

Distribution limited

WHC-01/CONF.207/3  
Paris, 25 October 2001  
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-fifth extraordinary session

Helsinki, Finland  
7 – 8 December 2001

**Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

This document presents reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

**Decision required:**

PART I: The Bureau is requested to examine the reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and take the appropriate decisions under the following three headings:

- (a) The Bureau recommends the Committee to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
- (b) The Bureau transmits the state of conservation report to the Committee for action;
- (c) The Bureau transmits the state of conservation report together with its own observation/recommendation to the Committee for noting.

PART II: The Bureau is requested to take note of the information provided.

## INTRODUCTION

1. This document deals with **reactive monitoring** as it is defined in the Operational Guidelines: "The reporting by the Centre, other sectors of UNESCO and the advisory bodies to the Bureau and the Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage sites that are under threat". Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the eventual deletion of properties from the World Heritage List (paragraphs 48-56 of the Operational Guidelines) and for the inclusion of properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger (paragraphs 86-93 of the Operational Guidelines).

2. Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger are submitted directly to the World Heritage Committee. The Bureau is requested to examine reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

3. The present document is also made available to the members of the Committee for consideration as Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/3. The observations/recommendations of the Bureau will be reflected in the report of the Bureau session that will be transmitted to the Committee as Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/4.

## STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT

4. To facilitate the work of the Bureau, state of conservation reports are presented in a standard format that includes the following information:

- **Name of property (State Party)**
- *International assistance*
- *Previous deliberations* (Reference is made to relevant paragraph numbers from the Reports of the twenty-fifth ordinary session of the Bureau (25 - 30 June 2001, Paris, France) and the twenty-fourth ordinary session of the Committee (27 November - 2 December 2000,

Cairns, Australia). In order to limit the length of this working document to a minimum number of pages, texts from those two reports have not been repeated in this document.)

- *Issues*
- *New information*
- **Action required**

5. In addition, this document is now divided into two parts:

### **PART I Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for examination**

This part of the document includes state of conservation reports on which the Bureau is requested to take action, i.e. adopt a proposed decision under the following three categories:

- (a) The Bureau recommends the Committee to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
- (b) The Bureau transmits the state of conservation report to the Committee for action;
- (c) The Bureau transmits the state of conservation report together with its own observation/recommendation to the Committee for noting.

### **PART II Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for noting.**

This part includes information on the state of conservation of specific properties that is transmitted to the Bureau for noting.

---

## **PART I Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for examination**

### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

### **MINING AND WORLD HERITAGE**

The Bureau at its twenty-fifth session noted that, following the review of the results of the technical workshop on World Heritage and Mining by the last session of the Committee, the proceedings of the workshop were published by the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME), IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. A copy has been sent in July 2001 to all Committee members for information.

The Bureau also noted the change in the organization of the mining industry relating to the Global Mining Initiative's (GMI) decision to put in place a new organization. On 21 May 2001, the Board of Directors of the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME) agreed to transform the organization into the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), to be based in London. ICMM has been given a broader mandate by the membership to focus principally on providing sustainable development leadership for the industry. An environmental scientist has been appointed the Secretary-General of ICMM in October 2001. The membership comprises leading companies from the mining, metals and minerals industry (represented by their Chairmen/CEOs), as well as office bearers of regional, national and commodity associations.

The objectives of ICMM are as follows:

- to initiate, conduct, promote and communicate research and analysis into the interaction of the world's mining, minerals and metals industries with the economy, the environment and communities;
- to seek to lead change within these industries by stimulating discussion and coordinating activities between and among member companies, others involved with the industry and the industry's regional, national, commodity and international associations;
- to develop and communicate a clear and authoritative position on global issues affecting the future of the mining, minerals and metals industries;
- to determine and promote global best practice performance standards within these industries;
- to maintain a high-level dialogue with government and inter-governmental bodies, non-governmental and community organisations, academic and professional institutions and other stakeholders.

The inaugural meeting of the Governing Council of ICMM has been held on 24 October 2001 in London. Issues related to mining and biodiversity will continue to be a priority for this new organization. The Bureau may wish to note that following the creation of ICMM, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN will review the proposal for the establishment of a Working Group on World Heritage and Mining, as proposed by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session.

## **Africa**

### **Dja Forest Reserve (Cameroon)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List: 1987 under criteria N (ii) and (iv)

#### *International assistance:*

US\$56,000 under Technical Co-operation and US\$167,410 under Training (1984 to 1999).

#### *Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee: Annex IV

Twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee: paragraph VIII. 24

#### *Issues:*

Illegal poaching, logging

#### *New information:*

During August and September, The Guardian (London, UK) published two articles on illegal poaching in Cameroon, with particular mention of and Dja Faunal Reserve. One article criticised UNESCO for not doing enough to halt the loss of wildlife in Dja Faunal Reserve, quoting a report by the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) that said "Hunters operate almost unimpeded in the Dja Reserve, despite its status as a world heritage site." The second article focuses on the role logging operations and their staff play in wild meat consumption and trade. Figures reported include:

- 13 tonnes of bushmeat passed through one village bordering Dja Faunal Reserve within two months. Most of it was bound for Yaoundé.
- The logging roads used for the transportation bushmeat to Yaoundé come to within 500 metres of the border of Dja Faunal Reserve.
- Three tonnes of meat arrive at Yaoundé's four bushmeat markets daily.
- The number of men hunting in the logging concession adjoining Dja Faunal Reserve equals the number of men employed by the concessionaire.
- Each hunter may lay 200 snares, and capture on average three or four chimps and two gorillas a month.

IUCN reports that the articles also raised concern about the effectiveness of the 50 'eco-guards' funded by the EU, who are responsible for law enforcement in and around Dja. Both articles claim that the guards are not making a difference to the poaching problem. They are hampered by the State requirement that any meat they confiscate - including that of protected species - must be auctioned for State revenue, hence creating a perverse incentive to protect wildlife. IUCN notes that such a situation can negatively impact protected area relations with local people. IUCN reports that, in collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and TRAFFIC, the wildlife monitoring programme of IUCN and WWF, convened a technical workshop in Yaounde, Cameroon from 17-20 September 2001. The workshop, entitled "Links Between Biodiversity Conservation, Livelihoods and Food Security and the Use of Wild Meat", aimed to: forge functional links among the species conservation, food security/community development and commercial sectors in order to identify means to address conservation and development concerns linked to the unsustainable use of wild fauna for food; contribute to the process of identifying, prioritising and planning practical responses to address priority conservation and development concerns related to the use of wild fauna for food; and provide input to a GEF proposal related to the use of wild fauna to contribute to sustainable livelihoods in Central Africa.

IUCN and the Centre note that the UNESCO/FAO African World Heritage Forest Initiative (AWHFI) concept document, currently being developed for submission to the UNF Board for the July 2002 round of biodiversity grants, includes Dja Faunal Reserve. IUCN received an update on activities of the Africa Working Group of the CEO Forum from the NGO co-chair. The Forum, initiated by the World Bank in 1998, comprises chief executives of the major logging firms worldwide. The CEO Africa Working Group (CEO-AWG) comprises the chief executives of the major European logging firms active in Central Africa, representatives from various conservation NGOs (WCS, IUCN, WWF) and officials from the World Bank and the European Union.

From this meeting it was reported that the logging companies had produced a code of conduct, which included a clause for independent monitoring. The code of conduct and associated operational work programme is to be finalised on 5 October 2001. The Forum was working

on developing some additional clauses to add to the code, notably:

- A clause on sub-contracting and environmental responsibilities of the sub-contractor.
- A clause on the establishment of small totally protected areas within logging concessions.
- A clause on bush meat.

The latter includes two key sub-clauses requiring logging companies to make available alternative protein supplies for all its employees and families, and requiring them to ban the use of their facilities and transport for illegal hunting operations.

The Centre and IUCN observe with concern that the reports on poaching and logging, if accurately reported, suggest that it may be necessary to consider whether the site should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They acknowledge that the problem is due to a combination of factors including law enforcement, political commitment, cultural differences, resources, and food availability. In light of the recent Wild Meat workshop it is hoped that prompt and effective action will be taken by the State Party to address these damaging trends.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee welcomes the recommendations of IUCN, and calls upon the State Party to take urgent action to halt illegal poaching in the Reserve, and requests a full report from the State Party on this situation by 1 February 2002. This report shall be submitted for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee (June 2002), at which time it will decide on the need for a mission to the site. Furthermore, the Committee commends the CEO Africa Working Group for its initial efforts in bringing stakeholders together to tackle the environmental problems associated with logging operations. The code of conduct should be supported, and the Committee urges the CEO-AWG to strengthen its efforts to involve Asian companies in the work of the group and to undertake every effort to include all logging companies working in Cameroon.”

### **Mount Kenya National Park/Natural Forest (Kenya)**

Inscribed in 1997 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (ii) and (iii)

#### International assistance:

US\$25,000 under Technical Co-operation in 2000

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – page 22 paragraph XIII .25

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph IV.91-92

#### Issues:

Deforestation. Encroachment. Marijuana cultivation within site.

#### New information:

The Centre and IUCN received a letter from the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) noting that IUCN had ‘requested KWS nominate Mt Kenya World Heritage Site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger’, and expressing opposition to the ‘proposed de-listing of Mt Kenya World Heritage site. The letter noted that the management of the site had recently been transferred from the Forest Department to the KWS with the aim of enhancing management and enforcement. The KWS reported that it had extended the boundaries of the site to include the natural forest, and was in the process of preparing an integrated management plan. IUCN has responded to the State Party by: clarifying its role as an Advisory Body; outlining the process involved in listing sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger; explaining the implications of inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and outlining the purpose of monitoring missions and the need for such missions to be approved by the State Party. The Centre and IUCN note that the delay in receiving an invitation from the Kenyan State Party for a monitoring mission appears to be related to a misunderstanding on what was requested by the Bureau in June 2001. The KWS was of the understanding that the request for a mission with the view to considering whether the site should be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger constituted automatic inclusion in this List, as well as subsequent removal from the World Heritage List.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee requests the State Party to invite a mission to the site as soon as possible to enable an independent assessment of the state of conservation of the World Heritage site.”

### **Banc d'Arguin National Park, Mauritania**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List: 1989 under criteria N (ii) and (iv)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations: N/A.

#### Issues:

Petroleum prospecting, International over-harvesting of fish resources.

#### New information:

The issue of 23 June 2001 of the *New Scientist* included an article on Banc d'Arguin National Park. Entitled “Breaking the Banc: Africa’s largest marine sanctuary is failing”, the article describes the threat to the Park’s fish stocks posed by ‘tens of thousands of traditional fishermen’ and ‘hundreds of giant foreign trawlers’ that fish at the edge of the Park boundary. The article provided the example of the collapse of the Mauritanian mullet fishery in the early 1990’s following a twenty-fold increase in the catch. The main harvesters were Senegalese fishermen, whose own mullet fisheries had collapsed, seeking to sell mullet roe to the European market. The article puts most blame on the large

international trawlers, many of them European (the largest European vessel can hold 7,000 tonnes of fish and is dedicated full time to Mauritanian waters) who have the financial power to buy fishing rights from the Mauritanian Government. It notes that the trawlers have displaced traditional fishermen who are placing greater pressure to be allowed inside the Park and World Heritage site.

The Centre and IUCN note the importance of working with traditional fishermen to help address their concerns. A vital element of effective management of the coastal zone is the protection of key ecosystems such as those within the World Heritage site. The increasing involvement of international trawlers is a cause for grave concern as it can potentially negate such initiatives.

