Temple of Konarak, undertaken in February 2000. The Bureau, taking note of the efforts made by the Indian authorities to undertake a structural analysis utilizing the World Heritage Fund, requested the Secretariat to assist the authorities in formulating a technical co-operation request for completing the structural survey for developing a strategy for removing the sand within the Sun Temple.

The Bureau, encouraging the Indian authorities to continue its regular maintenance programme, invited the authorities to periodically submit a monitoring report concerning the state of conservation of the site, following the format adopted by the World Heritage Committee. Moreover, the Bureau invited the Indian authorities to consider nominating, as a serial nomination, other well preserved temple complexes in the Bhubaneswar Region, which illustrate the unique architectural characters which Konarak has lost.

In order to mitigate potential threats caused by illegal encroachment and ad-hoc construction in the areas surrounding the site, the Bureau requested the authorities concerned to urgently prepare a Comprehensive Development Plan to ensure adequate building control in the areas immediately adjacent to the site. To this end, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to assist the State Party in mobilizing international technical expertise and co-operation of the local authorities concerned. The Bureau requested the Government of India to report to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau on the progress made preparing this Plan.

#### **IV.66 Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Iran)**

The Bureau recalled that the 1995 UNESCO Mission recommended that the site be redefined and extended in order to include key characteristics of the Safavid urban planning scheme. The establishment of a site commission had also been recommended by the 1995 Mission for improved co-ordination amongst the concerned departments of the Government for the management and planning of the historic city of Esfahan.

The ICCROM/ICOMOS expert who undertook a monitoring mission in December 1999 at the invitation of the Government of Iran, informed the Bureau that the third *Five-Year National Development Plan* which integrates heritage protection within the overall comprehensive development plans of the Government, had been recently approved by the Government of Iran. This National Development Plan is applicable to all urban areas and

complements other existing plans elaborated for the protection of the site, such as the *Urban Master Plan of the City of Esfahan*, which controls building heights and protects historic buildings within the historic city, and the *Rehabilitation Plan*, which identifies the main features of the Safavid city and establishes management and rehabilitation plans for features which are found to have historic value. The expert informed the Bureau that the third *Five-Year National Development Plan*, intended to strengthen inter-authority co-operation for sustainable development of historic towns in Iran, will pose new challenges in managing the World Heritage site which would need to be carefully monitored.

The Bureau was informed that the commercial and development pressures within the site were fairly high, and noted that enhancement of the general awareness of policy and decision-makers on conservation needs may be necessary. The expert informed the Bureau that a systematic monitoring mechanism of the site is yet to be established and recommended that monitoring indicators be identified and put into place.

The Bureau examined the state of conservation of Meidan Emam, Esfahan presented by the international expert who undertook a mission to the site in December 1999 in close co-operation with the Government of Iran. The Bureau commended the national authorities on the adoption of the *Five-Year National Development Plan* that includes heritage protection and integrated management of Esfahan within the overall urban development plan. The Bureau invited the Government of Iran to inform the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session on further progress made in implementing the *Urban Master Plan of the City of Esfahan* and the *Five-Year National Development Plan*, as the experience at this site could serve useful to other States Parties in the region in their efforts to protect historic cities.

In view of the absence of a systematic monitoring system, the Bureau recommended that the State Party establish a process of systematic monitoring on the state of conservation of the site, after identifying monitoring indicators based upon careful analysis of the world heritage values of the site. Finally, the Bureau recommended that the State Party enhance co-operation between the national and local authorities concerned to effectively implement existing management and development plans of Esfahan.

#### **IV.67 Tchogha Zanbil (Iran)**

A monitoring mission was undertaken by an ICCROM/ICOMOS expert in December 1999 at the invitation of the Government of Iran. The Bureau recalled that the site was located in the war zone during the 1980s and suffered from the impact of bombardments.

In 1995, a UNESCO mission recommended that a Master Plan of the area be prepared, taking into account the need to enhance site presentation, visitor management, basic infrastructure, and development control in the surrounding settlement areas. The 1995 mission also recommended that legal protection for the site and its buffer zone be established. The Bureau recalled that the 1995 UNESCO

reactive monitoring mission, undertaken following the heavy rainfall resulting in damage to the ziggurat, recommended further protective measures to consolidate the ziggurat and improve drainage of the mud-brick structure.

The expert informed the Bureau that current management and conservation activities on-site have dramatically improved since the previous UNESCO missions, largely due to the progress made in the implementation of Phase I of a UNESCO-Japan Funds-In-Trust Project, which began after a Technical Co-operation Agreement was signed in April 1999. The results, so far highly commendable, have been obtained through the joint efforts of the national authorities concerned, a scientific advisory group, and expert consultants who collaborate together in five project teams addressing issues related to (a) management, (b) archaeology, (c) architecture, (d) conservation, and (e) geology. A Master Plan, that is expected to be updated on a regular basis, is being prepared for the presentation of the site. The Bureau was informed that training at national and regional levels was being emphasised, particularly focusing on capacity building in the field of conservation sciences and conservation of mud-brick structures.

The Observer of Iran expressed his Government's appreciation to UNESCO and the Government of Japan for extending their co-operation and support for both the conservation and training activities being undertaken on-site by the Iranian authorities.

The Bureau examined the state of conservation of Tchogha Zanbil presented by the international expert who undertook a mission to the site in December 1999 in close co-operation with the Government of Iran. The Bureau, taking note of the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 1995 UNESCO mission, congratulated the Government of Iran on its efforts to develop a management plan to enhance the presentation and management of the site. The Bureau noted with appreciation, the technical collaboration between the national authorities and international experts mobilized under the UNESCO Japan Funds-in-Trust Agreement signed in April 1999.

In view of the importance of the activities being carried out under this Agreement, especially in relation to the conservation of mud-brick architecture, these activities could serve as an important case study for managing and conserving similar sites in States Parties of the region. The Bureau requested the Government of Iran, in close co-operation with the Secretariat, to submit a report on further progress made in Tchogha Zanbil under the UNESCO Japan Funds-in-Trust Project, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session in 2001.

#### **IV.68 Petra (Jordan)**

The Deputy Director reported on his mission to Jordan at the beginning of May and in particular his visit to Petra where he worked with the representatives of the Antiquities Directorate and the "Petra Regional Planning Council". He also met with the President of the Petra National Trust that financed the cleaning-up operations and the presentation of the "Siq". He briefly reported to

the Bureau on the situation at the archaeological site and its environmental problems, including the urban expansion in Wadi Musa and the disputes with the inhabitants of the area. He also informed the Bureau of the success in transposing the hotels from Wadi Musa to Taybé, located at a fair distance from the site.

The Delegate of Morocco insisted on the importance of the problem with the population at Petra and suggested that a synergy with the adjacent Dana Biosphere Reserve be sought. The Delegate of Greece suggested that the ICOMOS Committee on Cultural Tourism be associated with the work of the Secretariat concerning Petra. Renovation works at the site could be financed partly by income coming from tourism. The Bureau commended the authorities and the parties involved for the protection and presentation work already undertaken. It requested the Secretariat to agree to the request of the "Petra Regional Planning Council" to send a mission for the tourism management of the site and the physical and economic development of the vicinity, including the possibility of integrating the Dana Reserve into this work. The Bureau also requested ICOMOS to include in the same mission a specialist to evaluate the state of conservation and the presentation of the archaeological site. Finally, the Bureau requested that a detailed report on Petra be submitted to its twenty-fifth session in 2001.

#### **IV.69 Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic)**

The Secretariat reported that the conservation and development plan of the Town of Luang Prabang developed under the Luang Prabang-Chinon Decentralized Cooperation Programme was presented to the National Interministerial Commission on Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage in January 2000 and was approved in principle. However the plan has not yet been officially adopted, hence does not have legal enforcement power. The Secretariat also recalled that despite the repeated requests by the Bureau and the Committee for revision and subsequent enactment by the National Assembly of Laos of the Decree on the Protection of National Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage (issued on 20 June 1997 as Presidential Decree), this was still pending. The Bureau was informed of the rapid growth and ill-planned tourism development in Luang Prabang and incidents of illegal construction, despite the strengthened capacity of the local authorities in the management of urban heritage. A particular concern was raised over the planned consolidation of the riverbank with concrete gabions and the widening of the quay under a project financed by the Asian Development Bank's Secondary Cities Programme. This project may undermine the view of the historic peninsula from the opposite embankment and permit increased vehicular traffic into the core historic centre. The Bureau was informed that the State Party and the Asian Development Bank have been requested to carry out a geological survey to determine the need for the use of concrete gabions. The Bureau was also informed of the exemplary urban infrastructural improvement projects undertaken by the French Agency for Development (AFD) under the first phase of a multi-year programme of urban conservation and development (US\$ 1.8 million) and of

the on-going negotiations for a second phase for an amount of US\$ 3.5 million.

The Bureau noted with appreciation the mobilization by the World Heritage Centre and the City of Chinon for the protection and sustainable development of Luang Prabang, and expressed gratitude to the Government of France, the French Development Agency and the Asian Development Bank for supporting the safeguarding and development of this living historic town and that Luang Prabang was not intended to become a town museum. While noting the progress made by the national and local authorities in strengthening the legal and management framework for urban heritage protection in Luang Prabang, the Bureau expressed concern over the rapid and ill-prepared growth of tourism, incidence of illegal construction and the planned widening of the roads and riverbank quay which risk the loss of the town's authenticity and the World Heritage value of the site. The Bureau requested the State Party to approve the conservation and development plan of Luang Prabang as soon as possible to ensure adequate legal protection of the site and for the national tourism strategy to give greater importance to heritage protection concerns. The Bureau invited the State Party, in conformity with paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines, to inform the Committee through the UNESCO Secretariat, of all major infrastructural works at the planning stage. The Bureau requested the Centre to write to the Asian Development Bank, inviting them to submit the technical plan of the riverbank consolidation and quay improvement project of Luang Prabang to the Committee prior to the finalization of the implementation agreement with the local authorities. As suggested by the Delegate of Hungary, the Bureau proposed that the advisory bodies study the technical plan and present their analysis of it to the Committee so that it can better treat this complex issue. The absence of a co-ordinating committee meant, amongst others, that ICOMOS or other advisory bodies were not involved in the conservation and development of the site.

The Bureau then requested UNESCO to mobilize technical support, notably by involving ICOMOS, to assist the State Party in the selection of appropriate technical solutions in this regard.

#### **IV.70 Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)**

The demolition and new construction or alterations of historic buildings within Kathmandu Valley have persisted in spite of concerted international and national conservation efforts. This has resulted in the loss or continuous and gradual deterioration of materials, structure, ornamental features, and architectural coherence making the essential settings of the Monument Zones as well as in their authentic characters. In view of the above, the Committee, at its twenty-third session, requested a High Level Mission to be undertaken to hold discussions with representatives of HMG of Nepal in early 2000. The Bureau was informed that the tentative dates for the High Level Mission, 23-30 September 2000, had been proposed to HMG of Nepal. The participants of the Mission would be the Chairperson of the Committee, an eminent

international expert on Kathmandu Valley, a former Minister of Housing of the Government of France, the Director of the World Heritage Centre, and Centre staff. The Chairperson informed the Bureau that the High Level Mission could not be undertaken earlier, as the dates proposed in September were the only dates convenient to the participants and the Government.

The Centre informed the Bureau that the public rest house in Patan Darbar Square Monument Zone, which had been illegally dismantled without approval of the Department of Archaeology, in September 1999 despite conditions which permitted *in-situ* repair, had been reconstructed using new building material.

The Delegate of Zimbabwe noted with disappointment that the High Level Mission had not been undertaken earlier in the year as specified by the Committee, especially in light of further information on continued illegal demolition of historic buildings within the World Heritage protected areas. He was concerned about the delay with regard to the application of the extension of the site. Recalling the extended discussions during the twenty-third session of the Committee concerning the serious loss of the authentic urban fabrics within the site over the past years, the Delegate reiterated the Committee's recognition of the gravity of the situation, which should not be underestimated. Although the Committee had decided to again defer the inscription of the Kathmandu Valley site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-third session, the Delegate underscored that continued illegal demolition of historic buildings was unacceptable and the commitment and capacity of the State Party in implementing existing regulations were seriously questioned.

The Bureau recalled that at the twenty-first session of the Committee, in view of the continued deterioration of the World Heritage values in the Baudhanath and Kathmandu Monument Zones, affecting the integrity and inherent characteristics of the site, the Committee had requested the Secretariat, in collaboration with ICOMOS and the State Party, 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 was to take into consideration the intention of HMG of Nepal to nominate Khokana as an additional Monument Zone. The Bureau also recalled that this study, undertaken during the UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Joint Mission in 1998, found that although Khokana's characteristics could add to the recognized World Heritage values of Kathmandu Valley, it was not possible for the vernacular architectural characteristics of Khokana to replace the lost characteristics within the existing Monument Zones. It was recalled that the Committee requested in 1998, HMG of Nepal to take the necessary measures to ensure adequate protection and management of Khokana prior to its nomination as an additional Monument Zone to the Kathmandu Valley site. The Bureau was informed that the nomination file for the inscription of Khokana Mustard Seed Village as an Additional Monument Zone to the Kathmandu Valley site, had been received in early 2000, but the requested protective measures were not included amongst the documents submitted.

The Representative of ICOMOS informed the Bureau that they had not received a demand for extension of this site, as requested by the Bureau and the Committee on previous occasions.

The Delegate of Hungary expressed his concern, pointing out that the High Level Mission and the extension of the site were two separate issues that should be dealt with separately.

The Bureau requested HMG of Nepal to continue making all possible efforts to protect the remaining authentic historic urban fabric within the Kathmandu Valley site, and in implementing the 55 Recommendations and Time-Bound Action Plan of the UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Joint Mission. The Bureau requested the Secretariat and the advisory bodies to continue to assist the State Party as appropriate in order to strengthen its capacity to control development, retain historic buildings *in-situ*, to address the problem of illegal demolition and new construction, and redress illegal alteration of historic buildings. The Bureau requested the Centre to ensure adequate preparation of the High Level Mission scheduled for September 2000 and to report on the results to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau and the twenty-fourth session of the Committee.

Finally, the Bureau expressed appreciation for the Government's effort to nominate Khokana Mustard Seed Village as an additional Monument Zone to Kathmandu Valley. However, in view of the absence of legislative protection of the core and buffer zones of the sites, the Bureau reiterated the Committee's request to HMG of Nepal to take the necessary measures to ensure that adequate protection and management are put into place at Khokana.

#### **IV.71 Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal)**

Following the request of the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session, the World Heritage Centre organized a UNESCO reactive monitoring mission to Lumbini to examine the state of conservation of the Maya Devi Temple archaeological remains and to undertake further consultations with the Nepalese authorities concerning the proposals under consideration for the rehabilitation of the Maya Devi Temple.

The Bureau was informed that the UNESCO mission undertaken in April 2000 recommended the following:

- (a) The four draft conceptual designs for the construction of a "new" Maya Devi Temple on top of the archaeological remains of the Temple should be rejected, as such a construction, which would last a maximum of 100 years, would result in significant long-term damage to the unique site which is over 2000 years old;
- (b) Taking into consideration the sensitive religious, archaeological and political nature of the property, alternative designs for the Temple should be further discussed at an International Technical Meeting, based

on the concepts of non-intrusion, reversibility, shelter, visibility, focus, access, worship, authentic materials and integration with the Tange Master Plan, to be organized as soon as possible;

- (c) In anticipation of further discussions on alternative designs for the rehabilitation of the Maya Devi Temple, and in the absence of a regular monitoring system, the national authorities are recommended to put into place basic environment monitoring mechanisms of the Temple;
- (d) In the absence of a strategic plan for the on-going management and conservation of the site, the development of a "minor plan" for enhanced preservation and presentation of the Sacred Garden was urged to address the following recommendations:
  - (i) a geophysical survey is recommended in order to establish the full delineation of the site;
  - (ii) the adoption and implementation of a systematic conservation strategy for addressing the deterioration of the archaeological structures;
  - (iii) as the site has been developed resulting in incoherent landscaping, it is recommended that the authorities adopt a unified approach to connect the site to its surrounding to ensure that authentic materials are used with reference to the site's historical and archaeological nature;
  - (iv) as visitor numbers are unknown, it is recommended that recording of visitor numbers be conducted;
  - (v) as ritual practices have resulted in damage to the site in the past, the creation of a principle archaeological circuit and a principle ritual circuit with zones for ritual practices is recommended;
  - (vi) as the Tange Plan is still incomplete, the State Party is recommended to regroup the visitor services behind a distinct *entry zone* to be established, and to investigate the improvement of the drainage system.

On 19 June 2000, the Centre received a technical co-operation request for supporting the organization of the recommended International Technical Meeting. The request has been evaluated by ICOMOS, which fully supports the well-formulated request. The Bureau was informed that the request would be processed swiftly following normal procedures. The Centre also reported that information from the UNESCO Kathmandu Office had been received concerning the Government's initiation of the basic monitoring of the Maya Devi Temple environment through temperature and humidity fluxation measurement.

To follow-up on the findings of the UNESCO mission and following the request of the Bureau, an ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was organized between 19-23 June 2000. The ICOMOS mission, underlining the challenges faced in safeguarding the World Heritage values of this fragile archaeological site which is also a place of pilgrimage and worship, informed the Bureau that the interests of conservation and religious devotion could be contradictory. The Bureau was informed that, despite assurances from the State Party at the time of inscription that a conservation plan would be developed for the site, such plan had not yet been elaborated to date.

The Bureau examined the findings and recommendations of the UNESCO reactive monitoring mission undertaken by two international experts in April 2000 and the ICOMOS Mission of June 2000. The Bureau recommended HMG of Nepal to consider adopting the UNESCO Mission's Recommendations for Enhanced Management and Conservation of the site and report to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau on any further measures taken to enhance management and conservation of the site.

The Bureau expressed its appreciation to HMG of Nepal for adopting the UNESCO Mission's Recommendations for Immediate Actions by commencing regular monitoring of the Maya Devi Temple's environment and by submitting a Technical Co-operation request for supporting the organization of an International Technical Meeting to discuss and initiate alternative draft conceptual designs for rehabilitating the Maya Devi Temple.

In view of the absence of a conservation or management plan for safeguarding the World Heritage values of the Lumbini World Heritage site, the Bureau requested HMG of Nepal to urgently develop a Management Plan, taking into consideration the UNESCO and ICOMOS Mission Recommendations.

Finally, the Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to continue to assist HMG of Nepal in organizing the International Technical Meeting as early as possible, together with the UNESCO Kathmandu Office, and to report on the progress made to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.72 Taxila (Pakistan) Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore (Pakistan)**

In May 2000, the World Heritage Centre received information from the national authorities that the Department of Archaeology would restore the demolished hydraulic works of Shalamar Gardens, and that the football stadium constructed on Bhir Mound (600 BC – 200 AD) at Taxila would be demolished. The authorities had stated that the south-eastern wall of the stadium had been demolished and that the boundary wall on the remaining sides would also be demolished. The Centre was informed that the "rooms" constructed on the northern side will be utilized for watch and ward staff on the site.

At its twenty-third session, the Bureau recalled that, evidences of illegal excavations at two of the archaeological remains in Taxila had been witnessed by a UNESCO mission. At the time of the mission, the representatives of the Government of Pakistan had confirmed that large-scale illegal excavation by looters in search of antiquities within the Buddhist monastery sites had increased in recent years. At its twenty-third session, the Bureau had requested the Government of Pakistan to undertake archaeological research at unexcavated sites at Taxila and to adequately protect the sites from illegal looters. In view of Pakistan's adherence to the *UNESCO 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property*, the Bureau had

recommended the authorities of Pakistan to strengthen security at the archaeological remains of Taxila and the customs control at the borders of the North-Western Frontier Province. The Bureau had also requested the Government to undertake an impact assessment study of the heavy industries and military bases in the Taxila Valley areas. Although the Bureau had requested the Government of Pakistan to submit a report by 15 September 1999 on the actions taken, information had not been received concerning the control of illegal excavations and the impact assessment study at the time of the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau.

The Bureau was informed that during consultations between the World Heritage Centre and the Permanent Delegation of Pakistan to UNESCO held since the twenty-third session of the Committee, the national authorities had expressed their intention to nominate the two sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in view of the serious threats facing the authenticity and integrity of the Shalamar Gardens and Bhir Mound of Taxila. However, official nomination had not been received to date. The Centre reported that in the meantime, the Centre and ICOMOS were organizing ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions to be undertaken before the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau, to elaborate a comprehensive management plan for both the Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore site and the Taxila site.

The Delegate of Zimbabwe underscored the alarming situation at these two sites where monuments protected under the Convention were being demolished or archaeological values undermined.

The Observer of Pakistan reiterated the recent decision taken by her Government to restore the hydraulic works of Shalamar Gardens. Moreover, the Bureau was informed that the dismantling of the boundary walls of the football stadium constructed on Bhir Mound had commenced. Since May 2000, one third of the wall had already been demolished, while further excavation is being carried out on Bhir Mound. The Observer assured the Bureau of the Government's resolve to undertake corrective measures to safeguard the World Heritage values of these two sites. Finally, the Observer reiterated the Government's commitment to adhere to the provisions of the World Heritage Convention.

The Bureau examined the report of the Secretariat and requested the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to continue the organization of the reactive monitoring missions to the Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore and Taxila World Heritage sites. The Bureau requested the Findings and Recommendations of the Missions to be reported to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

The Bureau, expressing its appreciation for the information received from the Pakistan authorities concerning its intentions to undertake corrective measures for Bhir Mound and the Shalamar Gardens, requested the Government of Pakistan to report on further actions taken to restore the 375 year old hydraulic works and to demolish the football stadium, to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

The Bureau reiterated its request to the Government of Pakistan made at its twenty-third session for information concerning actions taken to strengthen security at the archaeological remains of Taxila and the customs control at the borders of the North-Western Frontier Province, as well as the progress made in undertaking an impact assessment study of the heavy industries in the Taxila Valley areas. The Bureau requested the Government of Pakistan to submit a report by 15 September 2000 on the actions taken, for examination by the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

Finally, the Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to continue consultations with the authorities of Pakistan concerning the Government's intentions to nominate the two sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A report on the results should be provided to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau to enable it to formulate recommendations for the decision of the Committee.

#### **IV.73 Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it had received on 21 June 2000, a brief report from the Polish authorities on the state of affairs for the planning and preservation for the World Heritage site of Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camps. This report included the following information:

1. An International Council for Auschwitz and Birkenau Concentration Camps was set up on 29 March 2000 under the chairmanship of an ex-minister for Foreign Affairs and with the participation of both national and international experts and institutions. The Council met for the first time on 7 June 2000 and will co-operate with and advise on the protection, management and presentation of the Camps and in obtaining the necessary means for the functioning of the Auschwitz Museum.
2. A Spatial Plan for the surroundings of Auschwitz, including a plan on scale 1:4000, had been prepared and had been subject to a long consultation process. A municipal resolution for the approval of the final version of the plan had been drafted. The Spatial Plan for the surroundings of Birkenau was less advanced but a plan on scale 1:4000 had been elaborated.
3. Both plans, translated into English, had been transmitted to the International Expert Group that was established in 1999. Due to scheduling problems, this Group was not able to meet so far in 2000 but two conference calls took place. The next meeting is scheduled for September 2000. Two new members had been appointed on the Expert Group, one from Poland and one from Hungary.

The Bureau noted the information provided by the State Party on the progress made in the implementation of the Strategic Governmental Programme for Oswiecim and that

the International Expert Group would meet in September 2000. It requested the authorities to submit a progress report by 15 September 2000 for examination by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session.

As to the request from the Polish National Commission for UNESCO for the Committee's views on the matter of the restitution from the Auschwitz Museum to the author of portraits made during her imprisonment in the Camp, the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-third extraordinary session concluded that legal advice from the Secretariat was required before this matter could be further examined by the Bureau or the Committee. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Office of Legal Affairs of UNESCO was of the opinion that *this matter does not come within the framework of the World Heritage Convention*. The Bureau took note of this advice.

The Observer of Israel, who is also a member of the International Expert Group, noted that, in fact, the World Heritage site should be called Auschwitz-Birkenau Concentration Camps. He also noted that the Spatial Plans refer to the urban town plans areas surrounding the Camps and not specifically to the World Heritage site itself. As to the restitution of the portraits, he recognised that this had also an emotional dimension and that there was a need to urge the parties to reach a conciliation.

#### **IV.74 Angra do Heroismo (Portugal)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it had received two reports from the Permanent Delegation of Portugal: (1) report of meeting on the marina project (13-14 January 2000, attended by the ICOMOS-designated expert), and (2) a Periodic Report on the State of Angra and its Sea Front (dated 10 April 2000).

The Periodic Report provided information on:

- The adoption of a plan for the Urban Involvement of the Angra Bay;
- Models developed for the marina dam, its connection to the city and support services;
- Status of development of the areas along the Bay, including the eighteenth-century staircase and the remains of the Porta do Mar.

The ICOMOS expert, who had been involved for several years in the examination of this project, advised that the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and the involvement of ICOMOS have given positive results. These involved the formulation of a series of plans for urban preservation and the relation between the historical centre and the urban area, and the solution of the problem of the integration of the proposed marina. He had made some specific recommendations for further follow-up.

The Bureau commended the authorities of Portugal and the Regional Government of the Azores for the report and the actions it had taken in response to the recommendations formulated by the Committee, its Bureau and the ICOMOS expert. It encouraged the authorities to continue to involve the ICOMOS expert in the further planning process for the marina and the area that will connect the marina with the city, as well as in the preparation of the Special Protection Plan for the city of Angra do Heroismo.

The Bureau requested the authorities to submit a progress report on the above by 15 April 2001 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session.

The Observer of Portugal highlighted the positive involvement of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in this project and the good progress that was made over the past years. He expressed the wish of his Government to continue this collaboration in the future. He reminded the members of the Bureau and the advisory bodies that the idea behind the construction of the marina was to give life to the area and thus give it the same character as in the 18th and 19th centuries.

The Delegate of Australia congratulated Portugal for the way it had made use of the system of periodic reporting.

#### **IV.75 Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Permanent Delegation of Portugal had submitted on 5 May 2000, a report concerning the state of conservation of Sintra which was transmitted to IUCN and ICOMOS for review. ICOMOS expressed reservations about the state of conservation of the site and indicated that a joint ICOMOS-IUCN mission would be required. Both IUCN and the Observer of Portugal endorsed this proposal. The latter informed the Bureau that Sintra, because of its location, 20 km from Lisbon, was under strong pressure (urban development, tourism).

The Bureau, therefore, requested ICOMOS and IUCN to undertake a joint mission to Sintra to examine the state of conservation of the cultural landscape of Sintra and to submit a report to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.76 Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it had received a Management Plan for the Stonehenge World Heritage site, prepared under the direction of the Stonehenge World Heritage Site Management Planning Group (comprising national and local organizations) and chaired by an English Heritage Commissioner. ICOMOS congratulated the Government of the United Kingdom for this management plan for what is a very complex site. It recommended that careful evaluation and assessment be undertaken in each stage of the process of implementation. The Delegate of Hungary commended the high quality of the plan and indicated that Hungary was already using this plan as a model.

The Bureau congratulated the Government of the United Kingdom for the preparation of this high-quality management plan and took note of the intention of the Government to follow the recommendation made by ICOMOS.

#### **IV.77 Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam)**

The Bureau was informed of the findings of the UNESCO-Vietnam expert team concerning the impact on the World Heritage values of the site caused by the heavy rainfall and floods of October-December 1999, which was the worst flood recorded since 1886. This technical study co-financed from World Heritage Fund's emergency assistance, noted the gravity of the erosion, particularly along the left bank of the Perfume River, and the urgent need for riverbank consolidation to mitigate the risks of further damage from future floods. The long-term damage of the monuments and houses from humidity and timber decay if left untreated, was also noted by the Bureau. Several delegates, including Hungary and Zimbabwe, noted the high quality of the crisis management plan and indicated the possibility of using it as a model elsewhere.

The Secretariat distributed to the Bureau members a document containing 19 project proposals (15 for Hué and 4 for Hoi An) for urgent rehabilitation and disaster mitigation activities. The total amounted to US\$ 6 million and was prepared by the UNESCO-Vietnam expert team. Another project proposal for the establishment of a housing improvement fund for urban heritage conservation prepared by the Caisse des Dépôts et Consignation (CDC) of France under the Hue-Lille Metropole Decentralized Cooperation Programme, established by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre was also included. The Bureau remarked on the exemplary quality of the project proposals and the integrated approach, but requested the official association of ICOMOS, as the advisory body to the Committee, to evaluate the projects and the need for inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau noted with deep concern, the report on the gravity of the damage caused to the monuments and the urban heritage of the Hué World Heritage site by the November 1999 floods. The Bureau expressed appreciation for the efficient manner in which the Vietnamese authorities have handled emergency actions to prevent further damage to the site and for their efforts in preparing the project proposals, despite priorities for relief to the inhabitants. The Bureau requested UNESCO, notably its Bureau for Extrabudgetary Funding (BER) to co-operate with the World Heritage Centre in seeking donors for these projects. In view of the damage and the important funding support required to redress the situation and to mitigate risks from future seasonal floods, the Bureau requested ICOMOS to undertake a reactive monitoring mission to prepare a recommendation for the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It requested the Secretariat to seek the views of the State Party by 15 September 2000 in this regard. The Representative of ICOMOS agreed to undertake a reactive monitoring mission to the site and to formulate a recommendation for consideration by the Bureau at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session for decision by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session in 2000.

## Reports on the state of conservation of properties of which the Bureau took note

**IV.78** The Bureau took note of the information provided in the working document on the state of conservation of the following properties:

### NATURAL HERITAGE

**Comoe National Park (Côte d'Ivoire)**

**Caves of the Aggtelek and Slovak Karst (Hungary/Slovakia)**

The Delegate of Morocco pointed out that the protection of surface water is important in karst systems.

**Kaziranga National Park (India)**

**Lorentz National Park (Indonesia)**

**Kamchatka Volcanoes (Russian Federation)**

**Sinharaja Forest Reserve (Sri Lanka)**

**Bwindi Impenetrable Forest (Uganda)**

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

**Rock-hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia)**

**Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania)**

**City of Cuzco (Peru)**

**Chavin (Archaeological Site) (Peru)**

**Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru)**

**IV.79** During the examination of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, the observation was made that, in several cases, the World Heritage Committee was only informed at a very late stage of major works that were undertaken at World Heritage sites. The Secretariat referred to paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines in which States Parties are invited *to inform the Committee of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention major restoration or new constructions which may affect the World Heritage value of the property*. It noted that only very few of the state of conservation reports came from States Parties themselves and that practically all of them were the result of reports and communications from the advisory bodies, individuals or NGOs. The Centre thus underlined the need to develop a systematic approach to heritage protection and development.

**IV.80** The Bureau was informed that the Director-General of UNESCO, recognizing the need to address the "root-cause" of threats and to strengthen the mechanism for enhanced monitoring of the state of conservation of sites "post-inscription", had requested the Centre to develop Framework Co-operation Agreements between overseas development agencies and UNESCO for close co-operation at the planning stage of major works and for these agencies to request the aid or loan recipient country to obtain "no objection certificates" from the Committee prior to finalisation of the loan or aid agreement.

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

### Tentative Lists

**V.1** The Chairperson informed the Bureau that all cultural and mixed sites under consideration are included on the Tentative Lists of the States Parties concerned.

### Nominations

**V.2** The Bureau examined a total of 77 nominations, of which 12 are natural, two extensions to natural sites, four mixed properties, 56 cultural nominations and three extensions to cultural sites received for review by IUCN and ICOMOS. It also studied one nomination of a natural property inscribed on the World Heritage List to include additional criteria.

**V.3** Concerning natural heritage, the Centre informed the Bureau that Italy has withdrawn the **National Park of the Abruzzo** via letter of 19 June 2000 and that the Russian Federation requested that the examination of the **Lena River Delta** be postponed. IUCN informed the Bureau that the evaluation missions for the Lena Delta (Russian Federation) and **Shey Phoksundo National Park** (Nepal) will be carried out later this year and reports will be provided to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the World Heritage Bureau.

**V.4** At the request of the States Parties, the Bureau did not examine the following cultural nominations:

**City of La Plata, Foundational Urban Plan (Argentina)**  
**Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile)**

**Historic Centre of Santa Fe de Bogotá (Colombia)**

**The Old Town of Corfu (Greece)**

**Historic Centre of Santarém (Portugal)**

**The Renaissance Monumental Ensembles of Úbeda and Baeza (Spain)**

### NATURAL HERITAGE

#### A. Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>Ischigualasto Provincial Park/ Talampaya National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>966</b>
State Party	<b>Argentina</b>
Criteria	<b>N (i)</b>

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe Ischigualasto Provincial Park and Talampaya National Park on the World Heritage List under natural *criterion (i)*. The site contains a complete sequence of fossiliferous continental sediments representing the entire Triassic Period (45 million years) of geological history. No other place in the world has a fossil record comparable to that of

Ischigualasto-Talampaya which reveals the evolution of vertebrate life and the nature of palaeoenvironments in the Triassic Period.

The Bureau suggested that the State Party, along with the relevant Provincial authorities, proceeds as soon as possible with the establishment of a single co-operative management regime, including completion of an integrated management plan and provision of adequate human and financial resources to implement effective management.

The Delegate of Morocco, in supporting the nomination, pointed out that it is not only of importance in documenting the Triassic Period but also the history of plate tectonics. The Observer of Argentina noted that the decision is a strong incentive for the strengthening of the protection of the site.

Property	<b>Noel Kempff Mercado National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>967</b>
State Party	<b>Bolivia</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Noel Kempff Mercado National Park be inscribed on the World Heritage List under natural *criteria (ii) and (iv)*. The site contains an array of habitat types including evergreen rainforests, palm forests, cerrado, swamps, savannahs, gallery forests, and semi-deciduous dry forests. The cerrado habitats found on the Huanchaca Meseta have been isolated for millions of years providing an ideal living laboratory for the study of the evolution of these ecosystems. The site also contains a high diversity of plant and animal species including viable populations of many globally threatened large vertebrates.

The Bureau recommended that the State Party consider exploring opportunities for transboundary co-operation with Brazil to enhance management and protection of this area.

Property	<b>Jaú National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>998</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that Jaú National Park be inscribed on the World Heritage List under natural *criteria (ii) and (iv)*. The site protects a large and representative sample of the Amazon Central Plain Forest including the entire hydrological basin of the Jaú River. The site is important for biodiversity, protecting a large portion of the biodiversity associated with the Blackwater River system – one of the three types of lymnological systems associated with the Amazon basin. The site has a sufficient size to allow the maintenance of significant on-going ecological and biological processes, such as blow downs, changes in the river flood dynamics and natural burns, thus providing unique opportunities to study their effect on biodiversity in natural ecosystems.

The Bureau encouraged the State Party: to support the implementation of the project for a biological corridor (including JNP and Mamirauá and Amanã State

Sustainable Development Reserves); to acknowledge the efforts of Vitória Amazônica Foundation for the protection and management of this site, and to provide additional technical, human and financial resources to consolidate the management of JNP.

The Observer of Brazil informed the Bureau that a new law on protected areas that foresees a council for each of the protected areas, has been approved by the Congress.

Property	<b>Pantanal Conservation Complex</b>
Id. N°	<b>999</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii), (iii), (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Pantanal Conservation Complex be inscribed on the World Heritage List under natural *criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv)*. The site is representative of the Greater Pantanal region. It demonstrates the on-going ecological and biological processes that occur in the Pantanal. The association of the Amolar Mountains with the dominant freshwater wetland ecosystems confers to the site a uniquely important ecological gradient as well as a dramatic landscape. The site plays a key role in the dispersion of nutrients to the entire basin and is the most important reserve for maintaining fish stocks in the Pantanal. The area preserves habitats representative of the Pantanal that contain a number of globally threatened species. The area is a refuge for fauna as it is the only area of the Pantanal that remains partially inundated during the dry season.

The Bureau noted the support of the Interamerican Development Bank (IDB) and The Ecotrópica Foundation for the conservation of the Pantanal Conservation Complex and encouraged the State Party to provide technical and financial support to finalise and implement the integrated management plan and enhance the management capacity of this area.

Property	<b>Kinabalu Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>1012</b>
State Party	<b>Malaysia</b>
Criteria	<b>N(ii), (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that Kinabalu Park be inscribed on the World Heritage list under natural *criteria (ii) and (iv)*. The site has a diverse biota and high endemism. The altitudinal and climatic gradient from tropical forest to alpine conditions combine with precipitous topography, diverse geology and frequent climate oscillations to provide conditions ideal for the development of new species. The Park contains high biodiversity with representatives from more than half the families of all flowering plants. The majority of Borneo's mammals, birds, amphibians and invertebrates (many threatened and vulnerable) occur in the Park.

The Bureau encouraged the State Party to minimise impacts on the Park, as described by the IUCN evaluation, by carefully regulating activities in proximity to its borders.

Property	<b>Central Suriname Nature Reserve</b>
----------	--

Id. N°	<b>1017</b>
State Party	<b>Suriname</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii), (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Central Suriname Nature Reserve be inscribed on the World Heritage List under natural *criteria (ii) and (iv)*. The site encompasses significant vertical relief, topography and soil conditions that have resulted in a variety of ecosystems. This ecosystem variation allows organisms within these ecosystems to move in response to disturbance, adapt to change, and maintain gene flow between populations. The site's size, undisturbed state (in general a rare condition in Amazonian forest parks) and protection of the entire Coppename watershed will allow long-term functioning of the ecosystem. The site contains a high diversity of plant and animal species, many of which are endemic to the Guyana Shield and are globally threatened. This site would be the first Suriname site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegate of Zimbabwe noted that currently the area is not inhabited and asked whether IUCN had any view on the long term perspectives for such a region. IUCN informed the Bureau that the site is a pristine area, however there are potential threats from gold mining.

The Bureau encouraged the completion of the management plan for the Reserve and commended the State Party and its partners for establishing the US\$ 18 Million trust fund to support protection of the site, which could serve as a model for other sites.

#### **B. Properties which were referred back**

Property	<b>Gunung Mulu National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>1013</b>
State Party	<b>Malaysia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that Gunung Mulu National Park is considered by IUCN to meet natural *criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv)*. However, it decided that the nomination be referred back to the State Party for clarification of the following issues: (a) Progress with the gazetting process to incorporate the three extensions referred to in the nomination; (b) action to strengthen management capacity in the Park; (c) recognition of the need to minimise impacts of logging activities around the Park and the effect of clear-felling on cave swiftlet and bat populations; and (d) assurance that the new management plan addresses issues relating to local peoples' use of and benefits from the Park as well as the new contractual arrangements for management of the Park. The Bureau furthermore drew the attention of the State Party to the important buffer and corridor function of the adjacent protected forests in the Labi Hills in Brunei and noted that this country had not yet signed the Convention.

Property	<b>The Cape Floristic Region - Phase 1:</b>
----------	---

	<b>Cape Peninsula Protected Natural Environment</b>
Id. N°	<b>1007</b>
State Party	<b>South Africa</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that Phase 1 of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) is considered to meet natural *criteria (ii) and (iv)*. The Cape Floristic Region is of outstanding value for representing ongoing ecological and biological processes associated with the evolution of the unique Fynbos biome. The Bureau decided however, that the nomination be referred back to the State Party with the request that they expedite the work to ensure that the core area of the Cape Peninsula Protected Natural Environment is under one effective and consolidated management regime. The Bureau also encouraged the State Party to complete the preparatory work associated with Phase 2 of the CFR nomination and to submit this when the boundaries of the complementary areas within the CFR are finalised. It was noted that the area is also a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve.

The Observer of South Africa informed the Bureau that his Government concurs with the suggestions made and that the requirements concerning the consolidated management of the site will hopefully be met before the twenty-fourth extraordinary session.

#### **C. Properties which the Bureau decided to defer**

Property	<b>Fernando de Noronha Marine National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>1000</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	

IUCN informed the Bureau that the site had been nominated under all four natural criteria, but that the information provided was not sufficient to justify the nomination. The Bureau decided to defer the nomination to enable the State Party to provide additional information to support the case for inscription.

The Observer of Brazil informed the Bureau that his Government intends to present a revised nomination for a larger area.

#### **D. Properties which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>Kopacki rit</b>
Id. N°	<b>964</b>
State Party	<b>Croatia</b>
Criteria	

IUCN informed the Bureau that Kopacki rit is an important site at the European scale and very significant within the Danube Basin as a whole. Nonetheless it does not meet the criteria set by the World Heritage Convention. Moreover, a number of important integrity questions remain unresolved.

The Delegate of Hungary informed the Bureau that the site

borders a protected area in his country, which may be considered for nomination and suggested to defer the present nomination to allow transboundary consultations. After a debate during which the comparative analysis undertaken was highlighted, the Bureau decided not to recommend the inscription of this site. The Bureau, however, commended the State Party for conservation work undertaken in recent years.

**E. Deferred nominations for which additional information has been received**

Property	<b>The High Coast</b>
Id. N°	<b>898</b>
State Party	<b>Sweden</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that the nomination was deferred by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau (November 1999). Better documentation of the values of the marine portion of the area to provide a more complete comparative analysis including, the relation to the proposed Quark World Heritage nomination and integrity issues, was requested. IUCN suggested that the Swedish High Coast be considered in 2001 and that further information be provided in relation to the potential for a transboundary nomination between Sweden and Finland.

The Delegate of Finland pointed out that the nomination needs to be considered on its own, as the Quark area requires consideration at the national level by both Finland and Sweden. After an extensive discussion, the Bureau decided that - as the technical information had been provided by the State Party - the site be considered by the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

**F. Extension of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>Plitvice Lakes National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>98 bis</b>
State Party	<b>Croatia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau recommended the Committee to approve the extension of Plitvice Lakes National Park site by the nominated area of 10,020 ha as this would contribute to the integrity of the site. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to prepare a new management plan for the enlarged site.

Property	<b>Caves of the Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst (Extension to include the Dobšinská Ice Cave (Slovakia))</b>
Id. N°	<b>N725-858 bis</b>
State Party	<b>Hungary / Slovakia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that Dobšinská Ice Cave be incorporated as part of the Caves of the Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst World Heritage

site. Although this ice cave is a relatively small (6km<sup>2</sup>) and specialised feature, it does add variety to the existing site. It would not merit inscription on its own but its features relate to and complement the Caves of Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst. The Bureau encouraged both State Parties to regulate activities in the adjacent watershed which may affect the integrity of the Caves of the Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst World Heritage site.

**G. Renomination of a property inscribed on the World Heritage List to include additional criteria**

Property	<b>Ha Long Bay</b>
Id. N°	<b>672 bis</b>
State Party	<b>Viet Nam</b>
Criteria	<b>N (i)(iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that Ha Long Bay be inscribed on the World Heritage List under natural *criterion (i)* in addition to the site's existing 1994 listing under *criterion (iii)*. The site is the most extensive and best known example of marine invaded tower karst and one of the most important areas of fengcong and fenglin karst in the world. The size of the area provides sufficient integrity for these large scale geomorphic processes to operate unhindered.

The Bureau commended the Ha Long Bay Management Department on the improvement in management of the renominated area. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to expedite a programme to increase visitor understanding of cave and karst geomorphological processes and to improve staff capacity in these areas.

**MIXED PROPERTIES**

**A. Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands)</b>
Id. N°	<b>908</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	<b>N (i)</b>

The Bureau recalled that at its last session it had not recommended that this property be inscribed under cultural criteria and had referred the nomination under natural criteria back to the State Party to allow it to provide additional information.

In the light of the additional information provided and IUCN's favourable assessment of it, the Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Aeolian Islands be inscribed on the World Heritage List under natural *criterion (i)*. The volcanic landforms of the site represent classic features in the continuing study of volcanology worldwide. With their scientific study from at least the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, the islands have provided two of the types of eruptions (Vulcanian and Strombolian) to volcanology and geology textbooks and so have featured prominently in the education of all geoscientists for over 200 years. They

continue to provide a rich field for volcanological studies of on-going geological processes in the development of landforms.

The Bureau noted that the State Party has adequately responded to the issues raised at its twenty-third session. The Bureau commended the State Party for further strengthening the nomination by simplifying the boundaries of the nominated area and creating a clear surrounding buffer zone. The Bureau also commended the State Party for establishing a co-ordinated management structure and initiating a separate management plan for the nominated area. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to expedite the completion of the separate management plan and the process of legalizing the nominated area boundaries.