In September 2001 the Park reported to IUCN that two pre-exploration permits for petroleum exploration within the Park had been signed by the Government of Mauritania. The Park is currently seeking to undertake an urgent assessment of the legal situation in Mauritania and its obligations under international conventions, including the World Heritage Convention, in order to halt the exploration and production permits. It is seeking assistance to undertake this assessment.

The Park reports that the situation with the proposed road between Nouadhibou and Nouackchott, which will pass close to the boundary of the Park, remains inconclusive.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

"The Bureau welcomes the recommendations of IUCN and requests a report from the State Party by 1 February 2002 for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau (April 2002). This report should address the following issues: the status of petroleum permits relating to oil exploration within the Park; threats to marine resources of the Park, and the status of the road between Nouadhibou and Nouackchott."

#### **Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal)**

Inscribed in 1981 on the World Heritage List under criterion N (iv)

#### International assistance:

US\$ 34,013 for Technical Co-operation 1985-1990; No International Assistance since 1990.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph VIII.27 / Annex X page 116.

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.93-96.

#### Issues:

Capture and relocation of wildlife

#### New information:

A Centre/IUCN monitoring mission to the site was undertaken from 5 to 15 July 2001. The full mission report is provided as an information document WHC-2001/CONF.207/INF.7. As suggested in the report, the

Centre and IUCN propose that an aerial survey should be conducted as a matter of urgency. This survey should determine the number and distribution of giant eland in Niokolo-Koba NP's eastern part and the adjacent Faleme Hunting Zone. Because of the present low density of giant eland, a total coverage of the primary giant eland area in Niokolo-Koba NP is recommended. A sample count following standardised methodology could be undertaken in the remaining areas of Niokolo-Koba NP and the Faleme Hunting Zone.

All National Park staff working in Niokolo-Koba or visiting the Park should be encouraged to record detailed giant eland information on standardised data sheets whenever possible. These records could possibly be kept at the Park offices in Tambacouda and later entered into a computer database. Observations should include standardised information such as date, habitat type, locality, group sizes and number of calves. Other regular visitors to Niokolo-Koba NP, such as tour operators, could also be encouraged to collect specific information on giant eland. It is desirable to protect a small number of giant eland outside Niokolo-Koba NP. The present six giant eland in Bandia Reserve could serve this purpose. No further captures and relocations of giant eland from Niokolo-Koba NP to areas outside the Park should be considered for the time being. A short field research project on giant eland should be considered for submission requesting support from the World Heritage Fund. This project should collect detailed population data, movements and habitat use. A one-year field project should be able to achieve the initial goals. Radio collaring of a few selected individuals would be essential to ensure that study animals could be reliably located.

Effective law enforcement (anti-poaching operations) will remain of critical importance, not only as far as the survival of giant eland is concerned but also other species in the Park. It is proposed that the services of a specialist consultant be sought to consider various alternative law-enforcement strategies. This must be done in close co-operation with National Parks' authorities as well as community representatives in the Niokolo-Koba region. The project "The protection, reproduction and veterinary control of large antelopes, such as the Derby eland" proposed by the Tropical and Sub-tropical Agronomy at the ITSZ CZU in Prague, should be reviewed by all key stakeholder groups. The project could play a major role in ensuring the survival of the giant eland.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following for transmission to the Committee:

"The Committee endorses the recommendations of the Centre/IUCN mission, and requests the State Party to review the document and report back with an action plan for implementation of the recommendations by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Committee (June 2002)."

## **Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania)**

Inscribed in 1979 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (ii)(iii)(iv)

### International assistance:

US\$ 79,500 Technical Co-operation; US\$ 20,000 Emergency Assistance.

### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph VIII.27 / Annex X page 117.

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.98-102.

### Issues:

Growing pressure for alternative land use, in-migration; cultivation, overgrazing, tourist vehicles.

### New information:

The Centre and IUCN received a report of extensive and increasing domestic crop cultivation in the Ngorongoro Crater and wider Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA), 97% of which constitutes the World Heritage site. A letter from the Centre dated 18 July 2001 was addressed to the Permanent Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania to UNESCO with a request to verify the situation with the Ngorongoro Conservation Area authorities and to inform the Centre. The same letter was copied to the Frankfurt Zoological Society that has undertaken projects in NCA. Concerns have been raised over the expansion and the negative impacts on wildlife and the Masaai traditional pastoralism. Specifically the concerns raised relate to:

- Cultivation on very steep slopes of 7.5 to 12.5 degrees. Cultivation was most intense behind Embakai Crater, around Endulen and on the slopes of the Ngorongoro Highland between the Crater and the Serengeti National Park
- Growing pressure for alternative land use which has reduced most of the Maasai's grazing lands, making Ngorongoro the last sanctuary with intact grazing land for the resident Maasai and the pastoral communities normally situated outside the boundaries of the NCAA.
- Steady increase in residents in Ngorongoro, mainly through immigration from other areas
- Changes in the agricultural practices of the Masaai pastoralists, including increased sedentarisation, intensification of livestock production, changing food traditions and introduction of modern housing and development inputs.

In response to the above report, the Conservator of Ngorongoro in his letter to the Centre dated 7 August 2001, notes that in 1995 the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority commissioned a team of experts to consider the issue of domestic cultivation. The study concluded that the cultivation practised by the Masaai pastoralists was not a threat to conservation and pastoralism interests. It recommended cultivation carried out by non-Masaai pastoralists should be halted as it posed a threat to the integrity of the Conservation Area. It also noted that increasing numbers of in-migrants who might not abide by Masaai relations and customs, could threaten

the functioning of the Masaai's social institutions which regulate land use.

Further, the Conservator of Ngorongoro notes that the following actions have been enforced:

- Identification of in-migrants and human and livestock census
- Acquiring alternative land for cultivation outside the Conservation Area for resettling of in-migrants and where domestic cultivation could be carried out
- Follow up study to the 1995 study
- Implementation of a DANIDA funded project aimed at revitalising the livestock- based economy in order to ensure that cultivation remains secondary to livestock
- Continuing the grain importation scheme to help the resident population gain access to grain at cost price, and therefore discourage crop cultivation

In its statement addressed to the Centre dated 27 August 2001, the Frankfurt Zoological Society express concern that “without a decision from the government, cultivation will continue and threaten not only one of the world's most famous wildlife areas but also one of the last grazing lands for the Maasai cattle”.

An article published in September 2001 by *The Guardian* newspaper entitled “PM warns Maasai against environmental damage”, reports that:

*“The Prime Minister of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Frederick Sumaye, has warned Maasai communities living inside the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) against tampering with the natural ecosystem and the unique geological set of the NCA which have put Tanzania on top among the World tourist attraction sites”.* The Prime Minister is also recorded as saying to villagers that

*“You should not carry out farming activities inside the conservation area because such an activity would interfere with nature and destroy this world heritage site which Tanzania is proud to own”.*

IUCN notes that the serious encroachment and destruction of the highland forests at the northern edge of the site continues. IUCN notes further that cultivation, even at a very low level, excludes use of the area by larger wildlife species in the long term, and that only a very small percentage of the NCAA is suitable for cultivation because of rainfall, soil and slope conditions.

IUCN notes that:

- the Ngorongoro Conservation Area was separated from the Serengeti and gazetted as a multi -use conservation area, hence sustainable use such as grazing is allowed
- Limited subsistence cultivation was allowed in the early nineties due to food shortages, declining livestock and population growth. This alone was not a serious threat. What has become a serious threat is the commercial farming introduced by immigrant farmers, and this is what needs to be addressed urgently
- There is some disagreement about the impact of the Masaai practising agriculture within the NCA. There is the possibility that Masaai agriculture (distinct from

traditional pastoralism or livestock rearing), is also negatively impacting on the site

- The management of the NCA requires more effective scientific guidance

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following for transmission to the Committee for action:

“The Committee requests the State Party to provide a report on the encroachment situation in the northern section of the World Heritage site and on the impacts of commercial farming introduced by immigrant farmers on the integrity and values of this World Heritage site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Committee.”

### **Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania)**

Inscribed in 1981 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (iii) (iv)

#### International assistance:

US\$ 30,000 (1990) for technical co-operation and US\$ 20,000 (1997) for training;

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph VIII.27

#### Issues:

Impact of hydroelectric project and water diversion in Kenya; threats to wildlife migration and populations.

#### New information:

The Centre and IUCN have received several reports concerning the proposed Ewaso Ng'iro Hydroelectric Project (ENP) in Kenya, and its potential impacts on the Serengeti and Mara ecosystems. The State-owned Kenya Electricity Generating Company is proposing to build three dams along the Ewaso Ng'iro River that would generate 180 MW of electricity and is expected to cost 350 million dollars by the time of completion in 2007. This scheme, if implemented, would link the Mara River system through a 3.5 km tunnel with the upper drainage of the Ewaso Ng'iro (south) River, thus reversing the Mara's flow into the Ewaso Ng'iro River, finally draining into Lake Natron in the east instead of Lake Victoria in the west.

There have been a series of Environmental Impact Assessments and discussions on the ENP which have held its implementation up. Potential impacts, if implemented, include downstream effects on Lake Natron in Tanzania (possible extension to the proposed Rift Valley Lake Reserves World Heritage site) and potential ecological impact on the Serengeti National Park. IUCN has received a report by the Frankfurt Zoological Society, which notes potential impacts of the project, if implemented, on the conservation of the Serengeti National Park:

- The main feature of the Serengeti Ecosystem, which extends across several protected areas, including the

World Heritage site, is the wildebeest migration. Wildlife numbers in this system are controlled by the dry season rainfall (and consequent grass availability) in the Mara River system. Presently the Serengeti Migration consists of approximately 1.2 million wildebeest and 200,000 zebras. This was an important feature of the inscription of this site.

- If the Mara River were to dry up, most of the wildlife migrants would perish and the Serengeti Migration would collapse irreversibly. There is concern that though the ENP makes allowances for maintaining some water flow in the Mara River, even during severe droughts, these drought times would also produce the worst power shortages in Kenya. Consequently, there would be unpredictable pressure on the demand for channelling all available Mara water into the Ewaso Ng'iro Hydroelectric project.

- Even under normal climatic conditions the project might endanger the Serengeti World Heritage Site and impact tourist revenues in Tanzania and Kenya. In June 2001, Tanzania National Parks, together with the Frankfurt Zoological Society and the Australian Institute for Marine Science developed an ecological model to test the possible impact of the Amala weir water diversion project on the Serengeti Migration (Gereta, E., Wolanski, E., and Borner, M., 2001. *Modeling the Impact on the Serengeti Ecosystem of the Proposed Amala Weir Water Diversion Project in Kenya*).

The model used several extraction rates to show the impacts on the wildebeest population. It showed the effect of the Amala weir water extraction scheme will only be negligible when rainfall is average or above. The effect is predicted to become significant once a drought occurs (i.e. a year where the annual rainfall is 30% below the long-term mean). In such a one-off situation, without considering the possibility of a higher water diversion by the Kenyan authorities, the Amala weir diversion scheme is predicted to result in the deaths of at least 20% of the wildebeest, over and above the normal die-off of 10-20% during such a drought. For more severe water extraction rates the model predicts a death rate of 50%. The recovery rate in such a situation will be between 15 and 20 years. Since a drought on the average occurs every ten years, the wildebeest would never recover. In the case of repeated droughts the wildebeest population would drop to below 200,000, from which it cannot recover, as predator control would take over.

It is understood that the East Africa Community has discussed this issue and the proposal has effectively been dropped for the time being. IUCN considers the Committee should note this proposal and keep the situation under review. IUCN understands that the Serengeti-Mara ecosystem has undergone considerable change in recent years. These include:

- major settlement and extensive development of intensive, large-scale agriculture along much of the Kenyan side of the Mara River in recent years, with

the off-take for irrigation and drinking water growing exponentially

- the River is now exploited virtually throughout its course except for the small section in the Serengeti
- within the Masai Mara National Reserve and the adjacent wildlife areas, the growth of tourism facilities has been tremendous, which has impacted on both off-take and the input of waste
- forest area has declined and so has the water holding capacity of the soil. Thus, the rains are producing progressively higher floods with the effect of eroding the river banks. Conversely in the dry season there is less water remaining in the soil and so there is progressively lower flow. The results are that the Mara is getting lower and lower over time in the dry season.

IUCN has been notified that WWF East Africa Regional Office is commencing design of a *Mara River Catchment Basin Initiative*. This will focus on conserving the Mara River Catchment's unique biodiversity; ensuring the maintenance of natural functions by balancing the supply and demand of biodiversity products, and developing alternative livelihoods for communities. As part of the Initiative's preliminary phase, WWF has recently commissioned a report on the hydrology of the Kenyan side of the Mara River, in order to consider the land use changes and impacts of these on the flow and quality of the River. IUCN notes that the Serengeti National Park is one of the field sites for the *Enhancing our Heritage Project* funded by the UNF.

IUCN notes that the East Africa Community has identified the Serengeti/Mara ecosystem as a priority transboundary ecosystem that should be managed jointly. Further, that the Maasai Mara Reserve was proposed to be included in the Serengeti World Heritage site in 1997, but was rejected by Tanzanian National Parks, the authority in charge of the Serengeti site, because of their concerns over the lack of an effective protection or management regime.

IUCN considers there is merit in the State Parties of Kenya and Tanzania establishing a joint committee through the Commission on East Africa Cooperation arrangement to undertake further in-depth studies on the entire catchments of the Ewaso Ng'iro, Lake Natron, Mara River systems.

IUCN notes that the Serengeti is not only a World Heritage site and Biosphere Reserve, it is also the main tourist attraction in Tanzania, a country where tourism revenue is the largest foreign exchange earner. It also notes that the very reason that the Serengeti is a World Heritage site - the wildebeest migration, could be potentially threatened by any future implementation of the ENP. IUCN recognises that any negative impact on the dry season range of the wildebeest has potentially major ramifications for the very criteria for which the Serengeti listing is based. IUCN also notes that the Mara River is habitat for riverine forest containing many rare forest birds and other fauna, and upon which large populations of crocodiles and hippopotamus depend. It is clear that there is a high element of risk in the diversion of water from the Mara. The Mara diversion cannot be considered in isolation, it must be considered in the context of other

ecological problems such as rapidly changing land use and deforestation in the catchments, as well as the impacts of climate change. Most serious ecological/environmental problems arise because of a complex combination of factors. In such cases, IUCN believes that the precautionary principle must be applied to avoid any actions that increase the risk of the Mara drying up.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau notes the ENP project has been discussed by the East African Community and has been abandoned for the time being. The Bureau notes the potential impacts of any implementation of the ENP scheme on the Serengeti World Heritage site and requests that it be kept informed of developments by the State Parties of Tanzania and Kenya.”

## Asia and the Pacific

### **World Heritage Properties of Australia**

In 1999, the Australian Committee for IUCN (ACIUCN) initiated a process for monitoring Australian sites that has now been applied to the Great Barrier Reef, Shark Bay and the Wet Tropics of Queensland. In the case of Great Barrier Reef, Focused Recommendations and a Framework for Management were adopted by the Committee and Australia has committed to submit a progress report on the implementation of priority actions to the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in 2002. The Australian authorities have also agreed to work with ACIUCN to prepare a Framework for Management, based on Focussed Recommendations already discussed, for Shark Bay and the Wet Tropics of Queensland, as part of Periodic Reporting activities to be undertaken in the Asia Pacific Region during 2002/2003.

#### **Great Barrier Reef**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981 under criteria N (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv)

*International assistance:* None

#### *Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraphs V.106 – V.112

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – Annex X.

#### *Issues:*

Catchment management and impacts of site-integrity

#### *New information:*

On 10 September 2001 the Australian Government released a scientific report addressing the effect of land use activities on water quality in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area. The report - *Great Barrier Reef Catchment Water Quality Action Plan* - recommends specific end-of-river pollution targets for 2011 for all 26 catchments adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef. The Plan was prepared by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

(GBRMPA) at the request of the Great Barrier Reef Ministerial Council and the Commonwealth Minister for Environment and Heritage. A scientific working group reviewed available data and existing national water quality guidelines, prioritised catchments according to the ecological risk presented to the Reef, and recommended minimum targets for pollutant loads that would halt the decline in water quality entering the reef. The Plan is available on the GBRMPA web site at: <http://www.gbrmpa.gov.au/>

The Plan notes that over the last 150 years, the sediment load has increased by 300-900%, phosphate by 300 – 1500%, total nitrogen by 200-400%, respectively and that pesticide residues are now detectable in sub-tidal sediments. For the 2001-2011 decade, the plan proposes the reduction of sediment by 38%, nitrogen by 39%, phosphorous by 47%, and chlorophyll by 30-60%, respectively. It is also proposed to reduce the detectable levels of heavy metals and pesticides.

The Plan recommends that the targets be incorporated into relevant plans under the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP) and the Natural Heritage Trust. For catchments not covered under the NAP, the report recommends the State Government prepare, and submit to the Great Barrier Reef Ministerial Council, integrated catchment management plans that set out the action required to meet the water quality targets. The Plan suggests specific actions, notably a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory measures that need to be taken to improve the quality of water entering the World Heritage site including:

- Reforms to ensure that all environmentally significant activities in the catchments are subject to proper environmental impact assessment and approval processes and that conditions are attached to ensure activities are carried out in a manner that protects and improves water quality
- Promotion of 'constraint mapping' for current and future agricultural development
- Protection and rehabilitation of catchment areas at risk such as freshwater wetlands and riparian vegetation
- Establishment and enforcement of standards for sewage, wastewater and storm- water discharge from coastal developments to watercourses
- Promotion of environmental management plans for agricultural activities, which promote farming practices that minimise downstream impacts
- Promotion of full compliance to Industry Codes of Practice, and
- Initiation of public and catchment specific education programmes about the connectivity between land use and the impacts on the Reef.

WWF-Australia has estimated that the cost of a significant restoration programme to mitigate pollution and to clean up the waters flowing into the Great Barrier Reef (GBR) would be in excess of AU\$300 million and has identified the following actions as key to success: (i) an immediate and permanent moratorium of land clearing in the GBR

catchment; (ii) urgent legislative protection for coastal freshwater wetlands; (iii) all agricultural activities to be regulated under the Queensland Environment Protection Act 1994; (iv) fertiliser and pesticide use to be licensed; (v) legislative discharge limits for acid sulphate soil to be set; and (vi) a major GBR catchment riparian revegetation and wetland restoration programme to be designed and financed.

IUCN notes that the *Great Barrier Reef Catchment Water Quality Action Plan* initiative directly addresses one of the major issues raised in the ACIUCN report on the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, relating to the need for more effective catchment management in lands adjacent to the Park.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau commends the State Party on the release of the Water Quality Action Plan, setting targets for improvements and the recommended actions to achieve the targets. The Bureau urges the State Party to take immediate action to progress and implement the strategic actions to achieve the identified targets. The Bureau invites the State Party to consider legislative, regulatory or other tools directed at land use in the catchments in order to further strengthen the Action Plan. The Bureau recommends the State Party provide regular reports to the Committee on the implementation of the Water Quality Action Plan as well as the implementation of the Focused Recommendations and Framework for Management adopted for the site by the State Party and ACIUCN in 1999”

#### **Fraser Island**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1992 under criteria N (ii) and (iii)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations: N/A

#### Issues:

Dingo and visitor management; management plan revision

#### New information:

On 30 April 2001, a 9-year boy was killed by dingoes on Fraser Island. This was the first recorded death in Australia by dingoes of a human over 1 year of age. This death prompted a re-evaluation of the risk posed to humans by dingoes and a re-assessment of the management strategies outlined in the draft Fraser Island Dingo Management Strategy (March 2001). The revised Strategy is now with the Queensland Government awaiting approval.

Immediately following the incident, the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service (QPWS) undertook a cull of 31 dingoes to reduce the immediate risk to people from habituated dingoes that were frequenting areas heavily used by people. This cull was a one-time operation. A

Risk Assessment Report (*Risk Assessment: Risk to humans posed by the dingo population on Fraser Island, EPA, May 2001*) was commissioned by the Queensland Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Risk Assessment provides direction for the immediate management of dingoes on Fraser Island and provides site-specific management recommendations. As such it is complementary to the draft Fraser Island Dingo Management Strategy. The Risk Assessment outlined some previously unused management options at particular sites, including: (a) fencing of campgrounds and recreational areas; (b) active deterrence of animals in the vicinity of popular visitor areas; (c) restriction on taking of food to certain locations; and (d) time restrictions for visitors at some sites. Additional island wide management approaches recommended include: (i) limiting visitor numbers using a variety of approaches; (ii) significantly increasing fines and penalties for feeding dingoes; (iii) enhancing public education and awareness programmes; (iv) increasing enforcement through additional ranger presence; (v) increasing monitoring and research on the dingo

The need for consultation with the Island's residents, tour operators, the Fraser Island Community Advisory Committee, native title claimants and the Island's World Heritage Area Management Committee on appropriate limits and mechanisms is emphasised in the Risk Assessment Report. IUCN has received expert advice that the impact of the cull is unlikely to have any adverse impacts on the long-term viability or survival of the dingo population. The Fraser Island dingo population is of great relevance and high importance to the status of Fraser Island as a World Heritage site. Although the Fraser Island dingo population is not 100% pure, Fraser Island represents the best opportunity to establish and maintain a self-sustaining population of wild genetically pure dingoes.

Elsewhere in Australia, and other range countries in Asia and Africa, most populations are, or will soon be, predominantly hybrid. The IUCN Canid Action Plan lists the dingo as a threatened species. With the 2nd edition of the Plan currently in preparation, the conservation status of the dingo is under review and may be upgraded to endangered. Fraser Island may well be the only opportunity for the world to conserve a wild population of genetically pure dingoes.

Fraser Island does not have an exclusive Plan of Management, rather, it is catered for in the Great Sandy Region Management Plan (GSRMP). The GSRMP covers the Great Sandy Region National Park, of which Fraser Island is a part, and also adjacent marine areas and some lands outside the protected area. Released in 1994, it was prepared as a regional conservation plan with input from numerous government departments. It does not have statutory status. The GSRMP is about to undergo a detailed review. The process will involve substantial stakeholder and community input and is scheduled for completion in March 2003. The review is explicitly considering a specific management plan for the Fraser Island World Heritage property, as well as a commitment

to new legislative requirements for the World Heritage site.