Property	<b>Drakensberg Park alternatively known as oKhahlamba Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>985</b>
State Party	<b>South Africa</b>
Criteria	<b>N(iii)(iv) C (i)(iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Drakensberg Park, alternatively known as the oKhahlamba Park, be inscribed on the World Heritage List under *natural criteria (iii) and (iv)*. The site has exceptional natural beauty with soaring basaltic buttresses, incisive dramatic cutbacks and golden sandstone ramparts. Rolling high altitude grasslands, the pristine steep-sided river valleys and rocky gorges also contribute to the beauty of the site. The site's diversity of habitats protects a high level of endemic and globally threatened species, especially of birds and plants.

The Bureau encouraged the State Party to consider the following: the overall integrated Master Plan for the site be completed as quickly as possible and that it give priority to the management of fire and invasive species as well as visitor management; the stated intention to work towards establishing additional conservation areas to give continuity to the site along the escarpment be pursued; efforts to establish the Drakensberg-Maloti Transfrontier Protected Area be strengthened, and consideration be given to a transboundary extension to the World Heritage site, should Lesotho become a State Party to the World Heritage Convention; and that efforts to establish a Special Case Area Plan covering the Drakensberg and adjoining areas be continued.

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *cultural criteria (i) and (iii)*:

*Criterion (i):* The rock art of the Drakensberg is the largest and most concentrated group of rock paintings in Africa South of the Sahara and is outstanding both in quality and diversity of subject.

*Criterion (iii):* The San people lived in the mountainous Drakensberg area for more than four millennia, leaving behind them a corpus of outstanding rock art which throws much light on

their way of life and their beliefs.

The Delegate of Greece recalled the need to have a cultural information service at the site.

The Observer of South Africa informed the Bureau that the recommendations will be addressed and that transfrontier co-operation with Lesotho already exists for this area.

## B. Properties which were referred back

Property	<b>Greater Blue Mountains Area</b>
Id. N°	<b>917</b>
State Party	<b>Australia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau recalled that at its twenty-third session (July 1999), it had recommended deferral for the natural part of this mixed nomination and invited the Australian authorities to consider the possibility of a serial nomination to cover the full range of values of eucalyptus ecosystems. It had also noted that although nationally important, it is not considered on its own to be a significant representation of eucalyptus-dominated vegetation on a global scale. The Bureau at the time did not recommend inscription according to cultural values.

IUCN informed the Bureau that a thorough evaluation of the additional material presented by Australia took place and that the main feature of the nomination is the eucalyptus vegetation. The additional material did not address the question of a serial nomination to cover the full range of values of eucalyptus ecosystems. The Delegate of Australia informed the Bureau that out of 700 Eucalypt species, 696 are represented in Australia and that 91 are present at the site, which covers 1 million ha.

The Bureau debated extensively on the need to recognize eucalyptus ecosystems on a global scale, on serial nominations and on the links between universality and representativity.

The Chairperson informed the Bureau that he had received a letter dated 30 June 2000 with new information from the State Party which would commence a process for the identification, evaluation and potential listing under new national heritage legislation of a series of areas representing the eucalyptus theme.

IUCN welcomed the willingness of the State Party to consider a serial listing under context of the State Party's new legislation and asked for more specific details concerning the new information the State Party has committed itself to provide on the make up of such a serial listing.

The Bureau decided to refer the nomination to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the World Heritage Bureau.

Property	<b>Mount Qincheng and the Dujiangyan Irrigation System China</b>
Id. N°	<b>1001</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that Mt Qincheng is considered to meet *natural criteria (ii) and (iv)*. However, it decided that the nomination be referred back to the State Party for clarification of the following matters relating to the integrity of the site: the management regime in the buffer zone; the completion of the Overall Plan for the management of Longxi-Hongkou Nature Reserve, and a commitment made to its early implementation; the inclusion within the plan of arrangements to deal with long term funding, the development of adequate trained staff, satisfactory controls over tourism development and activities, and programmes for monitoring, research, education and public awareness. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to consider: (a) the merits of enlarging the site to include other Giant Panda areas, such as Wolong Nature Reserve physically linked to the site; and (b) initiating a wider review of the potential which exists in China for other natural World Heritage sites with consideration for a workshop focusing on sites of biodiversity value.

Concerning cultural values, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *cultural criteria (ii), (iv), and (vi)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: The Dujiangyan Irrigation System, begun in the 2nd century BC, is a major landmark in the development of water management and technology, and is still discharging its functions perfectly.

*Criterion (iv)*: The immense advances in science and technology achieved in ancient China are graphically illustrated by the Dujiangyan Irrigation System.

*Criterion (vi)*: The Temples of Mount Qincheng are closely associated with the foundation of Taoism, one of the most influential religions of Asia over a long period of history.

There was a short discussion about the outstanding universal value of the site from a religious point of view. The Bureau noted that the site should be considered as crucial for the birth of Taoism.

The Observer of China informed the Bureau that additional material would be provided on the natural aspects to the Secretariat.

Property	<b>Curonian Spit</b>
Id. N°	<b>994</b>
State Party	<b>Lithuania/Russian Federation</b>
Criteria	

IUCN informed the Bureau that the Curonian Spit is an important site at the European scale and very significant within the Baltic Region as a whole. However, it was not considered to meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List as a natural property. The Bureau decided not to recommend inscription under natural criteria. Concerning the site as a possible cultural landscape, IUCN informed the Bureau that the integrity of the site's natural values needs to be addressed, particularly in the areas of improved transfrontier co-operation, as well as better planning for increased tourism and securing sustainable resources. The Bureau commended the States Parties for the co-operation they have achieved to date in improving the conservation of the site.

The Bureau decided that the Curonian Spit be referred back to allow the States Parties to take active steps towards collaborative management mechanisms and to harmonize the management plans. The site could fulfil *cultural criterion (v)* as an outstanding example of a landscape of sand dunes that is under constant threat from natural forces. After disastrous human interventions that menaced its survival, the Spit was reclaimed through massive protection and stabilization works, begun in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, still continue to the present day.

The Observer of Lithuania pointed out that the necessary documents would be provided in time and noted the excellent co-operation between the two States Parties. She informed the Bureau that the site is a fragile ecosystem and was damaged by the storm last year. She stated that, if inscribed, this would be the first cultural landscape site from her country.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

### A. Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>Jesuit Block and Estancias of Córdoba</b>
Id. N°	<b>995</b>
State Party	<b>Argentina</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it had received additional documentation from the State Party in response to its recommendations and that it could now recommend inscription. Taking into consideration the new information, the Bureau recommended to the Committee that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: The Jesuit buildings and ensembles of Córdoba and the estancias are exceptional examples of the fusion of European and indigenous values and cultures during a seminal period in South America.

*Criterion (iv):* The religious, social, and economic experiment carried out in South America for over 150 years by the Society of Jesus produced a unique form of material expression, which is illustrated by the Jesuit buildings and ensembles of Córdoba and the estancias.

Property	<b>The Monastery of Geghard and the Upper Azat Valley</b>
Id. N°	<b>960</b>
State Party	<b>Armenia</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criterion (ii)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The Monastery of Geghard, with its remarkable rock-cut churches and tombs, is an exceptionally well preserved and complete example of medieval Armenian monastic architecture and decorative art, with many innovatory features which had a profound influence on subsequent developments in the region.

Property	<b>The Wachau Cultural Landscape (the Wachau Region including the Abbeys of Melk and Göttweig and the Historic Centre of Krems)</b>
Id. N°	<b>970</b>
State Party	<b>Austria</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The Wachau is an outstanding example of a riverine landscape bordered by mountains in which material evidence of its long historical evolution has survived to a remarkable degree.

*Criterion (iv):* The architecture, the human settlements, and the agricultural use of the land in the Wachau vividly illustrate a basically medieval landscape that has evolved organically and harmoniously over time.

Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that the State Party establish a Coordinating Commission for the management of this site. The Observer of Austria informed the Bureau that the Coordinating Commission has been established and that a written report will be sent to the Secretariat.

Property	<b>The Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower</b>
Id. N°	<b>958</b>
State Party	<b>Azerbaijan</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the site be inscribed on the World Heritage List, subject to the State Party giving assurances of the further development of the conservation management and monitoring structures for the City before 1 October 2000. The State Party's response should be examined by the Bureau at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session. The Bureau should then be able to recommend inscription on the basis of *criterion (iv)*:

*Criterion (iv):* The Walled City of Baku represents an outstanding and rare example of a historic urban ensemble and architecture with influence from Zoroastrian, Sassanian, Arabic, Persian, Shirvani, Ottoman, and Russian cultures.

Property	<b>The Mir Castle Complex</b>
Id. N°	<b>625</b>
State Party	<b>Belarus</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*.

*Criterion (ii):* Mir Castle is an exceptional example of a central European castle, reflecting in its design and layout successive cultural influences (Gothic, Renaissance and Baroque) that blend harmoniously to create an impressive monument to the history of this region.

*Criterion (iv):* The region in which Mir Castle stands has a long history of political and cultural confrontation and coalescence, which is graphically reflected in the form and appearance of the ensemble.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Brugge</b>
Id. N°	<b>996</b>
State Party	<b>Belgium</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the site be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iv), and (vi)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The Historic Town of Brugge is testimony, over a long period, of a considerable exchange of influences on the development of architecture, particularly in brick Gothic, as well as favouring innovative artistic influences in the development of medieval painting, being the birthplace of the school of the Flemish Primitives.

*Criterion (iv):* The Historic Town of Brugge is an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble, illustrating significant stages in the commercial and cultural fields in medieval Europe, of which the public, social, and religious institutions are a living testimony.

*Criterion (vi):* The Town of Brugge has been the birthplace of the Flemish Primitives and a centre of patronage and development of painting in the Middle Ages with artists such as Jan van Eyck and Hans Memling.

Property	<b>The Major Town Houses of the Architect Victor Horta</b>
Id. N°	<b>1005</b>
State Party	<b>Belgium</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (i):* The "Town Houses" of Victor Horta in Brussels are works of human creative genius, representing the highest expression of the influential *Art Nouveau* style in art and architecture.

*Criterion (ii):* The appearance of *Art Nouveau* in the closing years of the 19th century marked a decisive stage in the evolution of architecture, making possible subsequent developments, and the "Town Houses" of Victor Horta in Brussels bear exceptional witness to its radical new approach.

*Criterion (iv):* The "Town Houses" of Victor Horta are outstanding examples of *Art Nouveau* architecture, brilliantly illustrating the transition from the 19<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> century in art, thought, and society.

Property	<b>Archaeological Site of the Neolithic Flint Mines at Spiennes, Mons</b>
Id. N°	<b>1006</b>
State Party	<b>Belgium</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (i):* The Neolithic flint mines at Spiennes provide exceptional testimony to early human inventiveness and application.

*Criterion (iii):* The arrival of the Neolithic cultures marked a major milestone in human cultural and technological development, which is vividly illustrated by the vast complex of ancient flint mines at Spiennes.

*Criterion (iv):* The flint mines at Spiennes are outstanding examples of the Neolithic mining of flint, which marked a seminal stage of human technological and cultural progress.

Property	<b>Notre-Dame Cathedral in Tournai</b>
Id. N°	<b>1009</b>
State Party	<b>Belgium</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The Cathedral of Notre-Dame in Tournai bears witness to a considerable exchange of influence between the architecture of the Ile de France, the Rhineland, and Normandy during the short period at the beginning of the 12th century that preceded the flowering of Gothic architecture.

*Criterion (iv):* In its imposing dimensions, the Cathedral of Notre-Dame in Tournai is an outstanding example of the great edifices of the school of the north of the Seine, precursors of the vastness of the Gothic cathedrals.

Property	<b>Tiwanaku: spiritual centre of the Tiwanaku Culture</b>
Id. N°	<b>567rev</b>
State Party	<b>Bolivia</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (iii):* The ruins of Tiwanaku bear striking witness to the power of the empire that played a leading role in the development of the Andean Prehispanic civilisation.

*Criterion (iv):* The buildings of Tiwanaku are exceptional examples of the ceremonial and public architecture and art of one of the most important manifestations of the civilisations of the Andean region.

The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a progress report on the implementation of the Master Plan to the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session in June 2001. The State Party requested that the name of the property be changed to "*Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture*".

Property	<b>Churches of Chiloé</b>
Id. N°	<b>971</b>
State Party	<b>Chile</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii)</b>

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it had received additional information from the State Party in answer to questions about the definition of buffer zones and standards of control within these areas, as well as on the legal protection of all churches. It was of the opinion that it could now recommend inscription of the property. Considering this new information the Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iii)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: The Churches of Chiloé are outstanding examples of the successful fusion of European and indigenous cultural traditions to produce a unique form of wooden architecture.

*Criterion (iii)*: The *mestizo* culture resulting from Jesuit missionary activities in the 17th and 18th centuries has survived intact in the Chiloé archipelago, and achieves its highest expression in the outstanding wooden churches.

The Bureau decided that the detailed comments in the report of the ICOMOS expert mission should be made available to the State Party.

Property	<b>Ancient Villages in Southern Anhui - Xidi and Hongcun</b>
Id. N°	<b>1002</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv) (v)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii), (iv), and (v)*:

*Criterion (iii)*: The villages of Xidi and Hongcun are graphic illustrations of a type of human settlement created during a feudal period and based on a prosperous trading economy.

*Criterion (iv)*: In their buildings and their street patterns, the two villages of southern Anhui reflect the socio-economic structure of a long-lived settled period of Chinese history.

*Criterion (v)*: The traditional non-urban settlements of China, which have to a very large extent disappeared during the past century, are exceptionally well preserved in the villages of Xidi and Hongcun.

ICOMOS recommended that the State Party consider the nomination of other well-protected vernacular villages in China, emphasizing the importance of such architectural ensembles.

Property	<b>Longmen Grottoes</b>
Id. N°	<b>1003</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), and (iii)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The sculptures of the Longmen Grottoes are an outstanding manifestation of human artistic creativity.

*Criterion (ii)*: The Longmen Grottoes illustrate the perfection of a long-established art form that was to play a highly significant role in the cultural evolution of this region of Asia.

*Criterion (iii)*: The high cultural level and sophisticated society of Tang Dynasty China is encapsulated in the exceptional stone carvings of the Longmen Grottoes.

Property	<b>Imperial Tombs of the Ming and Qing Dynasties</b>
Id. N°	<b>1004</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) and (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The harmonious integration of remarkable architectural groups in a natural environment chosen to meet the criteria of geomancy (*Fengshui*) makes the Ming and Qing Imperial Tombs masterpieces of human creative genius.

*Criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv)*: The imperial mausolea are outstanding testimony to a cultural and architectural tradition that for over five hundred years dominated this part of the world; by reason of their integration into the natural environment, they make up a unique ensemble of cultural landscapes.

*Criterion (vi)*: The Ming and Qing Tombs are dazzling illustrations of the beliefs, worldview, and geomantic theories of *Fengshui* prevalent in feudal China. They have served as burial edifices for illustrious personages and as the theatre for major events that have marked the history of China.

ICOMOS recommended a possible extension to cover other well-protected tombs of the Ming Dynasty in China.

Property	<b>Coffee Plantation Culture from the Southeastern part of Cuba</b>
Id. N°	<b>1008</b>
State Party	<b>Cuba</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv)</b>

ICOMOS commended the State Party for this imaginative nomination and informed the Bureau that the requested additional information concerning the definition of the nominated area had been received and that the name of the property was changed to “*Archaeological Landscape of the First Coffee Plantations in the Southeast of Cuba*” as suggested. The Bureau recommended to the Committee the inscription of the property on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (iii)*: The remains of the 19th- and early 20th-century coffee plantations in eastern Cuba are unique and eloquent testimony to a form of agricultural exploitation of virgin forest, the traces of which have disappeared elsewhere in the world.

*Criterion (iv)*: The production of coffee in eastern Cuba during the 19th and early 20th centuries resulted in the creation of a unique cultural landscape, illustrating a significant stage in the development of this form of agriculture.

Property	<b>Honorary Holy Trinity Column in Olomouc</b>
Id. N°	<b>859 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Czech Republic</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The Olomouc Holy Trinity Column is one of the most exceptional examples of the apogee of central European Baroque artistic expression.

*Criterion (iv)*: The Holy Trinity Column constituted a unique material demonstration of religious faith in central Europe during the Baroque period, and the Olomouc example represents its most outstanding expression.

Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that the name of the site be changed to “*The Holy Trinity Column in Olomouc*”.

Property	<b>Kronborg Castle</b>
Id. N°	<b>696 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Denmark</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iv)*:

*Criterion (iv)*: Kronborg Castle is an outstanding example of the Renaissance castle, and one that played a highly significant role in the history of this region of northern Europe.

Property	<b>Monastic Island of Reichenau in Lake Constance (Klosterinsel Reichenau im Bodensee)</b>
Id. N°	<b>974</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi)*:

*Criterion (iii)*: The remains of the Reichenau foundation bear outstanding witness to the religious and cultural role of a great Benedictine monastery in the early Middle Ages.

*Criterion (iv)*: The Churches on the island of Reichenau retain remarkable elements of several stages of construction and thus offer outstanding examples of monastic architecture in Central Europe from the 9th to the 11th century.

*Criterion (vi)*: The Monastery of Reichenau was a highly significant artistic centre of great significance to the history of art in Europe in the 10th and 11th centuries, as is superbly illustrated by its monumental wall paintings and its illuminations.

The Bureau asked ICOMOS to take note of the observations made by the Delegate of Greece concerning examples of similar monasteries mentioned in the comparative analysis.

Property	<b>Gartenreich Dessau-Wörlitz (The Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz, cultural landscape of Dessau-Wörlitz)</b>
Id. N°	<b>534 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: The Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz is an outstanding example of the application of the philosophical principles of the Age of the Enlightenment to the design of a landscape that integrates art, education, and economy in a harmonious whole.

*Criterion (iv)*: The 18th century was a seminal period for landscape design, of which the Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz is an exceptional and wide-ranging illustration.

Furthermore, the Bureau requested the State Party to confirm that the 107 road will be re-routed within three years from inscription and that an environmental study of the motorway will be carried out with the minimum delay.

Property	<b>The Historic Centre of Assisi and the Basilica of San Francesco</b>
Id. N°	<b>990</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the site be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi)*:

*Criterion (i)*: Assisi represents an ensemble of masterpieces of human creative genius such as the Basilica of San Francesco, which have made deep fundamental reference for art history in Europe and in the world.

*Criterion (ii)*: The interchange of artistic and spiritual message of the Franciscan Order has significantly contributed to developments in art and architecture in the world.

*Criterion (iii)*: Assisi represents a unique example of continuity of a city-sanctuary within its environmental setting from its Umbrian-Roman and medieval origins to the present, represented in the cultural landscape, the religious ensembles, systems of communication, and traditional land-use.

*Criterion (iv)*: The Basilica of San Francesco is an outstanding example of a type of architectural ensemble that has significantly influenced the development of art and architecture.

*Criterion (vi)*: Being the birthplace of the Franciscan Order, Assisi has from the Middle Ages been closely associated with the cult and diffusion of the Franciscan movement in the world, focusing on the universal message of peace and tolerance even to other religions or beliefs.

Furthermore the Bureau recommended that the name of the nominated property be changed to "*Assisi, the Basilica of San Francesco and other Franciscan sites*".

Property	<b>City of Verona</b>
Id. N°	<b>797 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: In its urban structure and its architecture, Verona is an outstanding example of

a town that has developed progressively and uninterruptedly over two thousand years, incorporating artistic elements of the highest quality from each succeeding period.

*Criterion (iv)*: Verona represents in an exceptional way the concept of the fortified town at several seminal stages of European history.

Property	<b>Gusuku Sites and Related Properties of the Kingdom of Ryukyu</b>
Id. N°	<b>972</b>
State Party	<b>Japan</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii) and (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii), and (vi)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: For several centuries the Ryukyu Islands served as a centre of economic and cultural interchange between south-east Asia, China, Korea, and Japan, and this is vividly demonstrated by the surviving monuments.

*Criterion (iii)*: The culture of the Ryukyuan Kingdom evolved and flourished in a special political and economic environment, which gave its culture a unique quality.

*Criterion (vi)*: The Ryukyu sacred sites constitute an exceptional example of an indigenous form of nature and ancestor worship that has survived intact into the modern age alongside other established world religions.

Property	<b>Kyongju Historic Areas</b>
Id. N°	<b>976</b>
State Party	<b>Republic of Korea</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) and (iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iii)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: The Kyongju Historic Areas contain a number of sites and monuments of exceptional significance in the development of Buddhist and secular architecture in Korea.

*Criterion (iii)*: The Korean peninsula was ruled for nearly a thousand years by the Shilla Dynasty, and the sites and monuments in and around Kyongju (including the Holy Mountain of Namsan) bear outstanding testimony to its cultural achievements.

The Bureau, however, requested the State Party to consider the eventual removal of the railway line in the Wolsong Belt.

Property	<b>Koch'ang, Hwasun, and Kanghwa Dolmen Sites</b>
Id. N°	<b>977</b>
State Party	<b>Republic of Korea</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *critera (iii)*:

*Criterion (iii)*: The global prehistoric technological and social phenomenon that resulted in the appearance in the 2nd and 3rd millennia BCE of funerary and ritual monuments constructed of large stones (the “Megalithic Culture”) is nowhere more vividly illustrated than in the dolmen cemeteries of Koch’ang, Hwasun, and Kangwha.

The Delegate of Morocco requested the clarification of whether or not the site should be inscribed as a cultural landscape. ICOMOS responded that the property was not submitted as a cultural landscape nomination but it should certainly be considered as such.

Property	<b>Rietveld Schröderhuis (Rietveld Schröder House)</b>
Id. N°	<b>965</b>
State Party	<b>Netherlands</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *critera (i), (ii) and (vi)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The Rietveld Schröderhuis in Utrecht is an icon of the modern movement in architecture and an outstanding expression of human creative genius in its purity of ideas and concepts as developed by the *De Stijl* movement.

*Criterion (ii)*: With its radical approach to design and the use of space, the Rietveld Schröderhuis occupies a seminal position in the development of architecture in the modern age.

*Criterion (vi)*: The Rietveld Schröderhuis is a manifesto of the ideas and concepts of the *De Stijl*, one of the most influential movements in the Modern Movement in art and architecture.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Arequipa</b>
Id. N°	<b>1016</b>
State Party	<b>Peru</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the site be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *critera (i) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The ornamented architecture in the Historic Centre of Arequipa represents a masterpiece

of the creative integration of European and native characteristics, crucial for the cultural expression of the entire region.