On the 27 July 2001 the Queensland Government announced the allocation of an extra AU\$1.75million towards the management of Fraser Island. AU\$1 million has been earmarked this financial year for dingo management on the Island; the other AU\$750,000 is to be spent employing eight permanent rangers for the Island.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau commends the State Party/QPWS on the Risk Assessment and the draft Dingo Management Strategy and welcomes the State Party's consideration of a variety of options including the imposition of visitor limits. The Bureau invites the State Party to provide further information on the visitor management strategy as it is developed. The Bureau welcomes the review of the GSRMP and its explicit recognition of Fraser Island as a World Heritage area requiring special management plans and legislative frameworks to protect the World Heritage site for perpetuity”

#### **The Sundarbans (Bangladesh)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1997 under criteria N (ii) and (iv)

International assistance: N/A

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraphs – V.119 – V.121

Issues:

Exploration for oil and gas in the vicinity of the site.

New information:

In June 2001, the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau was informed of the plan of the Government of Bangladesh to explore “block 5” of the Sundarbans Reserve Forest for oil and gas. Shell has publicly declared that it has no plans for exploration activities in the Special Reserved Forest (SRF). The World Heritage site comprises three sections of the SRF at the coastal edge (see map in Annex 1 to this document). In a letter to IUCN Bangladesh, Shell note that:

- The Sundarbans is also a Ramsar site. The Ramsar Convention has confirmed that the Ramsar site is synonymous with the SRF and does not extend beyond the SRF.
- Shell will carry out extensive environmental and social studies and stakeholder engagement before conducting any activities elsewhere in Block 5.
- As regards the socio-economic impact zone outside the northern peripheries of the SRF, Shell will be discussing the implications of oil and gas exploration with the Ministry of Environment and Forest.
- Shell recognizes that one of the main objectives of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) -Government of Bangladesh (GoB) Sundarbans Biodiversity

Conservation Project (SBCP) is to reduce the poverty level of the 3.5 million people living in the impact zone and provide them with alternative livelihood options and encourage them to leave the forest.

- By providing economic activities, and in the case of successful exploration of clean gas, Shell can add value to the objectives of the SBCP and be a party to providing sustainable development opportunities in the region.
- Shell-Bangladesh is aware of the need to consider the potential indirect impacts on the SRF of any of its future activities elsewhere. Such exploration activities, whether inside the socio-economic impact zone, or elsewhere in Block 5, will be continued only after full environmental and social impact assessments and in consultations with all stakeholders.
- The current phase of the project consists of exploration only. If hydrocarbons are discovered and it is decided subsequently to develop them, further EIA and SIA studies will be undertaken, together with continuing stakeholder consultations.

On 20 September 2001 Shell convened its first workshop in Dhaka to share information about the ensuing work programme, oil and gas exploration and emergent issues and questions. It distributed briefing papers to stakeholders and invited responses and discussion. A web site has been launched with updated information on Shell's activities in Bangladesh: <http://www.shell.com/bd/>. IUCN Bangladesh is in discussion with Shell about their activities and will continue to advise them as and when requested. Shell is hosting, in co-operation with World Bank, a high level discussion on extractive industry (primarily oil and gas) on 21 and 22 October 2001, in Washington, USA. Representatives of the Centre and IUCN/WCPA will participate in the event and the main outcomes of the discussion will be reported to the Bureau at the time of its session.

The Steering Committee, established by GoB for smooth implementation of the SBCP, has invited IUCN Bangladesh to be a member. As part of the SBCP, IUCN Bangladesh will conduct independent monitoring of biodiversity of the Sundarbans, drawing on wetland, marine and protected area specialists from its international network. IUCN Bangladesh reports that the GoB has agreed to a second biodiversity project for the World Heritage site. The UN Foundation has provided a planning grant for a project to be executed jointly by UNDP Offices in Bangladesh and India for promoting trans-border co-operation between the two countries for improving World Heritage biodiversity conservation. The planning grant project activities are underway and a larger proposal for possible financing by the UNF and UNDP will be the principal outcome of the planning phase. UNDP has appointed consultants for preparation of the project proposal.

A media report claims that "due to the high level of salinity, 30 Bengal Tigers have died within the past 10 years. Autopsy reports revealed that liver damage has caused the death of these Tigers", have been brought to the attention of IUCN. The article mentions a proposal by the

Bangladesh Forest Department for a five-year, US\$2 million project called "Tiger Project: Sundarbans" which, though proposed in 1991, has not been implemented. IUCN has received advice that salinity levels are not a special threat to the tigers in the Sundarbans as they have adapted to water with salinity levels higher than in other parts of its range in South Asia. There may well be indirect threats to the tigers if salinity-induced changes impact other components of its habitat; i.e. its principal prey species, and habitat structures and distribution.

IUCN has been informed that the 'crown death' of Sundri trees, the dominant mangrove species in the Sundarbans, could be attributable to salinity, sedimentation, pest attack and natural successional processes, although salinity is frequently cited as the primary reason. The SBCP has initiated a study on the death of the Sundri trees. IUCN has received preliminary media reports of a planned 'Biodiversity Project' - comprised of an 'Ecopark' and mangrove arboretum - for Karamjal, situated in the Sundarbans East Zone under the Chandpai range. Karamjal is a captive breeding centre for many critically endangered species of the Sundarbans. The Ecopark will cover an area of 30 hectares and play a vital role in conserving forest resources while also being a tourist attraction for international visitors.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

"The Bureau commends the State Party for its efforts, in particular via the SBCP and other projects, to strengthen conservation of the site, and to provide alternative livelihood options to forest exploitation so that local communities acknowledge the positive influence World Heritage site protection has for the whole region. The Committee welcomes Shell's careful and transparent planning of its hydro-carbon exploration activities in Block 5 and its commitment to undertake full social, economic and environmental impact studies before any production occurs, and to continuing open dialogue with stakeholders. The Committee notes that proposals for oil and gas exploration are outside the boundaries of the World Heritage site but expresses its opposition to any mining or exploration activities within the site. All oil and gas exploration as well as other development activities in the vicinity of the World Heritage site must be carefully planned to minimise environmental and social impacts".

#### **Sunderbans National Park (India)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1987 under criteria N (ii) and (iv)

#### International assistance:

US\$ 20,000 has been approved as a contribution to the UN Foundation financed (US\$ 105,000) project to prepare a proposal for promoting trans-border co-operation for World Heritage conservation within the Sundarbans ecosystem.

Previous deliberations: N/A

Issues:

Potential threats from a waterway development project

New information:

IUCN has informed the Centre that the "Project Tiger Status Report" for 2001, prepared by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF) of India, 2001, mentions that a system of National Waterways is proposed for the Sundarbans Tiger Reserve. The report observes that: "the proposed national waterways, if declared, through the mangrove forests of Sundarbans, particularly through the portion of the Tiger Reserve, will affect the ecosystem adversely by large-scale human activities, dredging of streams and oil spills of numerous water crafts and vessels carrying cargo".

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

"The Bureau expresses its concern over the potential threat to the World Heritage property as identified by the "Project Tiger Status Report" for 2001, prepared by MOEF and requests that the State Party submit, before 1 February 2002 a detailed report on the proposed national waterways project and its potential impacts on the Sundarbans World Heritage site. The Bureau will review the information provided by the State Party at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002".

**Kaziranga National Park (India)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria N (ii) and (iv)

International assistance:

US\$ 50,000 as technical co-operation for purchase of equipment and improving facilities for interpretation.

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraphs V.122 – V.125

Issues:

Financial constraints and equipment shortages. Illegal fishing. Theft of Park property. Elephant-human conflicts.

New information:

In June 2001, the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau had invited the State Party to provide, before 15 September 2001, a report on major management issues of the site, particularly those related to financing anti-poaching operations and human-elephant conflicts. A report on the subject is still awaited. The Centre is in the process of contacting the Ministry of Environment and Forests of India to explore possibilities for the Centre/IUCN mission to Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in Assam, India, planned for February 2002, to include a visit Kaziranga National Park. As the extra-costs to visit Kaziranga will be minimal, it would be a good opportunity to obtain a first-hand impression on constraints facing Park management.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

"The Bureau reiterated its request, made at its twenty-fifth ordinary session in June 2001, that the State Party submit a report on major management issues. The Bureau welcomed the possibility of the Centre/IUCN mission visiting this site during its visit to Assam, India in February 2002, and recommended that an up-to-date state of conservation report on the site be submitted to its twenty-sixth session in April 2002"

**Komodo National Park (Indonesia)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991 under criteria N (ii) and (iv)

International assistance:

US\$ 136,000 for preparatory and technical assistance and staff training.

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – Annex X.

Issues:

Management plan implementation; controlling illegal fishing and reef-mining; sustainable tourism development.

New information:

The State Party had submitted a report on the state of conservation of the site using the format prescribed in the periodic reporting brochure and this report has been reviewed by IUCN. The State Party report notes that:

- The 25-year Management Plan for the site was completed in June 2000. The plan includes the expansion of the Park, to include an extension at Gili Banta and a connection to Gili Mota. The proposed extensions will add 504 square kilometres to the area of the Park, 479 km of which will be marine habitat. The new Park would therefore comprise 27% terrestrial and 73% marine areas. The proposed extension is based on the high level of coral and fish diversity and associated aesthetic value, biological corridors, and the importance of areas for migration of cetaceans.
- The plan also includes a new zoning system for the Park, dividing the Park into 7 zones covering both marine and terrestrial environments as follows: core zone; wilderness zone with limited tourism; tourism zone; traditional use zone; pelagic use zone; special research and training zone; and traditional settlement zone. Regulations have been formulated for each zone. A map of the Park is being completed and will be disseminated widely.
- According to the ongoing coral reef and fish monitoring programme conducted by The Nature Conservancy of USA (TNC) and Park personnel, a slow recovery, i.e. 2% increase in hard coral per year, has been occurring around Komodo since 1996. Eight demersal fish spawning grounds have been identified within the park waters. As a consequence the Park has applied regulations to prohibit demersal fish exploitation during the spawning season.

- In the terrestrial sector, forest fires occur frequently, largely the result of human activities during the dry season. Deer poaching has been a significant threat to the integrity of the Park, with poachers using fire to herd deer. Park patrols involve local police, navy and army personnel, as Park rangers are not equipped with firearms.
- The report states that a floating boat patrol, equipped with communication systems to allow contact with Park headquarters, has been added to the law enforcement programme. Overall, the incidences of dynamite and cyanide fishing and deer poaching have declined significantly with improved and intensified patrolling.
- Park regulations prohibit anyone from entering the Park without a permit, except official local people practicing traditional fishing. Despite this prohibition, illegal fishermen originating from other islands continues to be a significant issue.

TNC has been working on an innovative management scheme for the Park. This approach would involve TNC, the private tourism sector and the government of Indonesia in a partnership to establish sustainable financing for the Park. IUCN has been playing a supportive role and providing some technical input, in co-operation with the International Finance Corporation (IFC) which is helping to support the project. The Indonesian Government formally wrote to the UNESCO Office in Jakarta, Indonesia, requesting UNESCO's views on the joint TNC/Government of Indonesia/tourism sector initiative. The establishment of the tourism concession is seen as a sustainable financing mechanism to be tested within the framework of the implementation of the 25-year Management Plan.

IUCN has commended ongoing discussions on sustainable financing and collaborative management of the Park. UNESCO Office, Jakarta has also supported the establishment of the tourism management concession in principle but has stressed the need to closely monitor the work of the concession and all other projects designed to support the implementation of the 25-year Management Plan.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau welcomes the several initiatives to strengthen protection of the site and acknowledges the important contributions that TNC, IFC, GEF, the tourism sector and other partners are making towards the long-term conservation and sustainable financing of Komodo National Park. However, the Bureau notes with concern that the illegal entry of outsiders from other islands continues to be an important management issue and invites the Government of Indonesia to consider providing increased resources for patrolling the marine environment of the Park, especially in light of the marine extension. The Bureau invites the State Party to provide, before 1 February 2002, a status report on the establishment of the tourism management concession and a timeframe for nominating the

extensions to the Park for inclusion in the World Heritage site, to enable the Bureau to review the information at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.”

#### **Lorentz National Park (Indonesia)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1999 under criteria N (i), (ii) and (iii).

#### International assistance:

US\$ 15,000 as preparatory assistance and US\$ 30,000, at the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau in June 2001, for strategic planning.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraphs VII.26 – VII. 28

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – Annex X.

#### Issues:

Management infrastructure development within the constraints imposed by security risks in the area. Disposal of mine tailings. Strategic planning and promoting Government-NGO-industry co-operation for conservation.

#### New information:

The WWF-Office for Sahul Bioregion is now located in Jayapura in Irian Jaya and has provided a report to IUCN on its efforts to strengthen conservation of this site. WWF is providing direct assistance to the conservation of the site through a number of activities: (i) institutional strengthening of three local NGOs to develop skills in Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA), project planning and monitoring, identification and development of alternative income sources, community organization, advocacy and communications; (ii) promoting community-based approaches to natural resources management by documenting traditional practices of the three main ethnic groups using the Park's resources; (iii) identifying alternative sources of income in order to minimize community dependence on forest resources; (iv) encouraging the recognition of community rights and knowledge and enhancing community participation in site management; and (v) co-operating with Park management to develop an overall management plan as well as plans for the utilization of various management zones.

WWF-Indonesia has financed a range of activities up to the year 2001 and is in the process of submitting proposals for financing a number of new initiatives for the period 2001/2002 and beyond. The WWF-report identifies four activities as needing immediate attention:

- Organization of an integrated planning workshop bringing together all concerned parties;
- Building transparent relationships amongst NGOs, ethnic communities, private sector and the Government;
- Establishment of an institution with multi-stakeholder representation for management of the area; and
- Financing support programmes targeted to research, communities and institutional development and the overall long-term planning and development of the site.

The US\$ 30,000 grant approved from the World Heritage Fund by the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau will be used for the organization of a series of strategic planning workshops involving the participation of all stakeholders. As noted by the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau, the Australian Government is also considering assistance up to a sum of about US\$ 200,000 for capacity building activities in support of site-management.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau notes the variety of support that is becoming available to the site for strategic planning, capacity building and NGO and community support initiatives. However, recommendations from these activities need to be implemented to ensure a positive impact on the conservation of this site, thus the Bureau encourages relevant donors to support the implementation of recommended priority actions and to co-ordinate their activities. The Committee requests the Centre and IUCN to work through its partners, particularly the UNESCO Office, Jakarta and the IUCN Asia Regional Programme and IUCN/WCPA Vice-Chair for Southeast Asia to promote co-ordinated development and execution of projects and activities in support of Lorentz. The Bureau recalls that in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee made at the time of the site’s inscription in the World Heritage List in 1999 a Centre/IUCN mission to the site is due in late 2002. The Bureau recommends that a full status report on the conservation of the site and the planning of its future management be submitted to the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau in April 2003”

### **Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2000 under criteria N (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv)

International assistance: N/A

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – Section X, A.

Issues:

Possible extension of the Park; consultation with indigenous community in proposed extension.

New information:

IUCN has brought to the attention of the Centre information concerning a proposal to enlarge Mulu World Heritage site to include Gunung Buda. The proposal however, is raising concern amongst indigenous groups and the wider conservation community because of the reported lack of inclusion of indigenous peoples and their claims in the decision to extend Gunung Mulu.

The recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples in Sarawak was upheld by the historical legal decision on Rumah Nor. On the 12 May 2001 the High Court of Sarawak upheld the customary rights of the Iban village

Rumah Nor when it found that the Borneo Paper and Pulp company, which had begun logging the forest claimed by the villagers, did not have the right to destroy Rumah Nor’s rainforest.

Following this decision, the people of Gunung Buda lodged a claim with a land tribunal seeking an injunction to rule that they should have a share in the management of the Gunung Buda area. The government argued against this on the grounds that there was no properly surveyed boundary of their claimed lands, and so the claim was denied. Thus the indigenous peoples are opposing the inclusion of Gunung Buda in the Gunung Mulu World Heritage site.

IUCN notes that the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau, in its recommendations to refer the nomination back to the State Party had sought, amongst others, “...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...”. Further, the Committee, when it inscribed the site on the World Heritage List at its last session in Cairns, Australia, had suggested that the “...authorities be encouraged to review additions to the site for their World Heritage potential when the gazetting process is completed”.

In addition to the possibility of extension of the site, IUCN has been advised of three on-going initiatives aimed at enhancing management of Gunung Mulu National Park:

- Implementation of the Plan for Management of the Park - This plan was reviewed as part of the evaluation of the nomination of the site. Current status includes examination of options for contracting out management of the Park to the private sector, while overall regulatory responsibility remains with the Ministry of Forestry, Department of National Parks. The Plan of Management for the Park has been drafted in a manner that supports this possibility.
- Community development for areas outside the Park; this initiative aims to develop options for better planning and development around the Park boundaries, particularly in the Mulu area, including issues of land title, planning processes etc. This initiative could enable locals to manage better, and benefit from, the opportunities that come with World Heritage listing.
- Preliminary drafting of a project concept to secure international assistance with capacity building for management of the park - to focus on staff capacity and skills development.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau welcomes the possibility of the extension of the Park and notes with satisfaction the initiatives to improve site-management and staff capacity building. The Bureau however, invites the State Party to give due considerations to the involvement of indigenous peoples and other local communities in planning and

implementing decisions regarding the extension of the site, and to seek their full co-operation in the management of the site, including the extensions planned. The Bureau recommends that the State Party provide a report, before 1 February 2002, on the results of its negotiations with indigenous communities for review by its twenty-sixth session in April 2002”

### **Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1984 under criteria N (ii), (iii) and (iv)

#### International assistance:

A sum of US\$ 80,000 has been provided for management, equipment support and training.

#### Previous deliberation:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau- paragraphs – V.126 – V.127

#### Issues:

Road construction and transmission line construction through the Park and associated impacts.

#### New information:

In response to the request of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau in June 2001, the State Party has submitted a report, dated June 2000, entitled: “Environmental Impact Statement (EIA) for the Jagatpur Madi 33 kV Subtransmission Line Project”. The report states that the transmission line will pass through approximately 6km of the Park and World Heritage site between Dhrubaghat and Bankatta, and through 500 metres and 1,000 metres of buffer zone forest at Dhrubaghat and Bankatta, respectively. The project foresees the erection of eleven metres-high concrete poles and the stringing of lines. It will be aligned along the existing Hulaki road and hence require the clearing of a corridor two metres in width. In total 331 trees of endangered species - *Shorea robusta*; *Acacia catechu*, *Bombax ceiba* and *Cedrella toona* will be removed. The EIA has not yet been approved by the Government of Nepal.

According to the report, loss or alteration of habitat, construction disturbances to wild fauna, likely hunting and poaching by project workers, decline in water quality associated with erosion and silting, pollution from temporary workers camps, and bird deaths from collision with the transmission line are foreseen negative impacts. Mitigation measures proposed include: reforestation of two hectares of community land near the Park with the guidance of the Park authorities; a Community Forest Support Programme in three locations to be implemented in conjunction with Park authorities; an Environmental Awareness for Conservation Programme (EAC) to be implemented by NGOs, and a Habitat Management Programme to be implemented by the Department of National Parks and Wildlife.

The Kasara Bridge is under construction over the Rapti River that constitutes the northern boundary of the Park and World Heritage site. No EIA was conducted for the project. Due to budget uncertainties and restrictions, the

road will require a few years for completion. The road will pass through the Park and World Heritage site, but will partly follow the current designated Public Right of Way to Madi Village. The alignment from Kasara Bridge to the public right of way has not been decided. One option is to follow the Park/World Heritage site periphery along the Rapti River for 3-4 km.

IUCN notes that the provision of electricity will help reduce the need for kerosene for lighting and firewood for cooking, the two major sources of the local population, and also a source of fuel for lodges and hotels in the area. This should have a positive impact by reducing the amount of wood collected from the Park. IUCN is concerned about the impacts associated with the construction of the transmission line and road within the World Heritage site and notes that similar proposals have prompted Danger Listing in some cases.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau expresses its serious concerns regarding the construction of the transmission line that will traverse 6km through the Park and an additional 500 to 1000 metres of the buffer zone. However noting that the State Party has not yet approved the plan to construct the transmission line through the Park, the Bureau urges the State Party not to proceed with the plan to construct this line, and seek out alternatives that would have minimal impacts on the integrity of the Park. The Bureau notes that the Kasara Bridge and the associated road along the northern periphery of the Park might be a less impacting option to improve transport in the region. The Bureau recommends that the State Party take into due consideration these suggestions and inform the Centre, before 1 February 2001, its decision on the proposed transmission line and the routing of the road and provide a detailed report on the status for the State Party’s consideration of the projects.”

### **Sinharaja Forest Reserve (Sri Lanka)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1988 under criteria N (ii) and (iv)

#### International assistance:

US\$ 5,000 for technical co-operation activities.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – Annex X.

#### Issues:

Land claim conflicts between Government authority and a private enterprise concerned with organic agriculture.

#### New information:

At its twenty-fourth extraordinary session in November 2000, the Bureau had requested that the Centre and IUCN monitor developments with regard to the resolution of the dispute over land reclaimed by the Forest Department that had previously been leased to a private company. The private enterprise concerned, Sinharaja Plantations Organic (PVT) Ltd., has written to the Director of the

Centre raising preliminary objections against the reacquisition of land released earlier for Government approved organic tea farming. The undated letter reached the Centre on 15 October 2001.

The company provides a detailed explanation on why it considers the efforts of the Conservator of Forests of Sri Lanka to be unfair and has informed the Centre that it has placed the action of the Conservator before the judiciary of Sri Lanka to claim compensation. Hence, the company requests the Bureau refrain from arriving at any decisions concerning the parcel of land that it claims has been legally handed over to it by the authorities. A copy of the letter from the company has been transmitted to IUCN for verification with its regional office in Sri Lanka and the response will be reported at the time of the Bureau session.

**Action required:** The Bureau, based on IUCN views on the matter to be submitted at the time of its session, may take appropriate decisions and make recommendations to the consideration of the State Party, IUCN, Centre and other stakeholders.

### **Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994 under criterion N (iii) and re-inscribed in 2000 under criterion N (i).

#### International assistance:

A total of US\$ 67,207 has been provided for management planning support, equipment and training activities.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – Annex X.

#### Issues:

Rapid economic development, particularly in the tourism, transportation - including marine transport - sectors. Donor co-ordination. Monitoring and setting environmental standards befitting an internationally significant marine protected area.

#### New information:

As requested by the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 2000, the Ha Long Bay Management Department (HLBMD) provided the sixth annual progress report on the conservation, management and promotion of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area. IUCN has reviewed the report and has expressed broad support for the efforts of the HLBMD to manage this extremely complex World Heritage site located in an intensive economic development zone.