*Criterion (iv)*: The Historic Centre of Arequipa is an outstanding example of a colonial settlement, challenged by the natural conditions, the indigenous influences, the process of conquest and evangelisation, as well as the spectacular nature of its setting.

Property	<b>The Ensemble of Ferapontov Monastery</b>
Id. N°	<b>982</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *critera (i) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The wall paintings of Dionisy in the Cathedral of the Nativity of the Virgin at Ferrapontov Monastery are the highest expression of Russian mural art in the 15th-16th centuries.

*Criterion (iv)*: The complex of Ferrapontov Monastery is the purest and most complete example of an Orthodox monastic community from the 15th-17th centuries, a crucial period in the cultural and spiritual development of Russia.

Property	<b>Historic and Architectural Complex of the Kazan Kremlin</b>
Id. N°	<b>980</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *critera (ii), (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: The Kazan Kremlin complex represents exceptional testimony of historical continuity and cultural diversity over a long period of time, resulting in an important interchange of values generated by the different cultures.

*Criterion (iii)*: The historic citadel represents an exceptional testimony of the Khanate period and is the only surviving Tatar fortress with traces of the original town-planning conception.

*Criterion (iv)*: The site and its key monuments represent an outstanding example of a synthesis of Tatar and Russian influences in architecture, integrating different cultures (Bulgar, Golden Horde, Tatar, Italian, and Russian), as well as showing the impact of Islam and Christianity.

Property	<b>Bardejov Town Conservation Reserve</b>
Id. N°	<b>973</b>
State Party	<b>Slovakia</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (iii)*: The fortified town of Bardejov provides exceptionally well preserved evidence of the economic and social structure of trading towns in medieval Central Europe.

*Criterion (iv)*: The plan, buildings, and fortifications of Bardejov illustrate the urban complex that developed in Central Europe in the Middle Ages at major points along the great trade routes of the period.

Property	<b>The Roman Walls of Lugo</b>
Id. N°	<b>987</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *riterion (iv)*:

*Criterion (iv)*: The Roman walls of Lugo are the finest surviving example of late Roman military fortifications.

Property	<b>The Palmeral of Elche: A Cultural Landscape Inherited from Al-Andalus</b>
Id. N°	<b>930</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (v)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (v)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: The Palmeral (palm groves) of Elche represent a remarkable example of the transference of a characteristic landscape from one culture and continent to another, in this case from North Africa to Europe.

*Criterion (v)*: The palm grove or garden is a typical feature of the North African landscape which was brought to Europe during the Islamic occupation of much of the Iberian peninsula and has survived to the present day. The ancient irrigation system, which is still functioning, is of special interest.

Property	<b>The Archaeological Ensemble of Tàrraco</b>
Id. N°	<b>875 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iii)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: The Roman remains of Tàrraco are of exceptional importance in the development of Roman urban planning and design and served as the model for provincial capitals elsewhere in the Roman world.

*Criterion (iii)*: Tàrraco provides eloquent and unparalleled testimony to a significant stage in the history of the Mediterranean lands in antiquity.

Property	<b>Södra Ölands Odlingslandskap (The Agricultural Landscape of Southern Öland)</b>
Id. N°	<b>968</b>
State Party	<b>Sweden</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iv) (v)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iv) and (v)*:

*Criterion (iv)*: The landscape of Southern Öland takes its contemporary form from its long cultural history, adapting to the physical constraints of the geology and topography

*Criterion (v)*: Södra Öland is an outstanding example of human settlement, making the optimum use of diverse landscape types on a single island.

Property	<b>Three Castles, Defensive Wall and Ramparts of the Market-town of Bellinzona</b>
Id. N°	<b>884</b>
State Party	<b>Switzerland</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session decided that this nomination would be submitted to its twenty-fourth session. As requested by the Bureau, the Chairperson of the Committee and the Director of the Centre undertook a mission to Bellinzona on 25 and 26 May 2000. The report of this mission was made available to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, while recognising the national and regional significance of the site, it still had reservations about its outstanding universal value. As to the issue of authenticity, ICOMOS said that it had reviewed documentation submitted by the Swiss

authorities on the pre- and post restoration situation and that it had concluded that its concerns about the authenticity of the castles were limited to a proportionally not too great part.

The Chairperson expressed his regret that, contrary to the decision of the Bureau, ICOMOS had not undertaken a new mission to the site. He provided an oral report on his mission with the Director and expressed the view that recent modern interventions are within the mountain on which one of the castles is built and that they do not touch the monument itself and that only a very small part of the site is affected by the adaptation for use as an exhibition space. He regretted that no reference to this mission report was made by the Representative of ICOMOS. He also pointed out that the few slides presented did not give the right image of the site.

Upon the proposal of the Chairperson, the Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List. It requested ICOMOS to indicate the criteria for inscription to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

Property	<b>The Blaenavon Industrial Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>984</b>
State Party	<b>United Kingdom</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (iii):* The Blaenavon landscape constitutes an exceptional illustration in material form of the social and economic structure of 19th century industry.

*Criterion (iv):* The components of the Blaenavon Industrial Landscape together make up an outstanding and remarkably complete example of a 19th century industrial landscape.

Property	<b>The Stone Town of Zanzibar</b>
Id. N°	<b>173 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii) and (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that this site be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi)*

*Criterion (ii):* The Stone Town of Zanzibar is an outstanding material manifestation of cultural fusion and harmonization.

*Criterion (iii):* For many centuries there was intense seaborne trading activity between Asia and Africa, and this is illustrated in an exceptional manner by the architecture and urban structure of the Stone Town.

*Criterion (vi):* Zanzibar has great symbolic importance in the suppression of slavery, since it was one of the main slave-trading ports in East Africa and also the base from which its opponents such as David Livingstone conducted their campaign.

It was underlined that the site, a symbol of Swahili civilisation and traditions, had the appropriate legal protection. However, it is currently threatened by mass tourism.

**V.5** During the examination of the nominations of *The Major Town Houses of the Architect Victor Horta* (Belgium) and *Rietveld Schröderhuis (Rietveld Schröder House)* (Netherlands), some delegates raised the question of the justification of cultural criterion (i) proposed by ICOMOS for both of these two nominations. After a meeting attended by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, the Delegate of Greece, the Chairperson and a member of the staff of ICOMOS, the Director and a staff member of the World Heritage Centre, it was agreed that ICOMOS will prepare a new formulation of cultural criterion (i) which takes into account the exceptional artistic and architectural movement and will refer to the importance of its creator.

## **B. Properties which were referred back**

Property	<b>Echmiatsin and the Archaeological Site of Zvartnots</b>
Id. N°	<b>1011</b>
State Party	<b>Armenia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that the nomination be referred back to the State Party, asking for reconsideration of the project of the open-air Sanctuary. In the event of this information being supplied before 1 October 2000 and found acceptable, the Bureau recommended to the Committee that the property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iii)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The developments in ecclesiastical architecture represented in an outstanding manner by the churches at Echmiatsin and the archaeological site of Zvartnots had a profound influence on church design over a wide region.

*Criterion (iii):* The churches at Echmiatsin and the archaeological site of Zvartnots vividly depict both the spirituality and the innovatory artistic achievement of the Armenian Church from its foundation.

Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that the name of the nominated property should be changed to "*The Cathedral and Churches of Echmiatsin and the Archaeological Site of Zvartnots.*"

ICOMOS recommended that the State Party consider applying for technical assistance regarding the conservation and presentation of the Zvartnots archaeological site.

Property	<b>The Old City of Mostar</b>
Id. N°	<b>946</b>
State Party	<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>
Criteria	

In the light of new information provided on the implementation of the management plan of the site, the Bureau decided that the nomination be referred back and asked ICOMOS to undertake a second mission to the nominated property and to prepare a recommendation for the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

Property	<b>Cathedral of St James in Šibenik</b>
Id. N°	<b>963</b>
State Party	<b>Croatia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that the nomination be referred back to the State Party requesting a detailed plan of the perimeter of the buffer zone. In the event that the requested information is provided by 1 October 2000 and found to be satisfactory, the Bureau could recommend to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The structural characteristics of the Cathedral of St James in Šibenik make it a unique and outstanding building in which Gothic and Renaissance forms have been successfully blended.

*Criterion (ii)*: The Cathedral of St James is the fruitful outcome of considerable interchanges of influences between the three culturally different regions of Northern Italy, Dalmatia, and Tuscany in the 15th and 16th centuries. These interchanges created the conditions for unique and outstanding solutions to the technical and structural problems of constructing the cathedral vaulting and dome.

*Criterion (iv)*: The Cathedral of St James in Šibenik is a unique testimony to the transition from the Gothic to the Renaissance period in church architecture.

Property	<b>The Loire Valley between Maine and Sully-sur-Loire</b>
Id. N°	<b>933</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>
Criteria	

The Committee at its twenty-third session decided to defer the examination of this nomination to the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau. In response, the French authorities had submitted complementary documentation on this nomination.

ICOMOS recognised that the Loire Valley deserved to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. It noted, however, that further study was required of recently received information on the impact of certain works on the cultural

landscape. It recommended that the examination of the nomination be referred. The Chairperson informed that he had received a letter from a local association regarding the negative impact of the planned strengthening of sixty kilometres of dikes along the river and that this letter would be immediately transmitted to the French authorities with a request to report on the possible impact of this project on the values of the site.

IUCN informed the Bureau that, on the basis of the information available to IUCN, it had provided its advice to ICOMOS for consideration in the evaluation process. This advice was that the Loire Valley was considered to have the qualities to be inscribed on the World Heritage list but that the boundaries should be further revised to exclude the nuclear power station. IUCN did not see a nuclear power station as being associated with the 'traditional way of life' as the Operational Guidelines envisage for an organically evolved cultural landscape.

Subsequent to the presentation by the advisory bodies a discussion took place whether nuclear power plants or big industrial complexes could be accepted within the boundaries of World Heritage cultural landscapes, if they can be considered to be part of the *organically evolved landscape* concerned or if they are hostile to it. The possible value of the architectural design of nuclear power plants was also discussed as was the concept and definition of cultural landscapes in the context of the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegate of Finland referred to the questions that he had posed during the Committee meeting in Marrakesh. He thanked the French authorities for giving answers to each of his questions and considered that the additional information provided by the French authorities was sufficient and thus the inscription of the Loire Valley on the World Heritage List was justified.

The Observer of France requested that, whatever the decision of the Bureau, it must clearly state its position and provide clear indications to the State Party on how to proceed.

Considering that some members of the Bureau expressed reservations about the boundaries as proposed by the State Party, the Chairperson concluded that the nomination would have to be re-examined by the Bureau at its twenty-fourth extra-ordinary session. He called for a closed session of the members of the Bureau, ICOMOS and IUCN and the Secretariat in order to formulate recommendations to the State Party on how to proceed with this nomination.

Following the closed session of the Bureau, the Chairperson informed the plenary that the Bureau and the advisory bodies had agreed to request the State Party to exclude the nuclear power plant from the nominated area and therefore to submit a proposal with revised boundaries, in order to exclude the nuclear power plant, and to limit its visual or other impact on the area proposed for inscription. This revision should be submitted by 1 October 2000. The Chairperson concluded by stating that all participants had reiterated that they were convinced of the outstanding universal value of the site and that it was

necessary to come to a satisfactory solution for its inscription on the World Heritage List.

Property	<b>Cultural stratification in the Historic Centre of the City of Pécs</b>
Id. N°	<b>853 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Hungary</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that the nomination be referred back to enable ICOMOS to evaluate the revised nomination and to present a recommendation to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

Property	<b>Ruins of León Viejo</b>
Id. N°	<b>613 rev</b>
State Party	<b>Nicaragua</b>
Criteria	

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it had recently received additional documentation that should be formally examined. The advisory body was confident, however, that this documentation answered all outstanding questions. The Bureau, however, decided to refer the examination of this nomination to enable ICOMOS to prepare a revised recommendation to be presented to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau. Based on this revised recommendation, the Bureau could recommend to the Committee that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (iii)*: The ruined town of León Viejo provides exceptional testimony to the material culture of one of the earliest Spanish colonial settlements.

*Criterion (iv)*: The form and nature of early Spanish settlement in the New World, adapting European architectural and planning concepts to the material potential of another region, are uniquely preserved in the archaeological site of León Viejo.

The State Party underlined that all the required actions are currently being addressed.

Property	<b>Cultural Ensemble of Shisr, Khor Rori, al-Balid Archaeological Sites and the Wadi Dawkha Frankincense Park in the Dhofar Region</b>
Id. N°	<b>1010</b>
State Party	<b>Oman</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that this nomination be referred back to the State Party, requesting the preparation and presentation of a management plan. In the event that the plan is prepared by 1 October 2000 and found to be in conformity with the requirement of the Operational Guidelines, ICOMOS recommended that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*.

*Criterion (iii)*: The group of archaeological sites in Oman represent the production and distribution of Frankincense, one of the most important luxury articles of trade in the Old World in antiquity.

*Criterion (iv)*: The Oasis of Shisr and the entrepôts of Khor Rori and Al-Balid are outstanding examples of medieval fortified settlements in the Persian Gulf region.

Property	<b>The Bolgar Historical and Architectural Complex</b>
Id. N°	<b>981</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that this nomination be referred back to the State Party, requesting more detailed information about the reconstruction of the Great Minaret, confirmation that the industrial project has been definitively abandoned, and a more detailed comparative analysis. In the event that the requested information is provided by 1 October 2000 and found to be satisfactory, the Bureau recommended that this site be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii)*:

*Criterion (iii)*: Bolgar represents unique testimony to the history and culture of the Tatars and to the empires that they founded, in particular the empire of the Golden Horde.

Property	<b>The Catalan Romanesque Cultural Landscape of the Vall de Boí</b>
Id. N°	<b>988</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that the nomination be referred back to enable ICOMOS to evaluate the revised nomination and to present a recommendation to the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

Property	<b>Archaeological Site of the Sierra de Atapuerca, in the Municipalities of Atapuerca and Ibeas de Juarros (Burgos)</b>
Id. N°	<b>989</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that this nomination be referred back to the State Party, requesting the definition of a suitable buffer zone and the preparation of a tourism development plan. In the event that this information is provided before 1 October 2000 and found to be satisfactory, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (v)*:

*Criterion (iii)*: The earliest and most abundant evidence of humankind in Europe is to be found in the caves of the Sierra de Atapuerca.

*Criterion (v):* The fossil remains in the Sierra de Atapuerca constitute an exceptional reserve of information about the physical nature and the way of life of the earliest human communities in Europe.

Property	<b>Island of Saint-Louis</b>
Id. N°	<b>956</b>
State Party	<b>Senegal</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau recommended that this nomination be referred back to the State Party in order to provide, before 15 September 2000, guarantees for the establishment of on-site conservation structures with appropriate expertise and resources for its long-term conservation.

The Bureau recommended to enlarge the nominated area, so as to include the whole island of Saint-Louis.

*Criterion (ii):* The historic town of Saint Louis exhibits an important exchange of values and influences on the development of education and culture, architecture, craftsmanship, and services in a large part of West Africa.

*Criterion (iv):* The Island of Saint-Louis, a former capital of West Africa, is an outstanding example of a colonial city, characterized by its particular natural setting, and it illustrates the development of colonial government in this region.

Property	<b>The Historic Town of St George and Related Fortifications</b>
Id. N°	<b>983</b>
State Party	<b>United Kingdom</b>
Criteria	

ICOMOS reported that a draft management plan had been received and that it conformed to the overall requirements of the Operational Guidelines. The Bureau decided that this nomination be referred back to the State Party. In the event that the final management plan is provided by 1 October 2000 and evaluated positively by ICOMOS, the Bureau recommended that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (vi):

*Criterion (iv):* The Historic Town of St George with its related Fortifications is an outstanding example of a continuously occupied, fortified, colonial town dating from the early 17th century and the oldest English town in the New World.

*Criterion (vi):* St George represents the beginning of the English colonisation of the New World, a step in the European settlement of North America that has resulted in developments of outstanding universal significance.

The Bureau recommended that the name of the nominated property be revised to “*The Historic Town of St George and Related Fortifications, Bermuda.*”

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz</b>
Id. N°	<b>885</b>
State Party	<b>Uzbekistan</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau, at its twenty-third session in June 1999, decided that the nomination should be referred. The State Party was requested to furnish precise details of the area proposed for inscription, the limits of the buffer zone and the regulations governing its use, and further material relating to the merits of Shakhrisyabz in comparison with other central Asian cities.

At its extraordinary session in Marrakesh, the Bureau recommended the approval by the Committee of international assistance to support the national effort to improve the nomination of the Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz.

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that following a training assistance request approved by the Committee, a series of missions by expert trainers have been programmed, the first of which took place in April 2000. Upon receipt of the first draft revision of the nomination file and new maps, an ICOMOS-ICCROM endorsed expert is foreseen to undertake a mission in July-August to assist the authorities in finalizing the revision. The revised nomination file with supplementary information requested by the Bureau is expected to be submitted by the national authorities of Uzbekistan by 1 September 2000.

The Bureau decided to examine this nomination at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session in November 2000, subject to prior review by ICOMOS of the additional information due to be provided by the State Party.

Property	<b>Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas</b>
Id. N°	<b>986</b>
State Party	<b>Venezuela</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided to refer this nomination to give ICOMOS the time necessary to evaluate the additional documentation already received and, if needed, to request further information. In the event that satisfactory information on the open questions of management co-ordination and the Botanical Garden is received, the Bureau would recommend that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (i):* The Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas is a masterpiece of modern city planning, architecture and art, created by the Venezuelan architect, Carlos Raúl Villanueva and a group of distinguished avant-garde artists.

*Criterion (iv):* The Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas is an outstanding example of the coherent realization of the urban, architectural, and artistic ideals of the early 20th century. It constitutes an ingenious interpretation of the concepts and spaces of colonial traditions and an

example of an open and ventilated solution, appropriate for its tropical environment.

### C. Properties which the Bureau decided to defer

Property	<b>Historic Centre of the Town of Goiás</b>
Id. N°	<b>993</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that further consideration of this nomination be deferred, requesting the State Party to revise the nomination regarding the justification of the outstanding universal value and the definition of the nominated area.

Property	<b>Varazdin - Historic Nucleus and Old Town (the Castle)</b>
Id. N°	<b>957</b>
State Party	<b>Croatia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided to defer further consideration of this nomination and to await the completion of a comparative study of historic towns in Central Europe.

Property	<b>Historical Town-Planning Complex Tvrdá in Osijek</b>
Id. N°	<b>961</b>
State Party	<b>Croatia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided to defer further consideration of this nomination to await the completion of a comparative study of historic fortified towns in Central Europe.

Property	<b>The Cultural Industrial Landscape of the "Zollverein Mine"</b>
Id. N°	<b>975</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided to defer further consideration of this nomination, to enable the State Party to remove the Ferris wheel in the coking plant, to abandon the plans to build a new structure on top of the washing plant, and to prepare a comprehensive management plan for the industrial site, with a conservation plan based on the preparation of a detailed inventory.

### D. Properties which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>The Ancient Pula with the Amphitheatre</b>
Id. N°	<b>808 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Croatia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau did not recommend this property for inscription on the World Heritage List.

Property	<b>The Abava Valley</b>
Id. N°	<b>Latvia</b>
State Party	<b>997</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that the site is not of outstanding universal value and therefore it did not recommend that this property for inscription on the World Heritage List.

### E. Extension of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>The Monasteries of Haghpat and Sanahin</b>
Id. N°	<b>777 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Armenia</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve the extension of the inscribed property.

Property	<b>The Potala Palace and the Jokhang Temple Monastery</b>
Id. N°	<b>707 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (iv) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee the extension of the inscribed property of the Potala Palace to include the Jokhang Temple Monastery.

Property	<b>The Classical Gardens of Suzhou</b>
Id. N°	<b>813 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee the extension of the inscribed property of the Classical Gardens of Suzhou to include the *Canglang Pavilion*, the *Lion Forest Garden*, the *Garden of Cultivation*, the *Couple's Garden Retreat*, and the *Retreat and Reflection Garden*.

## VI. REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS

**VI.1** The Bureau examined item 6 of the agenda "Recommendations of the Working Groups on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, on the Representativity of the World Heritage List, on the Equitable Representation of the Committee, and the International Expert Meeting on the Operational Guidelines". The following documents were referenced:

### Working Documents

- WHC-2000/CONF.202/8 "Report of the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention"

- WHC-2000/CONF.202/9 " Report of the International Expert Meeting on the Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention"
- WHC-2000/CONF.202/10 and 10 Add. "Report of the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List"
- WHC-2000/CONF.202/11 "Report of the Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee"
- WHC-2000/CONF.202/16 "Collated recommendations of the Task Force on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List, the Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee and the International Expert Meeting on the revision of the *Operational Guidelines*"

#### Information Documents

- WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.10 "Synthesis Report of the Meeting on 'Cultural Landscapes: Concept and Implementation', Catania, Italy, 8-11 March 2000"
- WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.13 "Synthesis Report of the Expert Meeting on 'Authenticity and Integrity in the African Context,' Great Zimbabwe National Monument, Zimbabwe"

**VI.2** The Chairperson informed the Bureau that the Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/16 presented a summary table of the recommendations of the working groups and the international expert meeting on the revision of the Operational Guidelines. This table was prepared by Australia and adopted by the Chairperson and rapporteurs of the three groups and the expert meeting on Operational Guidelines during their meeting on 23 June during which they outlined the manner in which the Bureau should deal with the agenda item. The Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/16 serves as a guide for decision-making for the Bureau and should be used jointly with the reports of the groups and the expert meeting.

**VI.3** The Chairperson indicated that discussions would be in line with the themes indicated in the summary table of Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/16. He requested each of the Chairpersons of the four groups to present their report, spelling out their mandate, the composition of the group, the working methodology and the conclusions submitted to the Bureau.

**VI.4** After the presentation of the documents by the Chairpersons in the following order:

- WHC-2000/CONF.202/8: "Report of the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention": Chairperson Ms C. Cameron (Canada); Rapporteur Mr Kevin Keefe (Australia)
- WHC-2000/CONF.202/11: "Report of the Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee": Chairperson H.E. Ambassador Musitelli (France); Rapporteur Mr David Masek (Czech Republic)
- WHC-2000/CONF.202/10: "Report of the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage

List": Chairperson H.E. Ambassador Yai (Benin); Rapporteur H.E. Mr Matthew Peek (Australia)

- WHC-2000/CONF.202/9: "Report of the International Expert Meeting on the Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention": Chairperson Mr Christopher Young (U.K.); Rapporteur Ms Karen Kovacs (United States of America).