IUCN has been informed that the project proposal for the Institutional Capacity Building of the Halong Bay Management Department, prepared by IUCN-Vietnam, HLBMD and the Quang Ninh Provincial Authorities, has been widely circulated and finalised in close collaboration with relevant institutions and the province. The proposal is currently being shared with potential donors. Furthermore, HLBMD, IUCN-Vietnam and UNESCO Vietnam are developing a proposal with several components: a comprehensive survey and mapping of all significant caves

in the Halong Bay World Heritage area; an assessment of biodiversity values (both terrestrial and marine) of Halong Bay and surrounding hinterland; and an evaluation of cultural values of the site. These will provide the basis for the future possible re-nomination of the site under biodiversity value criteria and, perhaps, as a mixed World Heritage site.

The UNESCO *Ha Long Bay Eco-Museum Feasibility Project*, financed by UNDP has been completed and a final 135-page report on the feasibility study and a video have been transmitted to the Centre by the UNESCO Office in Vietnam on 17 October 2001. IUCN served as a member of the Steering Committee of this Project. Discussions have been held on collaboration between the Eco-Museum project and the Institutional Capacity Building project. The final proposal of the *Ha Long Bay Eco-Museum Feasibility Project*, envisages to implement the following main activities. The project has proposed the development of an "Ecomuseum Hub" in the vicinity of Ha Long Bay and a variety of interpretation packages based on several themes identified in the study.

The feasibility study follow up places strong emphasis on the establishment of a project team of Vietnamese staff of the Ha Long Bay Management Department supported by two international facilitators. Intensive capacity building and skills transfer, particularly in the fields of planning, data collection and integrated interpretative management of the area are proposed. A comprehensive analysis to develop strategic partnerships between the Ecomuseum and key stakeholders has been undertaken and has identified a number of thematic areas for collaboration. For example, a theme on the fishing traditions of Ha Long will directly involve floating fishing villages, terrestrial fishing communities, boat builders and major institutions such as the Viet Nam Institute of Oceanography, the Institute of Marine Products and local authority agencies such as the provincial Fisheries Department. An outline for an Interpretative Management Plan by HLBMD will include a number of interpretative themes, at least two of which are targeting the fishing industry.

IUCN has observed the HLBMD report states that tourism has increased by 135% between 1997 and 2000 and is a critical management issue at this site. IUCN has expressed satisfaction with the fact that the direct management and control of the caves has been brought under the authority of HLBMD, and hopes this will ensure appropriate measures to present the caves, control tourism and minimise impacts. The Feasibility Study's effort to propose a "Ecomuseum Hub" and an Interpretative Management Plan aim to spread the visitor resources in and outside of Ha Long Bay and thereby support the intensity of visitation to the World Heritage site without reducing the number of tourists visiting the broader region. The feasibility study estimates that total cost of the development of the "Ecomuseum Hub" and other interpretation theme products is likely to cost US\$ 17 million over a 4-year period. The Quang Ninh Province has committed US\$ 3 million and intends to seek other funds from external sources.

During a visit to Japan in early October 2001, a representative from the Centre met with officials of the Japan International Co-operation Agency (JICA). These officials confirmed that the Environmental Management of Ha Long Bay continues to be one of the priority projects of JICA and that discussions with the Government of Vietnam are underway in order to implement the Environmental Management Plan as soon as possible.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau commends HLBMD efforts to conserve the site and acknowledge efforts of the State Party to support the development of a range of projects to address management issues at the site. Given the considerable international interest in the site, the Bureau urges the HLBMD to continue and strengthen its efforts to co-ordinate projects in order to ensure optimal use of resources and skills available via HLBMD’s association with IUCN and UNESCO Offices in Vietnam and other partners. The Bureau reiterates the recommendation made at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session regarding the early implementation of the recommendations of the JICA/Government of Vietnam Environmental Management Plan for Ha Long Bay and invites the State Party to submit by 1 February 2002 a progress report on what has been achieved in this regard for consideration of the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002”

## **Latin America and the Caribbean**

### **Los Katios National Park (Colombia)**

Inscribed in 1994 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (ii) (iv)

*International Assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph VIII.25 / Annex X page 113.

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph IV.128-129

*Issues:*

Transboundary management, instability in the area.

*New information:*

No invitation was received to carry out a mission to Los Katios following the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau. The Bureau had noted that an IUCN Representative would visit Bogota, Colombia in November 2001. The information gathered during this mission on Los Katios will be reported by IUCN at the time of the Bureau meeting.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to consider it’s decision in the light of information received from IUCN at the Bureau meeting.

### **Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)**

Inscribed in 1978 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

*International assistance:*

Preparatory Assistance (US\$ 15,000); Emergency Assistance (US\$ 110,500); Technical Assistance (US\$ 324,500); and Training (US\$ 100,000). In 2001 US\$ 50,000 were provided as Emergency Assistance.

*Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph VIII.25  
Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.130-137

*Issues:*

Legal and physical enforcement, illegal fishing and poaching, invasive species, tourism

*New information:*

IUCN received, on 10 October, a progress report from the Director of the Charles Darwin Research Station noting the implementation of a number of programmes aiming to enhance the institutional capacity of the Park Administration. The report also noted the status of regulations concerning tourism, fisheries and quarantine, as well as progress achieved in the preparation of the Strategy 2010 for the Sustainable Development of the Islands.

*Galapagos Special Law:* On 18 September, 2001, Ecuador’s Constitutional Court voted in favour of the Galapagos Special Law, one day after, a public inquiry was held in response to a lawsuit brought forward by the Association of Industrial Tuna Fishermen (ATUNEC), which challenged the Special Law’s constitutionality. The final decision of the Constitutional Court Judges - eight votes in favour and one abstention - represents an important achievement in the continued efforts to protect the Galapagos Islands under the regulations of the Special Law. Since its approval in March 1998, the Galapagos Special Law has faced continued attacks, primarily from the industrial fishing sector based in continental Ecuador, which seeks fishing rights inside the Galapagos Marine Reserve (proposed in entirety as an extension to the World Heritage site). The Special Law granted exclusive fishing rights in the Marine Reserve to artisan fishermen and calls for a system of quotes and zoning to control fisheries. However, the Special Law can only be fully enforced after having approved all the regulations and by-laws on key management issues such as fisheries.

According to information received, dated 19 September 2001, two of the key regulations (on tourism and fisheries) are likely to be approved by the President’s Office by the end of November. The third regulation on quarantine, introduced species and agriculture is in the process of local consultation. The fourth regulation, which covers Environmental Management and pollution issues, is the least advanced.

*Enforcement and Control of the Marine Reserve:* Earlier this year, the vessel *Sirenian*, owned and operated by the environmental NGO Sea Shepherd Conservation Society,

commenced a five-year tour of duty to help the Galapagos National Park Service clamp down on illegal commercial fishing operations within 40 miles of the Islands. This collaborative operation, given a favourable ruling by the Ecuadorian Court, is the first conservation patrol of the Galapagos by a foreign vessel officially supported by the Ecuadorian Government. A loan by the Inter-American Development Bank for 10 million US\$ has been approved for enforcing controls in the Marine Reserve. Logistical assistance and institutional strengthening are the two most important elements of this project. Galapagos National Park hopes to purchase four more boats and a helicopter to cover the whole area. At the moment, the Park possesses two vessels, ten speedboats, twelve wooden boats and personnel of 50 to patrol the 133,000 km<sup>2</sup> marine area. Despite the assistance of the Ecuadorian Navy, this is clearly not sufficient. Only 5% of entrance fees to the GNP are directed towards controlling the Reserve.

*Illegal shark fishing:* The destructive fishing of sharks, where the shark fin is cut from the live shark and the mutilated animal is dumped back into the sea, continues in the Galapagos Marine Reserve due to the high demand for shark fins for the Asian market. The fishing techniques used also negatively affect other species, including marine birds. During 2001, 22 fishing boats were caught, 5,600 shark fins confiscated and 3,000 pounds of meat seized. According to the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society half the boats caught fishing illegally in the Galapagos were not punished. But progress on this matter has been made: Canela II, a Costa Rican long liner caught fishing out of the port of Puntarenas, was confiscated by the Local Court of Galapagos and the order was upheld by the Court of Appeal. This is a legal precedent, as never before in Ecuadorian legal history has a fishing boat been confiscated for illegal fishing.

*Sea Lion Poaching:* On the 16 July fifteen (11 male and 4 female) mutilated sea lion corpses- *Zalophus wollebaeki* - were discovered on La Loberia beach on San Cristobal Island. This is the first time such action has been reported in the Galapagos Islands. The Charles Darwin Research Station, Galapagos National Park Service and a veterinarian of the Araucaria Foundation undertook autopsies of nine of the animals. The autopsy report makes the link between the incident and the increasing demand from Asian markets for the male genitals of sea lions and seals for use in traditional medicine, as aphrodisiacs and amulets.

*Invasive Species Eradication Programme:* IUCN notes that in early 2002, the Charles Darwin Research Station and the Galapagos National Park Service will commence a five-year programme to combat invasive species. Funding of US\$18 million is being provided over six years from the United Nations and GEF, while other sources are estimated to amount to US\$19 million. Biologists and Park staff will use a combination of measures to remove some alien species, make a dent in other populations, and bolster controls to keep other exotics out of the Islands. It is hoped that the holistic approach will set an example for other places combating invasive species. The Station and Park are in the final months of intensive monitoring to

confirm the eradication of pigs from Santiago Island. This follows decades of work involving a range of control methods, a highly trained ranger team and GPS/GIS technology.

*Tourism:* Progress has also been reported on the *SmartVoyager* certification programme, a joint initiative of the Rainforest Alliance and Conservacion y Desarrollo (C&D) of Ecuador. The programme aims to give a “green seal” of approval to tour boats operating in the Galapagos Archipelago that meet certain environmental and social criteria. Full details of the certification programme can be found at: <http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/programs/sv/objectives.html>

Despite continuing threats, progress is being made in the protection of the site with support from civil society, which is very conscious of the value of Galapagos Islands and the Marine Reserve.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee, recognising the continued and increasing threats posed to the marine and terrestrial flora and fauna of the Islands, urges the State Party to make all efforts to finalise the specific regulations under the Special Law and enforce them as soon as possible. The Committee commends the ruling by the State Party’s Constitutional Court to uphold the Galapagos Special Law. It also commends the Ecuadorian Government for supporting the “Sea Shepherd” patrols in the Galapagos Marine Reserve, as well as efforts to protect the marine ecosystem in the Reserve. The Committee also commends the *Smart Voyager* initiative, given the nature of tourism visitation to the Galapagos and the impacts of tourism on the fragile environment and in light of the proposed Marine Reserve. It believes that consideration should be given to promoting similar schemes in other World Heritage sites. The Committee furthermore notes that the sea lion incident demonstrates the need to enhance the capacity of the Park to reinforce patrolling and control of the Islands.”

#### **Sian Ka’an (Mexico)**

Inscribed in 1987 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (iii) (iv)

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 243,280 In 2001: US\$ 40,900 for two training courses.

Previous deliberations: N/A

Issues:

Tourism development; land use.

New information:

In August 2001, IUCN received a report informing that land on the strip of dunes between the ocean and the coastal lagoon of Sian Ka'an was being advertised for sale by a real estate agent in the town of Akumal. While this is consistent with State Party law and regulations on protected areas that maintains ownership of private lands, including the right to sell those lands, the rapid escalation of tourism development in the area since the mid 1980's is of considerable concern.