The Chairperson requested the members of the Bureau and the Observers to make general remarks. Many speakers emphasized the need to first of all examine priority issues of a practical nature recommended by the Task Force on the implementation of the Convention and which are shown in bold characters on the summary table of Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/16.

**VI.5** Following discussion, the Bureau members wished to know to whom would be entrusted the task of presenting the results of their discussions which, at the end of the Bureau session, should be addressed to the Committee and what form they should take. It was agreed that all the groups had completed their work. It was decided to entrust the Bureau with the responsibility during the special session in October 2000, with the assistance of individuals in their personal capacity (Recommendation 1.3.6 of the Task Force on Implementation of the Convention).

**VI.6** The discussion first dealt with priority issues of a practical order recommended by the Task Force for the implementation of the Convention; then the Bureau examined the themes contained in Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/16. This report presents issues upon which consensus had been reached and discussions which mainly dealt with the recommendations of the Groups on the representativity of the List and the Equitable Representation within the Committee. These agreed upon issues as well as the discussions are listed according to the headings and numerotation set out in Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/16. The priority issues identified by the Bureau are shown in bold characters. This presentation should permit the Bureau, during its special session in October, to carry out successfully their work which should result in the preparation of recommendations to be examined by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session (the reference codes are the same as Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/16 : OG = Operational Guidelines; ITF = Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention ; CANT = Recommendations of the International Expert Meeting for the revision of the Operational Guidelines ; RL = Recommendations of the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List and RC = Recommendations of the Working Group on the Equitable Representation of the World Heritage Committee).

## VI.7 COLLATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS OF THE BUREAU

### 1. STATUTORY MEETINGS

#### 1.1 General Assembly of States Parties

The Members of the Bureau discussed at length the proposal of holding the Committee meeting before the General Assembly. They considered that it would be difficult to organize and to ensure the presence of all members, especially those having small delegations at the General Conference. The Observer of Thailand and the Observer of Saint Lucia reminded the Bureau that the Committee meeting must take place after the General Assembly since its new members are elected at the General Assembly. It was finally agreed that the recommendation of the Bureau to hold the regular meeting of the Committee at the usual dates at UNESCO Headquarters in the year when the General Assembly meets. The Bureau noted, however, that the twenty-third session of the Committee had decided to hold its twenty-fourth session in Australia in 2000 and had been invited to hold its twenty-fifth session in Finland in 2001, its twenty-sixth session in Hungary in 2002 and its twenty-seventh session in China in 2003.

The Bureau also asked for legal clarification on the differential roles of the General Assembly of States Parties and the Committee. The Legal Adviser of UNESCO noted that there was a general legal principle of deferring to the plenary body which can deal with any questions related to the Convention. It was noted that the *World Heritage Convention* is different from many other international conventions in that all the substantive powers are designated to the Committee and not to the General Assembly. The Committee can transfer powers to the General Assembly.

**The Bureau decided to recommend that the Committee hold its regular meeting at the usual dates at UNESCO Headquarters in the year when the General Assembly meets (ITF 1.1.2.B and 1.3.4.B).**

#### 1.2 Bureau Meetings

The Bureau discussed the recommendation made by the Task Force (ITF 1.2.1) for the Committee to establish a sub-committee system - for the examination of state of conservation, nominations, budget etc. The Chair of the Task Force clarified the purpose of the proposed sub-committees as being to free the time of the Committee to concentrate on more substantive debates on policy issues. She noted that the composition, mandate and other details of the proposed sub-committees had not yet been defined. Several Bureau members cautioned against the proliferation of sub-committees in addition to the existing Bureau and the Committee (see ITF 1.3.6 B).

The Bureau agreed that prior to suggesting the creation of sub-committees to the Committee, the exact details, including the relationship with the Bureau and the Committee, be examined further. **The Bureau recommended to the Committee that an assessment be**

**made, with the Secretariat, as to the cost implications of the creation of the sub-committees.**

The possibility of the extraordinary session of the Bureau not discussing or receiving presentations on nominations which have been deferred or referred back, but allowing them to proceed to the full Committee was discussed by the Bureau (ITF 1.2.2 and ITF2.4.3). **It was agreed that during the next extraordinary session of the Bureau there will be no presentation or discussion on nominations which have been deferred or referred back. Instead, the Bureau will send the nominations to be discussed there directly to the World Heritage Committee (ITF 1.2.3).**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that Rule 22 of the Committee's Rules of Procedures, defining the order and time-limit of speeches be firmly applied by the Chair (see ITF 1.2.3) (RP Rule 7).**

#### 1.3 Committee Meetings

The Observer of Argentina emphasized the importance for southern hemisphere countries - which have their holiday period between January and March - of maintaining the current timetable for the submission and examination of nominations (ITF 1.3.8 C). He, as well as the Observer of Saint Lucia, opposed the idea of restricting the participation of observers in the work of the World Heritage Committee. After having listened to explanations concerning recommendation ITF 1.3.5 B, the Bureau decided that the second part of the recommendation would concern the ad hoc groups created during the meetings to resolve problems related to specific sites.

The Observer of the United Kingdom strongly supported these views and pointed out that a system of sub-committees would permit some items to be taken away from the agenda of the Committee in order to give more time to issues of strategic importance.

IUCN recommended that there should be an effective balance between periodic and reactive monitoring with clearer guidance and criteria in relation to which sites are subject to reactive monitoring (ITF 1.3.7 C).

**The Bureau agreed that the agenda of the Committee should have as a permanent item (with the allocation of sufficient time for discussion) general strategic policy matters, including the Strategic Plan and its implementation (ITF 1.3.1 and 1.3.3).**

**The Bureau agreed that the working documents for the Committee should be distributed 6 weeks prior to the meetings and should not be read aloud during the meetings (ITF 1.3.2). It was agreed that the documents for the meetings should, to the extent possible, be made available electronically.**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Committee agenda should be structured to ensure adequate time for discussion of strategic policy issues shared by States Parties (eg managing tourism impacts, legislative approaches) etc. (ITF 1.3.3).**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the following should become permanent agenda items for the General Assembly:**

- **Strategic policy issues and report on performance;**
- **Implementation of previous General Assembly decisions and resolutions**
- **Report on international assistance (ITF 1.1.1 B)**

## **2 DECISION MAKING**

### **Capacity Building**

**The importance of recommendations for strengthening capacities in the under-represented regions on the List has been underlined on numerous occasions. It was recommended to place the Task Force's recommendations on capacity building in bold thus emphasizing their importance and transmitting them to the Committee. The Bureau requested the Committee to strongly encourage the elaboration of strategies aiming at reinforcing and forging cooperation agreements to enable the States having well-developed capacities in the field of conservation to provide to under-represented regions financial and technical support (RL 11 vi-x). Nevertheless, it was emphasized that, these efforts alone would not be sufficient to improve the representativity of the List; and on the other, the Committee should ensure the long-term conservation of the sites and give high priority to training.**

#### **2.1 Strategic Planning**

**The Bureau recommended that the Committee commence a review to formulate a Strategic Plan with clear timelines and milestones for the period 2001-2005, based in part on the goals, objectives and recommendations of the 1992 Strategic Orientations document and the 1999 Resolution endorsing the Orientations. The Strategic Plan should contain at a minimum: a vision, goals, objectives, action plan, timelines, reporting mechanisms, accountable parties and a review cycle (ITF 2.1.1 B).**

#### **2.2 Tentative Lists**

The need to make it clear to States Parties that the tentative lists should be established in conformity with paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Operational Guidelines, according to a timetable of five to ten years, was underlined (ITF 2.2.1).

**The Bureau agreed that the submission of tentative lists by States Parties prioritising future nominations for both cultural and natural nominations was an important part of the Committee's process of strategic planning (ITF 2.2.1).**

#### **2.3 Nominations**

##### **Representativity of the World Heritage List**

The Observer of Italy requested that his reservations regarding the list of priorities for the examination of nominations for inscription (RL iv) be noted. He criticised

the intellectual approach which, in his opinion, betrayed the spirit of the Convention, and remarked that this Working Group had adopted a short-term approach which would not resolve the problem of the representativity of the List. He considered that any limiting of the number of nominations for inscription would constitute a constraint and pose a problem to some countries which could not thus benefit from the investment they had agreed to make in favour of the Convention. Finally, he expressed the view that emphasis should be placed, rightly so, on the strengthening of capacities in the regions where heritage was under-represented.

The Chairperson of the Working Group on the Representativity of the List recalled that his Group had a mandate to propose measures for a more balanced List on a voluntary basis. He asked the Observer of Italy to explain his reservations on the measures which, in his opinion, created problems. He recalled that the Working Group had adopted a set of measures aiming to strengthen the capacities in under-represented regions on the List and to slow down the number of nominations coming from regions or categories already well-represented. Ultimately, the goal is to implement an exercise which generates a movement of solidarity in the respect and the ethics of the Convention. He pointed out that the system of performance indicators should allow all the States Parties to be informed of the measures already undertaken by a number of countries with strong capabilities in the field of conservation in favour of rebalancing of the List and notably measures in favour of the increase of conservation capabilities in other regions. He pointed out that the exercise would not be obligatory. He concluded that solidarity could not be solicited but can only be on a voluntary basis.

The Delegate of Greece questioned the reasons for the imbalance of the List, and proceeded to point out the weakness or inexistence of legal protection, economic or political reasons. She referred to the Eurocentric concept of Article 1 of the Convention concerning the definition of the World Heritage monuments considered as "wonders of the world".

Several representatives recalled that the heritage of vast regions (Africa, Asia and the Pacific), comprising notably living cultures were not yet inscribed on the List. During discussions, it was recalled that the Convention was an instrument for international cooperation, that the duty of solidarity and the moral obligation implies that one supports the efforts of the under-represented regions and on the other hand, the number of nominations submitted by certain States being limited voluntarily. In fact, the universality of the List can only be ensured if it reflects the diversity of the cultures of the world and if Parties are not too preoccupied with national concerns. Moreover, it was considered that, following the twenty-second session of the Committee (Kyoto) and the adoption of the resolution of the General Assembly on the representativity of the List, the time had come to act. In that spirit, the Observer of the United States recalled that the problem was not that a country had a large number of sites inscribed on the List, but of a moral and ethical obligation to protect the common heritage of humankind. This implies on the part of each State a permanent commitment to the ideals of the

Convention which has a universal vocation. Several speakers were in favour of reducing the inequalities facing urgent needs of heritage protection. The Observer of France supported the idea of solidarity which, in his opinion was the key to redressing the problem.

The Delegate of Zimbabwe joined the previous speakers in supporting the results of the working group on the representativity of the World Heritage List. He noted that the statistical data shows that there is an interrelationship between the representativity on the List and the membership in the Committee. Those countries that have had several mandates in the Committee are those that have most sites on the World Heritage List, with two exceptions. He stressed that the unbalanced List was not just a matter of dynamics of the Convention but a larger issue of power politics. He advised the States Parties not to concentrate too much on theoretical discussions on heritage. What is needed is a moral commitment, as rightly stated by the Observer of the United States of America. He reminded the Bureau of the fact that most nominations are being presented by rich countries, to the detriment of those countries who cannot afford to conserve and promote their heritage.

Some representatives voiced their disagreement with the proposed system of "performance indicators" for the countries already having a large number of sites inscribed (RL 11 v). They requested that a test run of this system be carried out before its adoption. The Observer of the Netherlands indicated that this system had been elaborated as a management and information tool, based mainly on the measures indicated in the Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of States Parties, to encourage the countries to continue to bring a positive contribution to representativity. The imbalance of the List is a fact and it has continued to accentuate more so over the years. It is for this reason that it is important to attempt to redress the imbalance by using all available means. The system of performance indicators will be a useful exercise which deserves to be tested, even if it still requires improvements. The system of performance indicators will have an impact only if behaviour could be changed.

In response to the call for international solidarity, the Observer of Italy declared that at all costs the undertakings of the twelfth General Assembly of States Parties (1999) had to be respected and asked that during its special session in October 2000, the Bureau should examine the following proposal that could change the existing situation. This proposal consists of taking a pause in 2001 of the examination of all nominations for inscription, with the exception of those sites that may potentially be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger and others coming from States not having any sites inscribed. This possibility would permit the advisory bodies to devote their time to an analysis of the tentative lists and to define parameters on the basis of which priorities for examination of nominations could be established. He added that such a period of reflection was necessary to conceive a new system and in this respect, Italy would abide by its undertakings to the international community.

The Delegate of Finland welcomed the proposal made by Italy which corresponded to the proposals made by

Finland several years earlier. The Chairperson of the Working Group regretted that Italy had not made its proposal earlier on. Now, the recommendations of the Working Group need to be implemented.

Many speakers emphasized the need to define in a clear and effective manner the criteria for inscription as well as to define in a rigorous way the notion of outstanding universal value which remains trapped in by a Eurocentric vision. It was stressed that all the cultures had elements of an outstanding universal nature and that it was necessary to be able to identify the most significant sites that they have produced so as to increase the representativity of the List. It was suggested to prepare a Charter, and that the Committee adopt a policy with regard to inscription, so that all the types of heritage might, in time, be represented on the List. All the speakers underlined the central role of the advisory bodies in carrying out a reflection and an analysis at the philosophical and conceptual level, as well as in practical terms of the analysis of the tentative lists and, at this stage, the identification of the gaps of the List for both cultural and natural heritage.

The Representative of IUCN underlined that the concept of outstanding universal value should be applied in a scientific manner and thus be objective and credible. He emphasized the need to encourage nominations of natural sites to improve the representativity of the List. In particular, he noted that currently under-represented small island eco-systems such as those in the Pacific Islands must be considered for inscription, if and when more Pacific Island states become parties to the Convention. It is for this reason that IUCN has prepared a series of publications by themes and biomes which would enable an assessment of the outstanding universal value in a coherent and transparent manner. ICOMOS has also undertaken a similar commitment with a view to identifying the gaps of the List.

The Delegate of Australia and the Observer of Canada expressed their support for the proposal aiming at limiting to 40 the number of nominations to be examined by the Committee each year. It was estimated that the Bureau at its special session in October 2000 could review the order of priorities of the parameters announced by the Group. The Delegates of Finland, Morocco and Zimbabwe, and the Observers of Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Japan, the Netherlands, Saint Lucia and the United States of America, supported the overall recommendations of the Working Group on the Representativity of the List.

#### **Preparation and assessment of nominations**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Centre should implement and distribute to all State Parties, a checklist for the preparation and assessment of nominations to ensure that nominations are complete before they are sent to Advisory Bodies for evaluation (ITF 2.3.1) (OG Para 64, 65).**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the advisory bodies should present their recommendations for inscription in a consistent format: assessing outstanding universal value, relationship to the priorities of the Global Strategy, using a check list to**

**support recommendations, and identify potential or existing threats and protective actions (see ITF 2.3.2) (OG 57-63).**

The Bureau recommended further examination by the Special Session of the Bureau in October 2000 as to whether the results of advisory bodies' evaluations of nominations should be made available, in a timely manner, to the nominating State Party, whether or not they are members of the Committee (ITF 2.3.3 and OG 65). It was agreed that if this recommendation is adopted by the Committee, it would be the role of the World Heritage Centre, and not the advisory bodies, to provide the evaluations to the State Party.

### **Criteria**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that (a) the cultural and natural heritage criteria be merged (CANT 4.4.d), (b) the use of cultural heritage criterion (vi) be discussed in the light of the outcomes of the African meeting on authenticity (CANT 4.4.e) and (c) a new section of text be provided as a general introduction to integrity (La Vanoise recommendation of March 1996) and authenticity (CANT p 13, 3.II.4).**

### **Statement of Values**

**With reference to TFI 2.3.2 concerning the presentation of the advisory bodies' recommendations for inscription in a consistent format, the Bureau recommended that the Committee decide that a statement of specific World Heritage values of a property be a key element of a nomination dossier (CANT 4.6.b) and that these values must be the focus of nomination, assessment, inscription, management, and be the reference point for a cycle of on-site monitoring, periodic reporting, and potential reactive monitoring, in danger listing, and deletion (CANT 4.6.c).**

### **2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the assessment documents of the advisory bodies and Centre should be presented in a single summary table (with the four options: inscription, referral, deferral, and rejection) (ITF 2.4.2) (OG Para 57) .**

The Bureau recommended that further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau in October 2000 be given to grouping the presentation of and decisions on nominations according to similar nominations, themes and/or region and with reference to those sites already on the World Heritage List (ITF 2.4.1).

### **2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that reactive monitoring reports should be presented in a single document in a consistent format to facilitate discussion and consideration (standardised formats) (ITF 2.5.2) (OG Para 68).**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that presentations on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites should be encouraged to use images and maps to improve comprehension (ITF 2.5.3) (OG Paras 69-71, 77).**

The Bureau recommended further examination by the Special Session of the Bureau (October 2000) as to whether working documents on monitoring should be made available, in a timely manner, to the State Party concerned, whether or not they are members of the Committee (Task Force Recommendation 2.5.1, CANT 4.6.g and O G 68).

### **2.7 World Heritage Fund and International Assistance**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that it should encourage all parties to respect the Operational Guidelines provisions for international assistance especially on deadlines and follow up to previous projects (ITF 2.7.3) (OG Section IV).**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Centre should present the budget in a single document with several columns according to category of delegation (Chair, Committee, Bureau, Centre). The budget proposals should be in line with the strategic priorities. The budget will indicate, per objective of the strategic plan, the resources requested and the results expected. Every 6 months (or every year if the budget becomes biennial), the Centre will present a document reporting on the expenses actually made and the results achieved (ITF 2.7.1).**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that budget items should be supported by related working documents; each working document with budgetary implications should be cross-referenced to the budget (ITF 2.7.2).**

**The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Centre should identify opportunities to consolidate funding and conclude cooperation agreements with other organisations involved in world heritage activities (ITF 2.7.4).**

The Bureau recommended that the external evaluation of International Assistance performed by C3E (WHC-2000/CONF.202/13) also be considered as part of the examination of International Assistance by the special session of the Bureau to be held in October 2000.

## **3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT**

### **3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents**

**The Bureau recommended the Committee adopt ITF 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 concerning the reduction in volume and improvement in format of documents.**

The Bureau agreed that further discussion was required at the Special Session of the Bureau (October 2000) to clarify

the critical issue of rights of access to documents (ITF 3.1.6 C).

### **3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage sites**

With reference to Task Force Recommendation 3.2.1, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that a portion of data capture project was already underway. The Secretariat is seeking guidance as to the expansion of the project and noted that an assessment would need to be made of the costs involved.

The Bureau agreed that the strategy and budget for the Information Management System (IMS) needed to be discussed further. It was agreed that the special session of the Bureau to be held in October would set aside enough time for this discussion to bring together on-going work and to prepare a focused and budgeted proposal providing direction for the Information Management Strategy, including IMS (Information Management System).

## **4. OTHER MATTERS**

### **4.1 The Roles of Advisory Bodies and the Centre**

It was considered that at this stage an analysis of tentative lists would be premature because States Parties must be given time to define a calendar for the submission of nominations. In this regard, it was recalled that the Group on the Representativity of the List had recommended that the advisory bodies analyse, scientifically the recommendations of regional and thematic meetings on the harmonisation of tentative lists that have taken place since 1984 as well as Global Strategy meetings organised since 1994 (RL II ii and iii).

It was strongly underline that the analysis of tentative lists must be an exercise based not only on achievements but also on the evolution of Global Strategy. The latter must be evaluated at regular 5-year intervals. In effect, it constitutes a platform that should allow under-represented regions to nominate properties for inscription. In this manner it will clearly illustrate the obligations of international solidarity.

The Observer of Thailand cautioned the Bureau about using a checklist for the consistent presentation by the advisory bodies of their evaluations for inscription of natural and cultural properties (ITF 2.3.2) as, for cultural heritage, these checklists tend to be based on Eurocentric values.

The Director-General of ICCROM reported on progress being made with the preparation of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with UNESCO that would include key components concerning World Heritage. The General Assembly of ICCROM had recently accepted the principle of an MOU with UNESCO and the Director-General of UNESCO had been informed.

IUCN referred to the importance of also analysing the representation of natural sites on the World Heritage List as part of the review of tentative lists of States Parties. IUCN referred to its MOU with the World Heritage Centre

that had established a mutually agreed framework for the continuing involvement of IUCN in World Heritage matters.

## **5. EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION WITHIN THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Terms of Committee members (RC 1, para 5)**

**Number of Committee members (RC 2, para 5)**

**Equitable representation of the world's regions and cultures (RC 3, para 5)**

The Observer of France referred to his country's decision to limit its current mandate on the Committee to 5 years. He proposed that countries that have been members of the World Heritage Committee several times in a row, give their place to other countries.

Several members of the Bureau expressed their view that an increase in the number of Committee members would not do much to address the problem concerning equitable representation in the World Heritage Committee. A number of observers expressed their particular concern about re-opening the *Convention* as it could have other unfortunate consequences. Several members of the Bureau suggested that some of the alternative proposals such as increased rotation, more restriction with successive terms, and an effective use of observers should be used. The Observer of the United Kingdom proposed that the special session of the Bureau in October 2000 should study a system where participation of non-Committee members would be incorporated into the arrangements for the proposed sub-committees.

The Observer of Belgium presented a factual analysis with graphics showing that ninety-five States Parties (60%) have never had a mandate, whereas ten States Parties have had more than three mandates. There had not been enough rotation. States Parties which never had a mandate are also those which are under-represented on the List, and conversely, States Parties which had cumulated several mandates are those which are best represented on the List.

The Observer of Belgium commented that the five regions do not have the same size and the number of states varies as much as three times from the biggest region to the smallest. In the past, there have been, on that score, large differences between all the regions. Today, however, there is a certain balance in the distribution of the seats of the Committee between the regions, corresponding to the number of States Parties they represent.

Based on this tendency towards a more balanced Committee, the Observer of Belgium recommended the following measures.