However, in the framework of the UNF "Linking biodiversity conservation and sustainable tourism at World Heritage sites" project, it is noted that most of the beach front is in private hands. This has been the case since the Reserve's conception. The management plan has set a policy that private lots can be sold, but not divided, limiting tourism development within the Reserve. The management plan for the site also sets a moratorium on further construction on the private land until the preparation of the Ecological Land Use Plan has been finalised for the site. Authorities wish to fix tourism regulations in the near future to try to raise the quality of tourism and to control its' growth. These initiatives will be complemented by a new one from the Sian Kaan authorities on a transferable development rights strategy to deal with all the beach front holdings. The authorities hope to identify receiving areas and remove the density (development potential) from critical portions of the World Heritage site, while compensating property owners in those areas.

IUCN has received notification from the Municipality of Solidaridad, Playa del Carmen, State of Quintana Roo, Yucatan Peninsula of a scientific gathering planned for 5-10 November 2001. The event – "RIVIERA MAYA ECO'01: Safeguarding the Fragile Ecosystems of Solidaridad" is being convened with the aim of developing integrated programmes that consider protection, conservation, recovery and management of the areas unique biodiversity on a sustainable basis. The Municipality of Solidaridad, which includes part of the World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve, expects the construction of approximately 80,000 hotel rooms in the Municipality in the next 10-15 years, associated with a 24% annual population growth. Currently, the area receives 5,500 tourists a day.

IUCN believes the transferable property rights strategy holds some promise for reducing development pressures, and if successful, may have the potential to be applied in other World Heritage sites. IUCN therefore acknowledges the innovative attempt by the Park authorities to find a solution to the development problems facing the site, and requests the State Party to provide more information on the strategy.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

"The Bureau requests the State Party to provide a report on the impact of increased tourism development on the World Heritage site and strategies to address negative impacts. It also requests a report on progress achieved with the revision of the management plan for the World Heritage site by 1 February 2002."

**Canaima National Park (Venezuela)**

Inscribed in 1994 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

International assistance:

US\$ 30,000 for an on-site training and awareness-building workshop in 2000.

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau, paragraph III. ii)

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.138-141.

Issues:

Construction of power lines, involvement of indigenous people and local communities, mining.

New information:

The Ministry for the Environment sent a letter to the Centre dated 19 September 2001 that was transmitted to IUCN for review. This letter notes that, following one of the recommendations from the UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site in 1999, a "Participatory Long-Term Action Plan" for the site has been developed. The letter also notes the interest and commitment of the State Party to participate in the UNF financed project "*Enhancing our Heritage: monitoring and managing for success in World Natural Heritage sites*". Information was received at IUCN that INPARQUES, in charge of administration for Canaima National Park is facing serious financial difficulties, that is negatively affecting the protection of the site. Deforestation and rubbish dumping around tourist camps within the Park has also been reported. According to information received, tension between indigenous communities, FIEB and national authorities remains high with regard to the issue of the power line project. Further information on the state of conservation of Canaima National Park will be presented by IUCN at the Bureau session.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

"The Bureau requests the State Party to provide a comprehensive report on the conservation of Canaima National Park, including measures taken to enhance the capacity of INPARQUES to effectively protect and manage this site. The Bureau urges the Venezuelan Government to provide a report on the implementation of all recommendations of the UNESCO/IUCN 1999 mission by 1 February 2002".

## **Europe and North America**

### **Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)**

Inscribed in two phases in 1979 and 1982 on the World Heritage List under criterion N (iii) (extension of the Bialowieza National Park of Poland)

*International assistance:* None

#### *Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph III.24 / Annex X page 112.

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.142-145.

#### *Issues:*

Transboundary management, logging; community use.

#### *New information:*

The State Party submitted a copy of “*Background to Management Guidelines for Bialowieza Forest*” to the Centre dated 18 September 2001, which was transmitted to IUCN for review. It is an outcome of the Technical Working Group (TWG) created within the framework of the *Bialowieza Forest Project*. IUCN notes that the *Guidelines* document is the result of a trial process for establishing a decision-making procedure concerning the future of the Forest, its social functions, and the protection of natural values of primeval forests. The TWG is the only forum assembled to date that has included representatives of a wide range of stakeholders and has involved intensive consultations within the communities affected by management of the Forest. The *Bialowieza Forest Project*, supervised by the Ministry of Environment and supported by Danish Co-operation for the Environment in Eastern Europe (DANCEE), aims to elaborate and agree upon a proposal for management of Bialowieza Forest. The objective of the Project is to achieve a participatory, coherent and sustainable approach to the management of the Forest, ensuring the protection of natural values and supporting development of local communities.

The *Guidelines* document makes several recommendations. Keys amongst these are to:

- create a system of strict protection covering the whole of the Bialowieza Forest, with 12,000 ha as a final, recommended area. Proposals for the precise location of the strictly protected territory require further consultation
- establish a Forest Board within the Powiat authority to coordinate management of the Bialowieza Forest and resolve conflicts. The Forest Board as proposed includes representatives of State Forests, Bialowieza Forest management, local authorities, the tourism sector and the Bialowieza National Park Board
- accord the Forest a special legal status, ie: pass a Bialowieza Forest Act that supports it as a unique area of regional, national and international significance while also taking account of specific natural conditions and the development of the local community

- establish one administrative unit for the Bialowieza Forest, which will enable rationalisation of decision making, management, financial organisation and implementation of projects and allow easier access to financial resources

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau notes IUCN’s support for the key recommendations as noted above. It commends the efforts of the TWG and the Bialowieza Forest Project to bring all stakeholders together to create a common vision for the World Heritage site. The Bureau requests the State Party to provide regular progress reports in relation to the implementation of this project.”

### **Pirin National Park (Bulgaria)**

Inscribed in 1983 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (i) (ii) (iii)

*International assistance:* None

#### *Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph VIII.24 / Annex X page 112.

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.146-149.

#### *Issues:*

Ski development.

#### *New information:*

The Ministry for the Environment and Water submitted a report on the conservation status of Pirin National Park dated 12 September 2001, which was transmitted to IUCN for review. The report includes the following information on the Territorial Development Plan (TDP) that was developed for the Bansko ski zone that lies within the site:

- The TDP passed all the Environment Impact Assessment procedures set by the Bulgarian Protected Areas Law. It was also subject to public hearing. It was later submitted to the High Expert Ecological Council (HEEC) of the Ministry of Environment and Water. The HEEC partially approved the TDP, while also requesting changes and protection measures aimed at improving the TDP.
- The final version of the TDP is 818.46 ha, with ski runs and facilities occupying 99.55 ha of this area.
- The TDP is considered as the upgrade and development of an existing ski zone, the most significant element of which is a cable car. It is considered to significantly reduce the negative impacts associated with crowding, traffic congestion, and rundown facilities.
- The development aims to ensure the achievement of one of the major goals of the National Park, namely encouraging ecotourism and generating income for the local people. The TDP will contribute to the sustainable development of the Park by enrolling the local community into the idea of protection of the

- Park. The State Party report noted that the local population is fully supportive of the TDP.
- The Management Plan for the Park is to be developed with financial assistance from the ongoing Bulgarian-Swiss Biodiversity Conservation Programme. This is expected to be complete in 2001. It is expected that the Management Plan will take note of the main directives of the TDP and after the approval of the Management Plan, some of the TDP's decisions may be changed.
  - On 12 July 2001, the sitting of the three-member High Administrative Court of Bulgaria ended with a rejection of the BALKANI Wildlife Society appeal against the decision of the Ministry of Environment and Water to grant permission for the TDP. There was an appeal against the decision with the sitting of a five-member Court, and was subsequently rejected by the Court in late September. The High Administrative Court is the final authority and avenue of appeal.
  - Prior to the High Court decision in July, the Ministry of Environment and Water opened the bid procedure for the concession for the TDP by advertising in the State Gazette, and a Commission was nominated to oversee the concession bidding process.

The State Party report invited a UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site. IUCN also received the first Brief of the "Save the Pirin Campaign", which involves a coalition of over 30 Bulgarian NGOs opposed to the development. The Brief and subsequent Briefs will be used to inform European NGOs, Convention Secretariats, European institutions including the EC, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and European Parliament about the Campaign's progress. Members of the Campaign have met with the new Minister of Environment and Water, representatives of the potential project sponsor and representatives of the EBRD, which is also involved in project financing. IUCN noted the State Party's belief that "the only solution to the problem of the sustainable development of the Pirin NP is to bind the goals of the Park to the interests of the local people", and that the TDP offers this opportunity. IUCN acknowledges that it is important that local populations benefit, where possible, from World Heritage designation. IUCN notes that any development in the World Heritage site must be carefully planned to minimise environmental impacts. IUCN questioned whether the TDP project in Pirin National Park can be classed as ecotourism and whether it is compatible with World Heritage status. It also noted that the total area covered by the TDP is 818.46 ha, whereas the current proposed ski runs and facilities cover less than 100 ha. This is a substantial increase.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

"The Committee notes the concerns over the Territorial Development Plan (TDP) which it is anticipated will lead to further incremental development within the remaining larger area. It requests the State Party to ensure that tourism development does not take place in the remaining TDP area in the future. The Committee

urges the mission invited by the State Party be carried out as soon as possible."

#### **Gros Morne National Park (Canada)**

Inscribed in 1987 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (i) (iii)

*International Assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.150-152.

*Issues:*

Logging near the World Heritage site.

*New information:*

Following the Bureau's request, the Canadian authorities provided a report concerning the site, dated 14 September 2001, which was transmitted to IUCN for review. The report notes that logging in the Main River watershed near Gros Morne National Park is unchanged since June 2001. There is currently no logging activity in the area. Parks Canada continues to work with the forestry company and provincial government authorities to ensure that the proposed harvesting regime takes into account potential impacts on the World Heritage values and the ecological integrity of the site.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

"The Bureau thanks Parks Canada for the report provided and requests the State Party to inform the Centre as soon as new developments occur."

#### **Nahanni National Park (Canada)**

Inscribed in 1978 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (ii) (iii)

*International Assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.153-157.

*Issues:*

Mining, proposed expansion of site.

*New information:*

Following the Bureau's request, the Canadian authorities provided a report concerning the site, dated 14 September 2001, which was transmitted to IUCN for review. IUCN notes that the report focuses on the potential impacts of increased mining activity in the region surrounding Nahanni National Park World Heritage site. The report notes that:

- A study is currently underway to determine preferred boundaries for three adjacent areas which are proposed as additions to the Park

- The Deh Cho First Nations have proposed that the Park reserve be expanded to include part or all of the South Nahanni River watershed
- *The Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* (MVRMA) governs land and resource use in the Nahanni area and the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board has authority. The Board is required to conduct preliminary screening on any proposed development before issuing a permit or licence; this screening includes consultation with government agencies including Parks Canada and First Nations. It can lead to an EIA being requested. In cases where the screening does not lead to an EIA, a federal department such as Parks Canada may request such an assessment
- For Nahanni National Park, the *Canada National Parks Act* applies, so only the environmental assessment provisions of the MVRMA have effect, and under those provisions consideration must be given to cumulative impacts
- In recent months, Parks Canada has been working with other federal and territorial agencies to review permit and licence applications under the MVRMA in an effort to ensure that the ecological integrity of Nahanni National Park Reserve is maintained
- There are currently seven mining and energy companies that have submitted applications for exploration or development activities in the region. The areas potentially affected by this activity are within the watershed of the South Nahanni River. In two cases, the areas potentially affected are in one of the three candidate areas identified as proposed additions to the Park Reserve

Parks Canada is concerned that the number and location of the proposed developments could result in cumulative impacts on aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, including changes to water quality, habitat fragmentation, changes to wildlife movement and resulting impacts on biodiversity. Parks Canada is continuing to work in the processes established under the MVRMA and De Cho Process to address its concerns. It is:

1. Continuing efforts to expand the Park Reserve into the three identified candidate areas identified and to work with other jurisdictions towards a comprehensive conservation regime for the balance of the watershed
2. Through the MVRMA process, focusing its reviews on the identification of potential impacts of the development proposals on ecological integrity and World Heritage values. It will work with proponents and regulatory agencies to develop appropriate mitigation measures, and if measures cannot be found, it will recommend further environmental review.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau notes the importance placed by Parks Canada on the issue of cumulative impacts from mining to this World Heritage site and the measures underway to solve or minimise this problem. The Bureau requests the State Party to provide a progress

report on the implementation of the MVRMA and De Cho Process by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau”.