1. The Chairperson of the General Assembly could remind the voters of both (i) Article 8, para. 2 of the Convention stating that the election of the members of the Committee should ensure an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world, and (ii) the 1989 General Assembly Resolution. In addition, the Chairperson could give, before each vote, specific

information on the situation of the representation of the regions compared to their size.

2. Revise the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly to allow all the non-elected candidates to participate in the second round thus avoiding the States Parties of under-represented regions being eliminated in the first round.
3. Make it obligatory to submit candidatures for the Committee at least two years in advance to give the potential members of the Committee the opportunity to demonstrate their commitment and actions in support of the implementation of the Convention.

The Observer of Belgium concluded by saying that if these proposals did not work after several sessions of the General Assembly, a strict sharing of Committee membership would need to be implemented on the basis of geographical regions. This would require a change to the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly. Finally she noted that any proposals for change would need to be accompanied by an effective system of rotation.

The Observer of Argentina thanked the Observer of Belgium for her paper. He expressed his view that it was not enough to change the current system of Committee elections by simply changing the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly. He stated that there was a need to augment the number of Committee members. He referred to the imaginative solutions suggested by the Working Group that responded to expressed concerns that it was not desirable to open the *Convention* to change. He agreed with the Observer of the United Kingdom, saying that he too was in favour of enlarging the role of the observers in the work of the Committee. He concluded by stating that the *World Heritage Convention* would not be universal unless there was an increase in the involvement of more States Parties.

The Delegate of Greece outlined a number of the legal reasons why she was against revising the *Convention*. She also said that her Delegation needed to review the Belgian proposal in more detail but preferred a mixed system of seats allocated according to region with some "free" seats to be allocated by vote. This was also the opinion of the Finnish Delegate who stressed the need to accelerate rotation in the Committee's membership.

The Observer of the United States of America thanked the Observer of Belgium for the detailed analysis presented to the Bureau. She commented that the facts could now be reviewed and a responsible decision taken on this complex matter. She concluded by noting that she found the process suggested by the Observer of Belgium deserving of serious consideration as States Parties would in the future be better informed prior to the election of Committee members.

The Bureau recommended further discussion on this subject take place at the special session of the Bureau to be convened in October 2000.

**VI.8** The Chairperson specified that the working and information documents concerning this agenda item as well as the text of the Observer of Belgium and the evaluation of international assistance (C3E) will be communicated to the Bureau for its special session in October 2000. All additional written inputs should be sent to the World Heritage Centre before 7 September 2000. The recommendations of this special session of the Bureau will be examined by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session. The Committee will then report the outcomes to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly.

## **VII. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

**VII.1** The Chairperson informed the Bureau that there were four points to be discussed under this Agenda item:

- i) new International Assistance requests to be funded from the International Assistance budget for year 2000 (WHC-2000/CONF.202/12);
- ii) examination of the Evaluation of International Assistance undertaken by C3E (WHC-2000/CONF.202/13);
- iii) examination of the ICCROM Information Document on the Global Training Strategy for Cultural Heritage (WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.15); and
- iv) examination of the Information Document (WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.8) on a proposal submitted by the Government of Hungary for a World Heritage Fellowship Programme.

**VII.2** The Centre informed the Bureau that the number of requests for International Assistance and amounts requested continued to increase dramatically, reflecting the growing number of sites and increasing threats. The Centre recalled the Bureau's attention to the discussions concerning International Assistance at its twenty-third session, when the former Chairperson, current Director-General of UNESCO, noted with deep concern that priority of approved requests was not necessarily given to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Low Income Countries (LICs). At its twenty-third session, the Bureau underlined the need for strategic and catalytic use of international assistance under the Fund, and to ensure quality control, along with prioritization. The Bureau was also informed that the Centre continued to encourage LDCs and LICs, especially those with sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, to utilize limited World Heritage funds in catalytic ways. Moreover, non-LDC / LIC States Parties have been encouraged to actively seek funds for large -scale projects from other sources. However, non-LDC/LIC States Parties continue to request International Assistance to meet their urgent needs, while LDC/LIC States Parties often do not benefit from International Assistance due to their arrears to the World Heritage Fund.

**VII.3** The Centre, recalling the Report of the Director of the Centre presented in WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.3,

informed the Bureau that all Training Assistance funds allocated for Cultural Heritage had been exhausted by mid-January 2000. The Centre drew the Bureau's attention to the large percentage (56%) of Training Assistance funds for Cultural Heritage allocated to ICCROM. Out of the Cultural Heritage Training Assistance budget of US\$ 490,000, a sum of US\$ 276,365 had been approved for ICCROM to carry out six global or regional activities and to provide US\$ 85,000 for servicing costs.

**VII.4** In accordance with Chapter IV of the *Operational Guidelines*, the Bureau, recalling the order of priorities in granting international assistance as stated in paragraphs 113-116 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and taking note of the very limited funds available as of 30 June 2000 presented in WHC-2000/CONF.202/12, examined specific requests presented in WHC-2000/CONF.202/12 and took the following decisions:

**NATURAL HERITAGE  
Technical Co-operation**

**Guinea**

**Assessment of the State of Conservation of Mt. Nimba Strict Nature Reserve and Institutional Strengthening of the Centre for Environmental Management of Mt. Nimba**  
US\$ 30,000

The Bureau authorized the Chairperson to approve up to an amount of US\$ 30,000 for the request described in WHC-2000/CONF.202/12, subject to the Centre and the State Party co-operating to prepare a detailed budget breakdown and to achieve cost-savings for vehicle repairs, fuel costs, and the final report production.

**Kenya**

**Preparation of a Management Plan for Mt. Kenya National Park/Natural Forest**  
US\$ 25,000

The Bureau approved an amount of US\$ 25,000 for the request as described in the WHC-2000/CONF.202/12.

**Kenya**

**Preparation of a Management Plan for Sibiloi/Central Islands National Parks**  
US\$ 25,300

The Delegate of Morocco expressed his understanding that the local populations around this site are mainly pastoral and emphasized the importance to involve the local population in elaborating the Management Plan for the sites. IUCN informed the Bureau that it supports the request, and also endorsed the recommendation of the Delegate of Morocco on involving the local population in preparing the Management Plan. Finally, the Bureau approved an amount of US\$ 25,300 for the request, as described in WHC-2000/CONF.202/12.

**NATURAL HERITAGE  
Training Assistance**

**Madagascar**

**Building Capacity for World Heritage Area Planning in Southern Madagascar**  
US\$ 30,000

The Bureau approved US \$30,000 as a contribution towards direct costs for the project, as described in WHC-2000/CONF.202/12.

**Malawi**

**Capacity Building for Lake Malawi National Park**  
**Recommended approval to Committee**

The Centre informed the Bureau that upon consultation with the Equipment Section, it was found that cost savings could not be achieved, and suggested that the Bureau may wish to transmit the request to the Committee for approval. Therefore, the Bureau recommended approval of US\$ 37,094 by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session for the request as described in WHC-2000/CONF.202/12.

**CULTURAL HERITAGE  
Technical Cooperation**

**Latvia**

**Digitizing Works on Computers for all existing utilities networks located in the Old Town of Riga**  
US\$ 27,000

**Latvia**

**Carrying out archaeological and historical investigations in the centre of the Old Town of Riga**  
US\$ 29,579

The Centre, drawing the attention of the Bureau to the two Technical Co-operation requests submitted for the Historic Town of Riga site, informed the Bureau that the first request (US\$ 27,000) was the priority activity for the Government of Latvia. ICOMOS stated that this prioritization was commendable and supported the request. The Bureau approved US\$ 27,000 for the request as described in WHC-2000/CONF.202/12.

**Turkmenistan**

**Technical Support for monitoring the principal earthen architectural monuments within Ancient Merv**  
US\$ 30,000

The Centre informed the Bureau that ICOMOS, upon examination of the request in consultation with competent ICOMOS members, offered its full support for this well formulated and fully justified request. The Bureau approved US\$ 30,000 for the request as described in WHC-2000/CONF.202/12, subject to the State Party paying its dues to the World Heritage Fund, and requesting the Centre to co-ordinate the implementation of the activity in close collaboration with the State Party and CRATerre.

## Evaluation of international assistance

**VII.5** The Chairperson introduced the item for discussion by recalling the Working Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/13, "Report on the Evaluation of International Assistance provided under the World Heritage Fund". He then gave the floor to the Deputy Director of the Centre who reminded the Bureau that the decision to carry out an evaluation of international assistance had been taken by the Committee at its twenty-second session. The Central Evaluation Unit of UNESCO (BPE/CEU), was entrusted with this evaluation and selected the French company C3E to carry out this activity.

**VII.6** The evaluation was carried out between the summer of 1999 and April 2000 through a study of the files of the World Heritage Centre, interviews with the different actors (States Parties, advisory bodies, Secretariat staff) and a meeting with all parties concerned in April 2000 in Paris. The evaluation did not include an impact study to permit the evaluation of the results of assistance granted to the beneficiary sites. Similarly, it did not incorporate the results of the parallel evaluation carried out by ICCROM on international training requests, as ICCROM had not completed this study.

**VII.7** Mr Eric Monnier (C3E) thereafter presented the results and recommendations of the evaluation which can be summarized under the following three headings:

### **Recommendations relating to the aims of international assistance**

- To update strategic priorities through the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau
- Be more selective according to needs and emerging objectives
- Streamline assistance to properties on the List experiencing difficulties
- Seek a management system in accordance with the objectives to be attained

### **Recommendations related to international assistance results (effectiveness, efficiency)**

- From the point of view of effectiveness, prioritize actions which have greatest added value

- Favour assistance having catalyser effects (preparation of files)
- Continue actions relating to emergency situations and develop them with partners

-From the point of view of efficiency

- Prioritize «capacity building» partnership activities at a regional level and/or via Internet
- Confine co-funding (multiplier effects) to LDCs or to sites in critical states.

## **Recommendations concerning the implementation of international assistance: preserving the qualities of international assistance in terms of rapidity and flexibility**

- Mobilize complementary private sector funding
- Establish well-defined multicriteria grids for selection purposes
- Take advantage of Internet
- Increase transparency of the system (better accountability)

**VII.8** Members of the Bureau congratulated C3E and the Centre on the quality of the work undertaken and requested that this report be included in the Working Documents for the Bureau session in September 2000. They noted that the work demonstrated that past procedures could no longer continue to be used and that better adapted ones should be developed according to needs. A State Party called upon those Parties with several sites listed to provide financial and technical support to those in need in the framework of international assistance.

**VII.9** While commending the consultant for the quality of his work, the advisory bodies expressed their disagreement with the conclusion of the report which mentioned that they were 'judge and party' for international assistance. They considered themselves as priority partners of the World Heritage Centre and the Convention and had always acted within the frame of their mandate, trying to fulfil the tasks entrusted to them.

## **Global Training Strategy Progress Report**

**VII.10** The Chairperson briefly presented the point on Global Training Strategy for Cultural Heritage and the Information Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.15 related to this point, prepared by ICCROM and received by the Centre only on 27 June 2000. The Chairperson invited the Representatives of ICCROM to present their Document.

**VII.11** The Director-General of ICCROM, Mr Marc Laenen, introduced the progress report by drawing the attention of the Bureau to the necessary phases for launching and implementing successful strategic training programmes. He underscored the necessity of following a series of steps beginning with carrying out need assessments, developing strategies, and thereafter developing and implementing programmes.

**VII.12** Mr Joseph King, representing ICCROM, presented the Information Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.15, underlining the importance of finalizing the Global Training Strategy for Cultural Heritage in order to present progress to the Committee. He noted that the Committee is placing more emphasis on post-inscription activities, requesting States Parties to undertake complex actions such as the periodic reporting exercise. Furthermore, he noted that many of the recent working groups emphasized capacity building as an important long term strategic solution for enhancing conservation of sites.

**VII.13** Mr King reported on the progress made since 1995 in the development and implementation of a Global Training Strategy for Cultural Heritage in close co-operation with the Committee and the Centre. In 1995, a preliminary Global Training Strategy were presented to the Committee, and in 1996, the "Principle Training Guidelines" was adopted by the Committee. At an Expert Meeting held in 1998, a "Framework of Principles" guiding the planning and development of proactive training initiatives were developed. Some of the most important principles within the "Framework of Principles" were highlighted. The Bureau was informed that the Expert Meeting also elaborated a Checklist for assessing training requests. This Checklist has been utilized by ICCROM for evaluating Training Assistance requests submitted to the Committee from States Parties. It was noted that neither the "Framework of Principles" nor the Checklist have been examined by the Committee. Mr King, recalling that ICCROM had volunteered to undertake a review of previous Training Assistance requests financed by the World Heritage Fund, informed the Bureau that this Review, financed by the World Heritage Fund, was being finalized.

**VII.14** Mr King informed the Bureau that in order to effectively implement a Global Training Strategy for Cultural Heritage, it is necessary to develop complementary regional strategies. To date, the following four sub-regions or groups have benefited from the initiatives taken by ICCROM, the Committee and the Centre for some specific themes:

- North Eastern European Historic Cities;
- Latin American Historic Cities;
- Sub-Saharan Africa (AFRICA 2009 Programme);
- Southeast Asia

**VII.15** Mr King, ICCROM Co-ordinator for the AFRICA 2009 Programme, then presented the activities being implemented in detail.

**VII.16** In concluding, Mr King requested the Bureau to consider the two Recommendations presented in the Information Document. The two Recommendations were the following:

- (1) Organization of a small meeting to be attended by ICCROM, the Centre staff, and representatives of interested States Parties and other advisory bodies, as appropriate, to define more clearly ICCROM's role in training and to review the "Framework of Principles". ICCROM informed the Bureau that it would be pleased to host such a meeting in time to allow the Committee, at its twenty-fourth session, to examine the conclusions of the meeting.
- (2) Development of a definitive "Regional Training Strategy and Programme Matrix and Related Action Plan" by ICCROM, in close co-operation with the Centre and others as required, over the next several months, for presentation to the Committee at its twenty-fourth session.

**VII.17** Finally, Mr King requested the Bureau to include, on the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the Committee, an item concerning training separate from the item on International Assistance, to allow substantive discussions to be held, and for drawing conclusions from the results obtained from the two Recommendations proposed.

**VII.18** Four members of the Bureau and one observer expressed their appreciation for the presentation on the progress made in the implementation of the Global Training Strategy for Cultural Heritage of the Committee. The Delegates of Finland and Hungary supported the adoption of the Recommendations proposed by ICCROM. The Delegate of Greece supported the addition of a separate item concerning training to be included in the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the Committee. She pointed out that it was not possible to discuss the International Assistance before the policy issues related to it have been decided upon. The Observer of Kenya, underlining the importance of training and capacity building for developing States Parties and in view of the limited financial resources available within the realm of cultural heritage protection, requested the Bureau and the Committee to closely examine ways to develop training activities which are sustainable. Local training and capacity building were the best ways to sensitize people in developing countries to understand the value of World Heritage. The Observer of the United States of America noted that the observations made by ICCROM on developing training strategies for capacity building could be applicable for both cultural and natural heritage.

**VII.19** Noting that the Information Document was made available only on 27 June 2000, the Delegate of Australia stated that there had not been sufficient time to carefully examine the information and proposed Recommendations of ICCROM. The Delegate of Australia, underlining that training needs and capacity building have been examined by the two Working Groups, the Task Force, and the Expert Meeting on the Revision of the Operational Guidelines, drew the attention of the Bureau to the link between the works of these Groups and this Information Document. Therefore, he requested the World Heritage Centre to carefully develop an Action Plan, clearly defining the responsibilities of the World Heritage Centre, the advisory bodies, and the financial implications related to the adoption of the proposed Recommendations. This need for clarification was also supported by the Delegate of Finland, who highlighted the need for a more extensive discussion. Nevertheless, the delegates supported the inclusion of an Agenda item on training at the twenty-fourth session of the Committee.

#### **Proposal on a World Heritage Fellowship Programme**

**VII.20** The Chairperson drew the attention of the Bureau to Information Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.8 which presented a summary proposal submitted by the Delegate of Hungary with a view to reinforce national capacity for implementing the Convention through the granting of fellowships to national officers who could work in the field of the World Heritage Convention. The Chairperson also recalled that at the 30th session of the General Conference of UNESCO, Hungary had submitted

a draft resolution proposing the creation of this programme. The proposal was introduced for the first time by the Delegate of Hungary at the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee in Kyoto, in 1998.

**VII.21** The Delegate of Australia recognized the potential in the initiative proposed by the Delegate of Hungary. He proposed that the Fellowship Programme be integrated in similar activities of ICCROM.

**VII.22** The Delegate of Finland underlined the need to clarify the role of various bodies. In relation to the proposal of Hungary, he hoped that no parallel would be created, competing with existing mechanisms.

**VII.23** ICCROM welcomed the proposal and requested that it be elaborated in time for discussion at the twenty-fourth session of the Committee. It was also recommended that this proposal be integrated within the Global Training Strategy proposed by ICCROM and which is continuing to be developed. Finally, it was decided to change the title of this programme to *Heritage Partnership Programme*.

#### **VIII. DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE BUREAU (23-24 NOVEMBER 2000, CAIRNS, AUSTRALIA)**

**VIII.1** The Chairperson presented Working Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/14, the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau to be held in Cairns, Australia, from 23 to 24 November 2000. The Provisional Agenda was adopted and is attached as Annex V.

#### **IX. DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE (27 NOVEMBER - 2 DECEMBER 2000, CAIRNS, AUSTRALIA)**

**IX.1** The Chairperson presented Working Document WHC-2000/CONF.202/15Rev. the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the Committee to be held in Cairns, Australia, from 27 November to 2 December 2000.

**IX.2** The Bureau agreed with the need to give priority during the twenty-fourth session of the Committee, to discussions of the important work of the Task Force, the two Working Groups and International Expert Meeting on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines*. The Bureau also noted that enough time needed to be provided, earlier enough in the Agenda of the Committee, for the discussion on nominations of properties for inclusion in the World Heritage List. It was recommended that the discussion on nominations should follow the agenda item on the Global Strategy. Furthermore, it was agreed that an agenda item on the Training Strategy be included in two parts - "Global Training Strategy" and "Proposal for the establishment of a Heritage Partnership Programme". It was also agreed that a separate item on 'Information Strategy' be included in the agenda. The Secretariat was given the responsibility

to define the timetable of the meeting, taking into account the views expressed by the Bureau members.

**IX.3** The Provisional Agenda for the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee is included as Annex VI.

#### **X. OTHER BUSINESS**

**X.1** The Chairperson invited the Bureau members to raise any other issues of concern. No other matters were raised.

#### **XI. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

**XI.1** The Chairperson requested the Rapporteur to present the draft report to the Bureau. It was presented section-by-section and all changes suggested by the members of the Bureau, the observers and advisory bodies were noted, and the report adopted.

**XI.2** The Delegate of Australia thanked the Chairperson for the skillful and efficient manner in which he conducted the Bureau session. He noted that the session was an important event and would have implications for the future work of the statutory organs. The Delegate of Morocco thanked the Rapporteur for her work in the preparation of the report and recognized the professional contributions of the Secretariat in the conduct of a successful Bureau session.

**XI.3** The Chairperson expressed his satisfaction with the continuing interest shown by the delegates of States Parties for the work of the Bureau, as well as with the high professionalism of the Secretariat, who had ensured the smooth conduct of the session. He insisted upon the need to maintain the credibility of the Convention and spoke of the many countries who counted upon it for the preservation of their sites. He called upon States Parties, the advisory bodies and the Centre in its capacity as Secretariat to the Committee, to continue their important work for the preservation of world heritage.

**XI.4** The Chairperson declared the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee closed.



**BUREAU DU COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL /  
BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Vingt-quatrième session / Twenty-fourth session**

**Paris, Siège de l'UNESCO, Salle IV / Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room IV  
26 juin – 1<sup>er</sup> juillet 2000 / 26 June - 1 July 2000**

**LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**ETATS MEMBRES DU BUREAU / MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU**

**AUSTRALIE / AUSTRALIA**

*Mr Roger BEALE*  
Secretary  
Department of the Environment and Heritage  
GPO Box 787  
Canberra ACT 2601, Australia

*Mr Matthew PEEK*  
Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO  
4, rue Jean Rey  
75724 Paris Cedex 15

*Mr Kevin KEEFFE*  
Assistant Secretary  
World Heritage Branch  
Department of the Environment and Heritage  
GPO Box 787  
Canberra ACT 2601, Australia

*Mr Robin BRYANT*  
Assistant Secretary Energy Minerals  
Department of Industry, Science and Resources  
Allara St. Civic ACT 2601, Australia

*Mr David WALKER*  
Director, International Section  
World Heritage Branch  
Department of the Environment and Heritage  
G.P.O. Box 787  
Canberra ACT 2601, Australia

*Ms Anne SIWICKI*  
Policy Officer  
Australian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO  
4, rue Jean Rey  
74724 Paris Cedex 15

**FINLANDE / FINLAND**

*Mr Henrik LILIUS*  
State Archaeologist  
Director General of the National Board of Antiquities  
National Board of Antiquities  
P.O. Box 187  
FIN-00101 Helsinki, Finland

*Ms Taina KIEKKO*  
Ambassador, Pemanent Delegate of Finland to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mr Jukka-Pekka FLANDER*  
Chief Inspector  
Ministry of the Environment  
Kasarminkazu 25  
00121 Helsinki, Finland

*Ms Anne LAMMILA*  
Conseiller, Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Finland to UNESCO  
1 Rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

**GRECE / GREECE**

*Ms Hélène METHODIOU*  
Conseiller pour la Culture  
Délégation permanente de la Grèce auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

**HONGRIE / HUNGARY**

*Mr Zsolt VISY*  
Deputy Secretary of State  
Ministry of the Hungarian Cultural Heritage  
Szalay u.10-14  
1055 Budapest, Hungary

*S. Exc. M. Arpád FASANG*  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate of Hungary to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Dr. János TARDY*  
Ministry for Environment and Regional  
Policy  
National Authority for Nature Conservation  
Kolto u. 21  
H-1121 Budapest, Hungary

*H.E. Ambassador János JELEN*  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Department of Culture, Science and Information  
Nagy Imre ter 4.  
H-1027 Budapest, Hungary

*Mr Ferenc NEMETH*  
Chief  
Secretariat of the Hungarian National Committee  
for Heritage  
Ministry of the Hungarian Cultural Heritage  
Szin haz Utca 5-9  
H- 1014 Budapest, Hungary

*Bela KOVACS*  
Councillor  
Ministry of Agriculture and Regional Development  
Kossuth ter 11  
Budapest 1055, Hungary

#### **MAROC / MOROCCO**

*M. Abdelaziz TOURI*  
Directeur  
Ministère des Affaires Culturelles  
Direction du patrimoine culturel  
Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial  
17 rue Michlifen  
Agdal, Rabat, Maroc

*M. Ahmed SKOUNTI*  
Chargé de recherche  
Expert pour le patrimoine culturel  
Direction du Patrimoine culturel  
17 rue Michlifen, Agdal  
10000 Rabat, Maroc

*M. Dris EL FASSI*  
Professeur  
Expert pour le patrimoine naturel  
14 cité Al Khadra – Guich Oudaya  
10100 Rabat, Maroc

#### **MEXIQUE / MEXICO**

*S. Exc. M. Eralico ZEPEDA RAMOS*  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegation of Mexico to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mr José SANCHEZ GUTIERREZ*  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Mexico to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mrs Jessica DE ALBA ULLOA*  
Permanent Delegation of Mexico to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mr José de la ROSA*  
Institut national d'Anthropologie et Histoire (INAH)

*Mtro. En Arq. SAUL ALCANTARA ONOFRE*  
Profesor-Investigador Titular "C"  
Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM)  
Plantel Azcapotzalco

*Biol. LORENZA TOVAR DE TERESA*  
Profesora de la Escuela de la Ciudad de México

#### **ZIMBABWE**

*Mr Dawson MUNJERI*  
Executive Director  
National Museums and Monuments  
Penrose Hill, 107 Rotten Row  
Box CY 1485 Causeway  
Harare, Zimbabwe

*Mr Josiah MHLANGA*  
Deputy Permanent Delegate to UNESCO  
Embassy of Zimbabwe  
12 Lord Byron  
75008 PARIS

*Mr Darlington MUNYIKWA*  
Senior Curator of Paleontology  
National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe  
National History Museum  
Box 240 Bulawayo, Zimbabwe

## II. ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT A TITRE CONSULTATIF/ ORGANIZATIONS ATTENDING IN ADVISORY CAPACITY

### CENTRE INTERNATIONAL D'ETUDES POUR LA CONSERVATION ET LA RESTAURATION DES BIENS CULTURELS (ICCRUM)/ INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF THE PRESERVATION AND THE RESTORATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY (ICCRUM)

*Marc LAENEN*  
Directeur général  
ICCRUM  
Via di San Michele 13  
00153 Rome, Italy

*Nobuko INABA*  
Responsable du Projet ITUC  
ICCRUM  
Via di San Michele 13  
00153 Rome, Italy

*Joseph KING*  
Responsable du projet Afrique 2009  
ICCRUM  
Via di San Michele 13  
00153 Rome, Italy

### CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES (ICOMOS)/ INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES (ICOMOS)

*M. Michael PETZET*  
Président  
ICOMOS  
49-51 rue de la Fédération  
F-75015 Paris

*Mr Jukka JOKILEHTO*  
Consultant  
ICOMOS  
49-51 rue de la Fédération  
75015 Paris

*Dr Henry CLEERE*  
World Heritage Coordinator  
ICOMOS  
49-51 rue de la Fédération  
F-75015 Paris

*Mme Carmen ANON*  
Puerto Santa Maria 49  
Madrid 28043

*Mlle Regina DURIGHELLO*  
Coordonnateur adjoint  
ICOMOS  
49-51 rue de la Fédération  
75015 Paris

*Mr Giora SOLAR*  
Délégué général aux Finances  
ICOMOS  
49-51 rue de la Fédération  
75015 Paris

*Mlle Gwenaëlle BOURDIN*  
Assistante  
ICOMOS  
49-51 rue de la Fédération  
75015 Paris

### UNION MONDIALE POUR LA NATURE (IUCN) / THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION (IUCN)

*Mr David SHEPPARD*  
Head  
Programme on Protected Areas  
IUCN - The World Conservation Union  
Rue Mauverney 28  
Gland 1196, Switzerland

*Mr P.H.C. (Bing) LUCAS*  
1/268 Main Road  
Tawa  
Wellington 6006  
New Zealand

*Dr James W. THORSELL*  
Senior Advisor World Heritage  
Programme on Protected Areas  
IUCN - The World Conservation Union  
Rue Mauverney 28  
Gland 1196, Switzerland

*Mr Rolf HOGAN*  
Programme Associate for World Heritage  
IUCN - The World Conservation Union  
Rue Mauverney 28  
Gland 1196, Switzerland

## WORLD CONSERVATION MONITORING CENTRE

*Mr Jeremy HARRISON*  
Acting Director, International Conventions and Policy  
World Conservation Monitoring Centre  
219 Huntingdon Road  
Cambridge CB3 0DL, United Kingdom

### OBSERVATEURS / OBSERVERS

(i) **ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL/  
STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

#### AFRIQUE DU SUD / SOUTH AFRICA

*Mr Devandhran MOODLEY*  
Third Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of South Africa to UNESCO  
South African Embassy  
59 Quay d'Orsay  
75343 PARIS CEDEX 07

*Mr Makgolo MAKGOLO*  
Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism  
P.O. Box 447  
Pretoria 0001, South Africa

*Mr Chris SWART*  
Director  
Cultural & Local Natural Resources Management  
Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism  
Private Bag X 447  
Pretoria 0001, South Africa

#### ALLEMAGNE / GERMANY

*Mr Norbert KLINGLER*  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente d'Allemagne auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mr Michael WORBS*  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente d'Allemagne auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mr Hans CASPARY*  
Conservateur  
Lennebergstr. 38  
D-55124 Mainz, Germany

*Dr. Thomas WEISS*  
Director of the Foundation "Dessau-Wörlitz"  
Schloß Großkühnau  
D-06846 Dessau

#### ARGENTINE / ARGENTINA

*Mr Hugo Guillermo STORERO*  
Subsecretario de Cultura  
Av. Alvear 1690  
1014 Buenos Aires, Argentina

*H. Exc. Mr Lucio GARCIA Del SOLAR*  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Argentina to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis - 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Martí RUBEN A.*  
Ministerio Interior  
Subsecretario de Asuntos Municipales  
Alena 168  
Buenos Aires, Argentina

*Oscar SANTARELLI*  
Président de l'Agence Cordolsa Tourisme  
Gouvernement de Cordoba  
Tucumán 360  
5000 Cordoba, Argentina

*Lic. Pedro NEIFF*  
Directeur des Relations internationales  
Secrétariat au Tourisme  
Suipacha IIII Piso 21  
1368 Buenos Aires, Argentina

*Dra. Josefina PIANA*  
Directeur du patrimoine culturel  
Gobierno de la Provincia de Córdoba  
Av. Irigoyen Gzz  
5000 Cordoba

*Ministro Ruth DE GOYCOECHEA*  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Argentina to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Lic. Pablo CANEDO*  
Président de l'Agence Cordolsa Culture S.E.  
Province de Cordoba  
H. Irigoyen Gzz  
5000 Cordoba, Argentina

*Ariel W. GONZALEZ*  
Secretary of Embassy  
Permanent Delegation of Argentina to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732  
Paris Cedex 15

*Eduardo José VENTURINI*  
Architecte  
Agence Cordolsa Tourisme  
Gouvernement de Cordoba  
Tucumán 360  
5000 Cordoba , Argentina

*Dr. William SILL*  
Head of Paleontology  
Museum of Natural Sciences  
University of San Juan  
España 460 Norte  
5400 San Juan

#### **AUTRICHE / AUSTRIA**

*H. Exc. Mr Tassilo F. OGRINZ*  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate of Austria to UNESCO  
UNESCO-House

*Mr Hans HORCICKA*  
Director  
Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture  
Minoritenplatz 5  
1014 Vienna, Austria

#### **AZERBAÏDJAN/AZERBAIJAN**

*M. Djafar GIYASI*  
Directeur  
Institut des Travaux de restauration d'Azerbaïdjan  
209 rue de l'Université  
75007 Paris

*M. Adaliat MAMEDOV*  
Architecte principal de l'Institut des travaux de restauration  
d'Azerbaïdjan  
209 rue de l'Université  
75007 Paris

*M. Ramiz ABOUTALIBOV*  
Secrétaire général  
Commission nationale azerbaïdjanaise pour l'UNESCO  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Ganjlar Meidany, 3  
37000 Baku, Azerbaïdjan

*Mlle Guliara MOUSTAFABEILI*  
Délégation permanente d'Azerbaïdjan auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **BELGIQUE / BELGIUM**

*S. Exc. M. Hubert van HOUTTE*  
Délégué permanent auprès de l'UNESCO  
4 Villa de Saxe  
75007 Paris

*M. Edgar GOEDLEVEN*  
Chef de Division des Monuments et des Sites  
Koning Albert II-laan 20 – Bus 7  
1000 Brussels, Belgique

*Mme Suzanne Van AERSCHOT-Van HAVERBEECK*  
Adjoint du Directeur  
Ministère de la Communauté flamande  
Division des Monuments et des Sites  
Waaistraat 1  
3000 Leuven, Belgique

*Marc THUNUS*  
Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'UNESCO  
Délégation permanente de Belgique auprès de l'UNESCO  
4 Villa de Saxe  
75007 Paris

*Mme Bénédicte SELFSLAGH*  
Relations internationales  
Ministère de la Région wallonne (Belgique)  
Direction générale de l'Aménagement du Territoire, du  
Logement et du Patrimoine  
Division du Patrimoine  
p/a 30 avenue Junot  
F-75018 Paris

*Gislaine DEVILLERS*  
Première Attachée  
Ministère de la Région wallonne  
Rue des Brigades d'Irlande  
1 - 5100 Jambes, Belgique

#### **BENIN**

*S. Exc. M. Olabiyi Babalola Joseph YAI*  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 Paris

*Isidore MONSI*  
Premier Conseiller  
Délégation permanente du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 Paris

#### **BOLIVIE / BOLIVIA**

*Fernando LAREDO*  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente de Bolivie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Eduardo LORINI*  
Délégation permanente de Bolivie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

**BRESIL / BRAZIL**

*Mr Joao LANARI BO*  
Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation of Brazil to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mr Jose Pedro de OLIVEIRA COSTA*  
National Secretary for Biodiversity and Forests  
Ministry for the Environment  
Esplanada dos Ministérios  
70000-000 Brasilia, Brazil

**CANADA**

*Ms Christina CAMERON*  
Director General, National Historic Sites  
Parks Canada  
25 Eddy Street 25-5-N  
Hull, Quebec, Canada K1A 0M5

*Ms Gisèle CANTIN*  
Affaires internationales  
Parcs Canada  
25 rue Eddy 25-6-Y  
Hull, Québec, Canada K1A 0M5

*Mr John PINKERTON*  
Analyst, Ecosystems Branch  
Parks Canada  
25 Eddy Street 25-4-O  
Hull, Quebec, Canada K1A 0M5

*Mme Dominique LEVASSEUR*  
Délégation permanente du Canada auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**CHILI / CHILE**

*Sr. Jaime LAVADOS*  
Embajador, Representante Permanente  
Permanente Delegation of Chile to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Sr. Samuel FERNANDEZ*  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanente Delegation of Chile to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Angel CABEZA*  
Executive Secretary  
National Monuments Council  
Alameda 651  
Santiago, Chile

*Sr. Omar JARA*  
Asesor Ministra de Relaciones Exteriores

*M. Hernan MONTECINOS*  
Consellor  
National Monuments Council  
Alameda 651  
Santiago, Chile

*Sr. Cecilia JIMENEZ*  
Directora del Patrimonio  
Municipalidad de Valparaíso

*Sr. Hernán PINTO*  
ALCADE DE VALPARAÍSO  
Chile

*Sr. Andrés CARMONA*  
Secretario del Alcalde de Valparaíso  
Chile

**CHINE / CHINA**

*Mr Zhan GUO*  
Director of Division  
National Administration of Cultural Heritage  
29 Wusi Street  
100009 Beijing, China

*Mr Zhe LI*  
Deputy Director of Division  
Department of International Relations  
Ministry of Construction of China  
Sanlihe Road 9  
100835 Beijing, China

*Mr Qishan ZOU*  
Premier Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente de la Chine auprès de l'UNESCO  
Bd Pasteur  
75015 Paris

*Ms Xiaoping YU*  
Program Officer  
Division of Programme and Planning  
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO  
37 Damucang Hutong  
Xidan, Beijing 100816, China

*Mr Jin XU*  
Deputy Mayor  
Dujianyan City of Sichuan Province  
China

*Ms Bai JIANG*  
Secretary-General  
Lhasa Municipal Government  
Tibet Autonomous Region  
Lhasa, China

*Mr Li AN*  
Director  
Lhasa Municipal Bureau of Cultural Relics  
Tibet Autonomous Region, China

*Mr Guangping ZHU*  
Mayor, Lyoyang City of Henan Province  
China

*Mr Xinting QIAN*  
Head, Yixian County of Anhui Province  
China

*Mr Jianhua ZHU*  
Deputy Director of Division  
Hubei Provincial Bureau of Cultural Relics  
Dushuyuan 23  
430060 Wuchang, China

*Ms Min YANG*  
Deputy Director  
Foreign Affairs Office  
Sichuan Provincial Government  
610000 Chengu, China

#### **COLOMBIE / COLOMBIA**

*Marcela ORDONEZ*  
Second Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **COSTA RICA**

*Ms Iris LEIVA-BILLAULT*  
Déléguée adjointe  
Délégation permanente du Costa Rica auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **DANEMARK / DENMARK**

*Mlle Sarah GANGELHOF*  
Délégation permanente du Danemark auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **EQUATEUR / ECUADOR**

*M. Mauricio MONTALVO*  
Délégué adjoint  
Délégation permanente de l'Equateur auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **ESPAGNE / SPAIN**

*S. Exc. M. Jesus EZQUERRA CALVO*  
Ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire  
Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente de l'Espagne auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*D. Luis LAFUENTE BATANERO*  
Directeur général adjoint à la Protection du patrimoine  
historique  
Ministère de l'éducation et de la culture

*D. Sergio PEREZ ESPEJO*  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente de l'Espagne auprès de l'UNESCO

#### **ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE / UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

*Ms Karen T. KOVACS*  
Senior Counselor to the  
Assistant Secretary for Fish and  
Wildlife and Parks  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC, 20240 USA

*Mr John J. REYNOLDS*  
Regional Director, Pacific West Region  
National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
600 Harrison Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA 94107 USA

*Mr James H. CHARLETON*  
International Cooperation Specialist  
Office of International Affairs  
National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20240 USA

*Ms Shirley M. HART*  
U.S. Observer to UNESCO  
Embassy of the United States of America  
2, Avenue Gabriel  
75382 Paris CEDEX 08

*Ms Stephanie MULOT*  
Programme Specialist  
U.S. Observer Mission to UNESCO  
Embassy of the United States of America  
2, Avenue Gabriel  
75382 Paris CEDEX 08

#### **FEDERATION DE RUSSIE / RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

*Gregory ORDJONIKIDZE*  
Conseiller  
Permanent Delegation of Russia to UNESCO  
8 rue de Prony  
75017 Paris

*Ms Lioudmila ANDREEVA*  
Vice-Mayor of Kazan City  
Kozmonauts, 57-27  
420061 Kazan, Russia

*Mr Rasikh SAGITOV*

Deputy Head Department of External Relations  
of the Administration of Kazan City  
Icozmonouts  
Kazan, Russia

*Ms Farida ZABIROVA*

Head of the Department of Conservation of Monuments of  
Administration of Kazan City  
Cosmonouts 49-43  
420061 Kazan, Russia

*Ms Galina IVANOVA*

Director of the Museum of "Kirilo-Belozersky Monastery"

*Mr Herald VZDORVOV*

State Research of the Institute of Restoration

*Ms Ludmila SHMATKOVA*

Deputy Minister of Environment Preservation of the Sakha  
Republic  
3/1, Dzerzhinsky str  
Yakutsk, 677000, Russia

## FRANCE

*S. Exc. M. Jean MUSITELLI*

Ambassadeur  
Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente de la France  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris

*Mme Catherine CARO*

Adjointe au sous-directeur  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
20 avenue de Ségur  
75007 Paris

*Mme Catherine DUMESNIL*

Conseillère technique  
Commission nationale française pour l'UNESCO  
57 Bd des Invalides  
75007 Paris

*Mme Eva CAILLART*

Chargée de Mission  
Direction Architecture / Patrimoine  
Ministère de la Culture  
8 rue Vivienne  
75002 Paris

## GRENADA / GRENADA

*Chafica HADDAD*

Premier Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente de Grenade auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Nicola CARAMASCHI*

Délégation permanente de Grenade auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

## HONDURAS

*S. Exc. Ms Sonia MENDIETA de BADAROUX*  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente de l'Honduras auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Juan Carlos BENDANA-PINEL*

Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente de l'Honduras auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Stéphanie DIAS*

Assistante administrative  
Délégation permanente de l'Honduras auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

## ISRAËL/ISRAEL

*S. Exc. M. Arye GABAY*

Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Israël to UNESCO  
3 rue Rabelais  
75008 Paris

*Mr Roei AMIT*

Israël Permanent Delegation  
3 rue Rabelais  
75008 Paris

*Ms Elisabeth Cohen-Tannoudji*

Israël Permanent Delegation  
3 rue Rabelais  
75008 Paris

*Mr Michael TURNER*

25 Caspi Street  
North Talpiot  
Jerusalem 93554, Israel

## IRAK/IRAQ

*S. Exc. M. Ali AL-MASHAT*

Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent d'Irak auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

## ITALIE / ITALY

*S. Exc. M. Gabriele SARDO*

Ambassadeur  
Délégué permanent de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mario PANARO*

Conseiller  
Direction générale pour la promotion culturelle du  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères

*M. Alberto CUTILLO*  
Conseiller Diplomatique  
Ministère des Biens et des activités culturelles  
Via del Collegio Romano 27  
001811 Rome, Italy

*M. Luciano MARCHETTI*  
Surintendance pour les biens culturels de Florence  
Piazza Pitti  
Firenze, Italy

*Mme Maria Rosaria PALOMBI*  
Ministère pour les biens et les activités culturelles

*M. le Conseiller PIETRO SEBASTINI*  
Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'UNESCO  
Délégation permanente de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mme Marina MISITANO*  
Délégation permanente de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **JAPON / JAPAN**

*Dr Nobuo KAMEI*  
Director  
Architecture and Other Structures Division  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
100-0013 Tokyo, Japan

*Mr Atsuhiko YOSHINAKA*  
Senior Planning Officer  
Environment Agency of Japan  
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
100-897 Tokyo, Japan

*Ms Tomoka SATOMI*  
Deputy Director  
Monuments and Sites Division  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-3-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
100-0013 Tokyo, Japan

*Dr Makoto MOTONAKA*  
Chief Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties  
Monuments and Sites Division  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
100-0013 Tokyo, Japan

*Mr Tsuyoshi HIRASAWA*  
Associate Specialist  
Monuments and Sites Division  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki  
Chiyoda-ku  
100-0013 Tokyo, Japan

*Mr Kazuhiko NISHI*  
Associate Specialist  
Architecture and Other Structures Division  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
100-0013 Tokyo, Japan

*Ms Kumiko YONEDA*  
Senior Research Scientist  
Japan Wildlife Research Center  
3-10-10 Shitaya, Taito-ku  
110-8976 Tokyo, Japan

*Mr Akihiro TAKAZAWA*  
Third Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **KENYA**

*Mr. George ABUNGU*  
Director General  
National Museums of Kenya  
P.O. Box 40658  
Nairobi, Kenya

#### **LITUANIE / LITHUANIA**

*S. Exc. M. Ugnė KARVELIS*  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente de Lituanie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **MALAISIE / MALAYSIA**

*Naharudin ABDULLAH*  
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Malaysia to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **NICARAGUA**

*Ximena FLORES*  
Ministre Conseiller  
Chargé des affaires du Nicaragua auprès de l'UNESCO  
Délégation permanente du Nicaragua  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Manuel Salvador BALDODANO PICADA*  
Director de Patrimonio Cultural  
Instituto Nicaragüence de Cultura  
Managua, Nicaragua

*Edgar ESPINOZA PEREZ*  
Instituto Nicaragüence de Cultura  
Managua, Nicaragua

*Clemente GUIDO*  
Director General  
Instituto Nicaragüence de Cultura  
Managua, Nicaragua

**NIGER**

*Amadou TCHEKO*  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente du Niger auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**NORVEGE / NORWAY**

*Kris ENDRESEN*  
Director  
Nordic World Heritage Office  
P.O. Box 8196 Dep.  
N-0034 Oslo, Norway

*Synnove VINSRYGG*  
Observer  
Nordic World Heritage Office  
P.O. Box 8196  
N-0034 Oslo, Norway

*Mr Hans-Jacob ROALD*  
Senior Advisor  
Nordic World Heritage Office  
Sollien 38  
5096 Bergen, Norway

**OMAN**

*H. Exc. Dr Musa BIN JAAFAR BIN HASSAN*  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Oman to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**PAKISTAN**

*Aïsha AFAROODUI*  
Deuxième Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente du Pakistan auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**PAYS-BAS / NETHERLANDS**

*M. Herald VOORNEVELD*  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Delegation of the Netherlands  
5 rue Eblé  
75006 Paris

*Mr Rob de Jong*  
Co-ordinator World Heritage  
Netherlands Department for Conservation  
Broederplein 41  
3703C Zeist, Netherlands

**PEROU / PERU**

*Mme Maria Luisa Federici SOTO*  
Ambassadeur  
Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*M. Alberto CARRION*  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO

*Luis MALDONADO*  
Chef du Projet  
Centre Historique de Arequipa  
Municipalidad Provincial de Arequipa  
Portal de la Municipalidad No. 110 Arequipa, Peru

*M. Carlos VASQUEZ*  
Premier Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Alonso RUIZ-ROSAS*  
Jefe de la Superintendencia Municipal de Arequipa  
Municipalidad de Arequipa  
Portal de la Municipalidad 110  
Arequipa, Peru

**PHILIPPINES**

*Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO*  
First Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Philippines to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

**PORTUGAL**

*S. Exc. M. Jorge Marques Leitão RITTO*  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent  
Délégation du Portugal auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Maria DURAO*  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation du Portugal auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Graça MORIGADINHO*  
Vereadora da Cultura e do Património  
Camara Municipal de Santarém  
Praça do Município  
2000-027 Santarém, Portugal

*José Miguel CORREIA NORAS*  
Presidente  
Camara Municipal de Santarém  
Praça do Município  
2000-027 Santarém

*Jorge CUSTODIO*  
Director do Projecto Municipal de Santarém a Património  
Mundial  
Camara Municipal de Santarém  
Praça do Município  
2000-027 Santarém, Portugal

*José Augusto RODRIGUES*  
Chefe de Divisao de Núcleos Históricos  
Camara Municipal de Santarem  
Praça do Municipio  
2000-027 Santarém, Portugal

**REPUBLIQUE DE COREE /  
REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

*Mr Byung-mo KIM*  
President  
Korean National University of Cultural Heritage

*Mr Sungman LIM*  
Director  
Cultural Cooperation Division  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
Seoul, Republic of Korea

*Mr Jae-sun SHIM*  
Director  
Cultural Properties Planning Division  
Office of Cultural Properties  
920 Dum sam-dong, Seo-gu  
Government Complex – Taejon  
302-701 Taejon, Republic of Korea

*Mr Baek-kee KIM*  
Director for Planning and Cultural Affairs  
City of Kyongju, Republic of Korea

*Mr CHUNG II*  
First Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Korea to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE /  
CZECH REPUBLIC**

*Dr Josef STULC*  
Director  
State Institute for the Heritage Preservation  
Americká 2  
12000 Prague, Czech Republic

*Michal BENES*  
Secrétaire pour les Affaires Culturelles de l'UNESCO  
Ministère de la Culture  
132 Milady Horakové  
16000 Prague 6, Czech Republic

**REPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D'IRAN /  
IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)**

*M. J. SAFAEI*  
Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation of Iran to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**REPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE /  
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA**

*Mohammed SHEYA*  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania  
to UNESCO  
13, avenue Raymond Poincaré  
75116 Paris

**ROYAUME-UNI DE GRANDE-BRETAGNE ET  
D'IRLANDE DU NORD /  
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND  
NORTHERN IRELAND**

*Mr Nigel PITTMAN*  
Head  
Buildings, Monuments and Sites Division  
Dept. for Culture, Media and Sport  
2-4 Cockspur St.  
London SW1Y 5DH, UK

*Mr Christopher YOUNG*  
Head of World Heritage and International Policy  
English Heritage  
23 Savile Row  
London W1X 1AA, UK

*M. Anthony WEIGHELL*  
Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
Monfstone House  
City Rd.  
Peterborough PE1 1J4, UK

**SAINTE LUCIE / SAINT LUCIA**

*Vera LACOEUIL*  
First Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Saint Lucia to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Hakima ABBAS*  
Alternate  
Permanent Delegation of Saint Lucia to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**SENEGAL**

*Modou GUEYE*  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente du Sénégal auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**SLOVAQUIE / SLOVAKIA**

*Jozef KLINDA*  
General Director Sekpo  
Ministry of the Environment  
Nam. L. Stura No. 1  
Bratislava 81235, Slovakia

*Peter GAZIK*  
Slovak Caves Administration  
Hodrona 11  
Liptovský Mikuláš, Slovakia

*Jozef MLAVÁČ*  
Director of Slovak Caves Administration  
Hodzova 11  
Liptovský Mikuláš, Slovakia

*Viera DVORAKOVA*  
Vice-Director ICOMOS Slovakia  
Institute for Monuments Preservation  
81406 Bratislava, Slovakia

*Katarína KOSOVA*  
Director General  
Institute of Monuments Preservation  
Cesta Na Červený Most 6  
81406 Bratislava, Slovakia

#### **SUEDE / SWEDEN**

*Ms Birgitta HOBERG*  
Senior International Officer  
National Heritage Board  
P.O. Box 5405  
S-11484 Stockholm, Sweden

*M. Örjan BERNER*  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent de la Suède auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mr Rolf LÖFGREN*  
National Swedish Environment Protection Agency  
S-19648 Stockholm, Sweden

*Ms Christina LINDAHL*  
National Swedish Environment Protection Agency  
S-19648 Stockholm, Sweden

*Ms Margaretha JOHNSON*  
Délégation de la Suède auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mr Curt FREDEN*  
Geological Survey of Sweden  
Box 670  
S-751 28 Uppsala, Sweden

*Ms Ann MOREAU*  
County Administration of Kalmar

*Ms Helena LAGER*  
County Administration of Kalma

*Mats HENRIKSSON*  
County Administration of Västernorrland  
S-87186 Harnosand, Sweden

*Mr Johan DANIELSSON*  
Federation of Swedish Farmers

*Mr Jan TURTINEN*  
Researcher at the research-centre SCORE of the Stockholm University  
10691 Stockholm, Sweden

#### **SUISSE / SWITZERLAND**

*S. Exc. M. Denis FELDMEYER*  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente de la Suisse auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Mme Francesca GEMNETTI*  
Présidente de la Commission nationale suisse pour l'UNESCO  
Département fédéral des affaires étrangères  
Bundesgasse 32  
CH-3003 BERNE, Suisse

#### **THAÏLANDE / THAILAND**

*Prof. Dr. Adul WICHENCHAROEN*  
Chairman  
National Committee on the Protection of the World Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
60/1 Rama 6 Road  
10400 Bangkok, Thailand

*MANIT SIRIWAN*  
Senior Environmental Planning Expert  
National Committee on the Protection of the World Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy & Planning  
Bangkok, Thailand

#### **TURQUIE / TURKEY**

*Mrs Gülseren CELIK*  
Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation of Turkey to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **VENEZUELA**

*Javier DIAZ*  
First Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Venezuela to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*Colmenares ABNER*  
Dean of Architecture Faculty  
Universidad Central de Venezuela  
Caracas 1050, Venezuela

*Maria Fernanda JAVA*  
Coordinator  
Universidad Central de Venezuela  
Caracas 1050, Venezuela

Ana Maria MARIN  
General Coordinator  
Universidad Central de Venezuela  
Caracas 1050, Venezuela

(ii) **ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES /  
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**AUSTRALIAN CONSERVATION FOUNDATION**

*Mr David SWEENEY*  
Research Officer – Policy Division  
Australian Conservation Foundation  
340 Gore Street  
Fitzroy 3065, Australia

**CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL POUR LA SCIENCE /  
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE**

*Dr. Larry H. KOHLER, Executive Director*  
ICSU (International Council for Science)  
51 Bd de Montmorency, 75016 Paris, France

*Dr. Anne LARIGAUDERIE*  
Environmental Sciences Officer  
ICSU (International Council for Science)  
51 Bd de Montmorency, 75016 Paris, France

*Brian WILLKINSON, Professor*  
STEP [Solutions to Environmental Problems]  
17-18 Union St,  
Ramsbury, Wiltshire SN8 2PR, UK

**GUNDJEHMI ABORIGINAL CORPORATION**

*Jacqui KATONA*  
Executive Officer  
Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation  
P.O. Box 245  
0886 Jabiru, NT Australia

*Christine CHRISTOPHERSEN*  
Research Officer  
Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation  
P.O. Box 245  
0886 Jabiru, NT Australia

**GREEN EARTH ORGANISATION**

*M. George AHADZIE*  
P.O. Box AN 16641  
Accra, Ghana

*M. George Danso SEKYERE*  
*Ms Martha Kudamenu*  
*Mr Kwaku Amanfi*  
*Mr Martin Adame*

**TIBET HERITAGE FUND**

*André ALEXANDER*  
Programme Director  
Tibet Heritage Fund  
Snowland Hotel  
850000 Chasa, Tibet Autonomous Region, China

*Ken OKUMA*  
Architect  
Tibet Heritage Fund  
Snowland Hotel  
850000 Lhasa, Tibet Autonomous Region, China

**AUSTRALIAN CONSERVATION FOUNDATION –  
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH**

*Mr Mark WAKEHAM*  
Coordinator  
Environment Centre of the Northern Territory  
Australian Conservation Foundation  
Friends of the Earth Australia  
C/GPO Box 2120  
Darwin NT Australia 0801

**WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE /  
FONDS MONDIAL POUR LA NATURE**

*M. Jean-Pierre d'HUART*  
Directeur chargé de la Conservation  
WWF-Belgium  
Chaussée de Waterloo 608  
B-1050 Bruxelles, Belgique

**CRATERRE**

Craterre  
BP 53 rue de la Buthière  
Maison Levrat, Parc Fallavier  
38092 Villefontaine Cedex, France

(iii) **ORGANISATIONS GOUVERNEMENTALES INTERNATIONALES /  
INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR  
L'ENVIRONNEMENT (PNUE) /  
UNITED NATIONS PROGRAMME FOR  
ENVIRONMENTAL (UNEP)**

*M. Daniel DROCOURT*  
Coordonnateur Programme 100 sites historiques  
Programme des Nations Unies pour l'Environnement  
(PNUE)  
Atelier de la ville de Marseille  
10 ter, square Belsunce  
13001 MARSEILLE

*Wanda HOSKIN*  
Senior Programme Officer (Mining)  
UNEP  
39-43 Quai André Citroën  
Bureau 1319  
75739 Paris Cedex 15

**INTERNATIONAL UNION OF TECHNICAL  
ASSOCIATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS**

*M. Jacques MONTLUÇON*  
Président Délégué "Comité Patrimoine UATI"  
UATI Secretariat  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

*M. Joseph PHARES*  
Président du Comité Patrimoine  
UATI  
1, Rue Miollis  
75015 Paris Cedex 15

(iv) **OBSERVATEURS QUI NE SONT PAS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL/  
OBSERVERS WHO ARE NOT PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

**PALESTINE**

*S. Exc. M. Ahmad ABDELRAZEK*  
Ambassadeur, Observateur permanent  
Mission permanente d'Observation de Palestine auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

*M. Mohammad YAKOUB*  
Adviser  
Mission permanente d'Observation de Palestine auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis – 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**III. SECRETARIAT DE L'UNESCO / UNESCO SECRETARIAT**

Centre du patrimoine mondial / World Heritage Centre

Mr Mounir BOUCHENAKI  
Director

Mr Georges ZOUAIN  
Deputy Director

Ms Minja YANG  
Director, Asia/Pacific Region

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO  
Mr Natarajan ISHWARAN  
Mr Herman van HOOFF  
Ms Elizabeth WANGARI  
Ms Mechtild ROSSLER  
Ms Josette ERFAN  
Ms Sarah TITCHEN  
Ms Junko TANIGUCHI  
Ms Vesna VUJICIC-LUGASSY  
Ms Frédérique ROBERT  
Mr Peter STRASSER

Mr Feng JING  
Mr Peter STOTT  
M. Stéphane DUCLOT  
Ms Joanna SULLIVAN  
Ms Jane DEGEORGES  
Ms Marianne RAABE  
Mr David MARTEL  
Ms Claire SERVOZ  
Ms Marie-Christine BOTTE  
Ms Réjane HERVE  
Ms Nina DHUMAL

Ms Sonia RAMZI  
Mr Shinji MATSUMOTO

Division of Ecological Sciences /  
Division des Sciences Ecologiques

Ms M. JARDIN  
M. Sami MANKOTO  
Mrs Jane ROBERTSON  
VERNHES

Division of Cultural Heritage/  
Division du Patrimoine culturel

M. L. LEVI-STRAUSS  
Deputy Director

**SPEECH BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNESCO DIRECTOR-GENERAL  
AT THE OCCASION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION  
OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

Monsieur le président du Comité du patrimoine mondial, Monsieur Abdelaziz Touri, Mesdames et Messieurs les membres du Bureau du Comité du patrimoine mondial, Mesdames et Messieurs les délégués et observateurs, Excellences, chers collègues,

C'est un grand honneur pour moi de vous souhaiter, au nom de Koïchiro Matsuura, Directeur général de l'UNESCO, la bienvenue à la vingt-quatrième session du Bureau du Comité du patrimoine mondial, et de vous transmettre l'estime continue qu'il porte pour vos travaux et pour la Convention pour la protection du patrimoine mondial, culturel et naturel.

Cette année encore, comme les années précédentes, la tâche qui vous incombe est volumineuse et lourde de responsabilité : le nombre de propositions d'inscription qui doit être étudié - 87 - est le plus élevé de l'histoire de la Convention. Le mouvement constaté depuis plusieurs années déjà, mais surtout depuis la dernière Assemblée générale des Etats parties à la Convention, vers une Liste plus équilibrée et représentative de toutes les cultures et régions du monde, commence à porter les premiers fruits, mais il peine encore dans ses efforts. En effet, la majorité des propositions d'inscription nous parvient encore une fois des pays de la région géo-culturelle européenne et plus de trois quarts d'entre elles concernent des biens culturels. Il faut encourager les efforts des Etats parties à limiter volontairement de nouvelles inscriptions et à proposer uniquement des biens dans des catégories sous-représentées. Plusieurs pays se sont déjà concrètement engagés dans ce sens. Nous saluons avec grand plaisir les trois Etats parties qui soumettent cette année pour la première fois des propositions d'inscription : l'Azerbaïdjan, la Malaisie et le Suriname.

Le chiffre record de propositions reçues, ainsi que le nombre élevé de rapports d'état de conservation des sites à étudier - 61 - , mettent à rude épreuve les capacités du Secrétariat, celles des organes consultatifs, ainsi que les vôtres, à consacrer le temps et l'attention nécessaire à l'étude des douze points de l'ordre de jour qui se trouvent sur votre ordre du jour. Une prise de décision réfléchie et sérieuse est impérative pour le maintien de la crédibilité de la Convention et afin d'éviter la dévalorisation de la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Depuis le début de l'an 2000, quatre groupes de travail et d'étude, mandatés par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa dernière session de décembre dernier, à Marrakech, se sont penchés sur ces questions fondamentales qui sont : 1. La mise en œuvre efficace de la Convention, 2. La représentativité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial, 3. La représentation équitable au sein du Comité du patrimoine mondial, et 4. La révision des orientations pour la mise en œuvre de la Convention. Leurs propositions constructives

vous seront présentées au cours de cette réunion pour vos délibérations et recommandations à soumettre au Comité.

Ladies and Gentlemen, at several occasions during the first six months of this year, obvious proof was received of the vitality of the World Heritage Convention. At the Whale Sanctuary of El Vizcaino in Mexico the proposed saltworks project was cancelled following a UNESCO-led mission to the site and the recommendations made by the Committee at its 23rd session. Another example of successful co-operation with a State Party is illustrated through the case of Hampi, in India, one of the sites which the Committee included on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its last session. UNESCO has recently been informed of the decision of the State Government of Karnataka to relocate the two bridges threatening the integrity and authenticity of the site.

Along with strengthening the links with States Parties' conservation authorities, it is equally important to open up to new partnerships: methods may be different but the goal is always the same - preservation of the World Heritage. The United Nations Foundation commitment to a multi-year, multi-million dollar engagement in support of World Natural Heritage areas directly relevant to conserving biodiversity of outstanding universal value, is one such partnership, illustrating the growing interest of the private sector for UNESCO's work in this field.

This year, as the first in the six-year cycle for periodic reporting adopted in 1998 by the Committee, the Arab States have initiated the preparation of their periodic reports, including state of conservation reports for their sites. The reports will be submitted to the 24th session of the Committee end November 2000 in Cairns, Australia.

In line with the reforms taking place in UNESCO, and in the interest of rationalisation and efficiency of its Secretariat, the Director General decided in January to attach the World Heritage Centre to the Culture Sector. He once again transmits his particular assurances to the Bureau that the Centre's specificity and its intersectorial and transdisciplinary nature will be preserved. Furthermore, the procedure for the appointment of a new Director of the World Heritage Centre is nearly completed and a nomination is expected to be made in the very near future. In 2000, the World Heritage Centre has been strengthened with one new post. The UNESCO Task Force on Secretariat structure, staffing and management systems, created to assess the current organisational structure and staff establishment of the Secretariat, is working towards a better-balanced structure of the Secretariat, a rejuvenation of staff and is adopting modalities and procedures for transition towards the new structure and staffing of the Organisation as a whole. These changes will in the future facilitate the implementation of all UNESCO activities in

the field, including the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Finally, the 30th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention is due in two years time. Commemorative events should be organised first of all in the States Parties themselves to mark this historic date for international co-operation in the field of heritage preservation. Among the 160 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, 114 of them with sites included on the List, many look towards the Convention and its mechanism of international solidarity as their most important means of safeguarding their natural assets or their cultural heritage. Let us approach the 30th anniversary as one of strengthened co-operation, hope and tolerance. On behalf of the Director General, I wish you a very successful meeting.

## BUDAPEST PROPOSALS

### Preamble

The participants of the Integrated Urban Conservation Training Workshop and Urban Archaeology Seminar for World Heritage cities of Central and Eastern Europe assembled in Budapest and in Noszvaj, Hungary during the period June 18-24, 2000,

concerned that the contribution of heritage to urban quality of life has not been fully integrated in Hungary and the region in which it is situated, agree to the following points.

- **Identity and competitiveness.** Our urban heritage is an irreplaceable source not only of identity, but of mutual respect and social inclusion in human development. Efforts to strengthen care for the sources of this identity offer significant comparative advantages in economic development for Hungary and the countries of the region advantages. As a consequence, urban conservation deserves to be placed at the highest levels within political agendas. If developed with the proper involvement of all stakeholders throughout the process, the urban heritage can become the most important force available in the region for strengthening identity in the context of globalisation.
- **World Heritage sites and competitiveness.** The presence of urban World Heritage sites in the region of Central and Eastern Europe confers additional competitive advantages in regional development. These sites offer critically important opportunities to develop and test models of best conservation practice. In developing these models, it would be important for urban World Heritage sites to develop innovative management plans through planning processes involving impact assessment analysis in key areas of conservation and development interest.
- **Nature of urban heritage.** Urban heritage cannot be viewed separately from community development. Our urban heritage must also be understood as multi-faceted, including all those features, spatial patterns, functions, traditions and skills that contribute to and define the sense of character of historic places. As a consequence, conservation efforts must be directed not just to the monuments or special features of historic urban environments but to all the sources of significance, be these tangible or intangible, and must involve all those stakeholders for whom these sources hold meaning.
- **Urban archaeological resources.** In this regard, the care and management of urban archaeological resources, often overlooked in city development, and which constitute an essential source of understanding in historic cities, merit special attention and full integration within urban planning and development processes.
- **Decision-making.** In line with the objectives of Agenda 21, decision-making and authority for heritage as for all other municipal interests, is best located as close as possible to those affected by the decisions. Commitment to this principle may ultimately require a significant transfer of responsibility and resources from national levels to regional and local levels, while maintaining policy frameworks, research and documentation capacity, and conservation standards and principles at national levels. At all levels, effective urban conservation demands an integrated approach, involving the fullest inter-sectoral and inter-disciplinary collaboration in exploring development options.
- **Stakeholders.** Without bringing together heritage experts, developers, investors and lenders, community groups and residents, and public administrators and managers in order to increase understanding of each others' legitimate interests and objectives and their ability to work toward mutually acceptable forms of urban development, conservation efforts will remain fragmented and ineffective.
- **Critical moment.** The numerous institutional changes, the contradictions found in rapidly emerging legal and administrative frameworks, and the limited financial means in the region accompanying efforts to participate in the political unification of Europe demand a fully integrated approach to improving conditions for urban conservation.

**Noszvaj, June 25. 2000**

### **Statement of the Representative of UNEP on the Mining Spill in Romania**

Mr. President, I wish to make 2 comments.

1. With respect to the Baia Mare tailings accidents, there is no long term impact from cyanide for technical chemical reasons. Also, the UNEP/OCHA Assessment team noted that, shortly after the cyanide plume passed, aquatic micro-organisms were rapidly recovering.
2. UNEP considers it inappropriate and unhelpful to attribute all heavy metal contaminations in the area to the Baia Mare accidents alone because of the high level of historic pollution including heavy metals in the area. The UNEP/OCHA Assessment Mission reported that all existing heavy metal contamination exceeds quality criteria levels used in many other countries.

The Baia Mare cyanide containing tailings spills have focussed attention on the pollution problems of the area and hopefully this attention will lead to its clean-up.

The Aurul mine reopened June 13 with technical, operational improvements because the operation was addressing other existing environmental problems.

For your information, UNEP is undertaking several initiatives to implement the Assessment Mission Report recommendations and I suggest you consult the UNEP/UNCTAD Mineral Resources Forum website (<http://www.natural-resources.org/environment/>) for regular information updates.

Distribution limited

WHC-2000/CONF.202/14  
Paris, 30 June 2000  
Original : English/French

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

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

**BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Twenty-fourth session  
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room IV  
26 June-1 July 2000**

**Item 8 of the Agenda: Provisional Agenda of the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (23-24 November 2000, Cairns, Australia)**

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. Nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List
4. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
5. Requests for International Assistance
6. Other business
7. Closure of the session.

**World Heritage****24 BUR**

Distribution limited

WHC-2000/CONF.202/15rev  
 Paris, 30 June 2000  
 Original : English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
 ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
 WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-fourth session  
 Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room IV  
 26 June-1 July 2000

**Item 9 of the Agenda: Provisional Agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee (27 November - 2 December 2000, Cairns, Australia)**

1. Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. Report on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the twenty-third session of the Committee
4. Reports of the Rapporteur on the sessions of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
5. Report of the Bureau on the work of:
  - 5.1 Task Force on the implementation of the Convention
  - 5.2 Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List
  - 5.3 Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee
  - 5.4 International Expert Meeting on the Revision of the Operational Guidelines
6. Progress report on regional actions for the implementation of the Global Strategy Action Plan
7. Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List

8. Periodic Reporting:
  - 8.1 Report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage in the Arab States
  - 8.2 Progress report on regional strategies for periodic reporting
9. State of conservation of properties inscribed on List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List
  - 9.1 Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger
  - 9.2. Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
10. Activities concerning World Heritage documentation, information and education
11. Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the budget for 2001, and presentation of the Provisional Budget for 2002
12. Training Strategy:
  - 12.1 Global Training Strategy
  - 12.2 Proposal for the establishment of a Heritage Partnership Programme
13. International Assistance:
  - 13.1 Report on the evaluation of international assistance and prioritization in granting international assistance to States Parties
  - 13.2 Requests for international assistance
14. Information Strategy
15. Date, place and Provisional Agenda of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
16. Date and place of the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee
17. Other business
18. Adoption of the report of the session
19. Closure of the session