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

Inscribed in 1995-2000 on the World Heritage List under criterion N (i)

*International assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph A.3

*Issues:*

Mining proposals, surface protection of cave system;

*New information:*

In June 2001, IUCN received reports concerning the preparation of a new version of the mining law by the Slovak Ministry of Economy. The new law is believed to remove or weaken the present restrictions on mining operations in protected areas. The reports also claimed that mining companies are seeking to open new limestone mines in the Slovak Karst, and claims the granting of limestone exploitation licenses by the Slovak Government is imminent. SOSNA, a Slovak environmental NGO, has proposed to the Slovak Minister of Environment the re-categorisation of the Slovak Karst from a Protected Landscape Area to a National Park and the development of local sustainable tourism and biological farming. It has also proposed that the revised mining law exclude geological reserves. EuroBirder, a group of professional and amateur ornithologists based in Berlin concerned with the preservation of the environment in the Western Palearctic, has also approached the Minister of Environment on the issue of National Park status for the area. It also mentions interest from local towns in the development of ‘soft’ tourism and traditional industries, handicrafts and farming methods, and opposition to the visible impact caused by limestone mining.

IUCN has also received the State Party's state of conservation report for the Slovak Karst World Heritage site, dated the 5 October 2001, which notes:

- Under the Law of the National Board of the Slovak Republic regarding the Protection of Nature and Landscape, the Caves are listed as either National Monuments or Nature Monuments. This level of protection is the highest level of protection under the Law. Every cave that is listed as part of the World Heritage site is covered by this highest level of protection and is further located within the Protected Landscape Area of Slovensky Kras.
- In order to avoid and prevent negative human impacts in the Protected Landscape Area of Slovensky Kras, the Ministry of the Environment in coordination with District offices is in the process of preparing proposals for the reclassification of Slovensky Kras as a National Park. The proposed date for decision by the

Government of the Slovak Republic on this reclassification is October 2002.

- With National Park designation, under the *Law*, the protection of nature is of the highest consideration and only after that may considerations be made for other activities. This means that according to the *Law*, limestone exploitation is forbidden.
- The regional development plan for the Kosice region, gazetted in 1998, does not propose new limestone mining in the area of Slovensky Kras. Furthermore, this plan proposes the regulation of land-use to be guided by the limits of nature protection, the protection of cultural monuments, and the protection of agricultural and forest soil. These regulations have strong limits regarding acceptable human impact activities.
- The Ministry of Economy has proposed a new version of the *Basic Geological Law* regarding geological works and state geological services. This *Law* includes a section on research of geological conditions for opening new caves and the stabilization of underground areas. The proposed changes were not accepted by the Government, and the Ministry of Economy is preparing a revision. The Ministry of Environment will consider these revisions to ensure this proposal takes into consideration the existing environmental regulations (including the protection of World Heritage sites).

The Cave and Karst Theme Programme of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas, has provided the Slovak Government with policy and guideline literature on Karst and mining activities.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau commends the State Party on the process of changing the status of the Protected Landscape Area of Slovensky Kras to that of a National Park. This will complement the adjacent Aggtelek National Park in Hungary and, in doing so, facilitate more cohesive and equivalent management of the two sections of the World Heritage site. The Bureau requests the State Party to provide an update on the proposed revisions to the mining law and specific implications for the World Heritage site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau (April 2002)”.

#### **Aeolian Islands (Italy)**

Inscribed in 2000 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (i)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – A.1

Issues:

Landscape Territorial Plan

#### New information:

IUCN received reports of legal proceedings taken to oppose the implementation of the Landscape Territorial Plan for the Aeolian Islands. The Plan (“Piano Paesistico delle Isole Eolie”), was prepared by the Superintendent of Culture and Environment on behalf of the Sicily Region, which is fully responsible for the management of the World Heritage site. It covers the seven Islands in their entirety.

The main goals of the Plan are:

- To preserve the natural condition of volcanic bodies, structures and coastal areas
- To establish clear rules and criteria to guide human interventions in relation to the landscape of the Islands.

It is understood that the Mayors of two of the four townships on the Islands – Lipari and Leni, have opposed the Plan and have requested the Court to deliver a judgement in order to cancel the Plan. A group of non-governmental organisations, including Italia Nostra, Associazione Prostromboli, WWF and Legambiente, is supporting the Sicily Region’s Plan in Court. The deadline for submissions is 14 November 2001, while the court decision is expected on the 4 December 2001. In opposing the Plan, the Mayor of Lipari has stated that “limitations foreseen - for agricultural, tourist, economic and productive activities; in the alteration of existing buildings; the prohibition of new constructions; the limitations of new constructions on agricultural areas; the prohibition of building new roads and enlarging existing footpaths - will all harm the general economy of the Islands”.

The Plan will be managed by the Regional Office of the Superintendent of Culture and Environment of Messina who will approve or reject any alteration of the territory according to the rules stated in the same Plan. This Plan is the only existing plan for the Islands and meets the requirements set for the World Heritage site.

If the Plan should not be implemented, it is understood the rules regarding conservation, new constructions and general human activities on the Islands will be decided on a case-by-case basis by the different City Councils. As reported by Italia Nostra, these Councils have stated their intention to increase by at least 4 times the present level of tourist accommodation. IUCN notes the actions of Italia Nostra for support of the Landscape Territorial Plan, which is particularly important given its significance as the only (potential) plan governing the World Heritage site. However IUCN also notes that at the time of nomination, the State Party mentioned its commitment to preparation of a separate management plan for the World Heritage site, to be placed within the Landscape Territorial Plan.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau expresses its concern to the State Party on the local government opposition to the Landscape

Territorial Plan, noting that the inscription of the site was partly based on the existence of this Plan. The Bureau requests the State Party to provide information on the implications the court action has for the preparation of a Management Plan for the World Heritage site. It also requests to be provided with an update on: progress in development of the Management Plan; the protective and educational/interpretative actions undertaken for the site, and proposed development plans, particularly with respect to tourism on the Islands, how such tourism development may affect the World Heritage site and how it will be dealt with within the Landscape Territorial Plan and Management Plan. The Bureau requests that this information be provided by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau”.

### **Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)**

Inscribed in 1996 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

#### International assistance:

US\$ 30,000 for a training seminar in 1999;

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Bureau – paragraph Annex X, p. 116

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.281

#### Issues:

Federal Law; pollution; pulp and paper mill, decline in seal population; Baikal Commission; oil and gas pipeline; oil and gas exploration.

New information: The State Party invited a UNESCO mission to this site following the recommendation from the twenty-fourth session of the Committee. The mission took place from 25 August to 3 September 2001. A Representative of IUCN and the Director of UNESCO-Moscow Office, representing the World Heritage Centre, conducted the mission. The full report of this mission is contained in information document WHC-2001/CONF.207/INF.8. IUCN would like to acknowledge the excellent support received for this mission from the regional authorities and local stakeholders. However, IUCN notes that no representative from the Federal Government participated in the mission during the field visit, when substantive discussion on the state of conservation of this site took place. The Centre also received an unofficial translation of a brief document submitted by the Vice Head of the Section of Especially Protected Natural Territories of the Russian Federation. This document provided details of pollution levels of Lake Baikal and stated that the territorial bodies of the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation in Irkutsk Oblast and Buratia have been informed about the mission and are ready to co-operate.

IUCN welcomes some positive developments in relation to the increased awareness of regional authorities on the relevance of the status of Lake Baikal as a World Heritage

natural site, as well as the increased support given to enhance the management of the protected areas within this site through GEF Projects. However there are a series of recurrent problems and new potential threats that IUCN believes are seriously threatening the integrity of this site. Key recurrent problems have been reported to previous Committee meetings and include:

- The Federal Baikal Law, approved in March 1999, is still lacking the necessary detailed regulations and by-laws that will make it fully operational. Five important decrees are foreseen to complement this important law but only two of them, on *Regulation of the Water Level at Lake Baikal* and on *Activities Banned in the Central Ecological Zone* have been approved. However, even this limited legal framework has not been fully enforced. The decree to ban activities in the Central Ecological Zone is constrained by the fact that the zoning for this site has not been defined. There are also reports on frequent violations of the *Federal Law on the Protection of the Environment* and of the *Federal Law on Environmental Impact Assessments* in relation to logging activities, illegal hunting, over fishing and the development of new buildings and infrastructure in the Baikal World Heritage site.
- There is still no overall management plan for this site, as requested by the Committee at the time of inscription. This is essential in view of the need for effective zoning of this site and the increasing development pressures that this site is facing.
- In 2000 the Baikal Commission, an intergovernmental body comprising federal and regional authorities as well as scientific institutions, was abolished causing serious gaps in the co-ordination and implementation of conservation activities at Lake Baikal. The absence of this body also makes it more difficult to evaluate the impact of proposed new development projects on the integrity of this site and to take the necessary measures to stop or modify those projects.
- There is particular concern about the impact from the development of tourist centres in Pribaikalsky National Park that have been developed in ecologically important areas of this Park. An increase in illegal poaching and logging have also been reported in this Park as well as in other areas within the World Heritage site.
- Continuing decline of the Baikal Seal population (a census in 1994 estimated a total population of 104,000. Two research groups estimated the total population in 2000 at 40,000 - 60,000 and 67,000 respectively). This species is at the highest level of the food chain in Lake Baikal and its decline is an important indicator on the overall state of Baikal ecosystems. Research suggests a complex combination of causes, including a high accumulation of poisonous substances such as PCBs, and other organochlorine products, loss of immunity to natural diseases, habitat deterioration and human predatory activities. In relation to PCBs some studies point to the town of Usolye-Sibirskoye as the single largest possible source, being associated with the production

of the soda that it is used at the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill.

- The Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill (BPPM) continues to be a serious threat to the integrity of this site, discharging around 50,000 tons of wastewater into Lake Baikal and 20,000 tons of total emissions into the atmosphere per year. Polluted areas of the Lake of almost 100km<sup>2</sup> are recorded by scientific studies, and include impacts on phytoplankton composition in the southern part of the Lake. A number of options have been studied in relation to BPPM operations: from closure of the plant to a total re-profiling of the plant to move from pulp production to the production of paper and furniture. There is also a proposal to establish a closed-loop recycling system for BPPM, however some experts consider this option unfeasible. In addition there is concern that a re-profiling of the plant to use unbleached cellulose will create additional pressure on the forests of the Lake Baikal region, including forest area within the World Heritage site. The technical, social and economic considerations related to BPPM re-profiling are very complex and urgently require substantial international funding and technical support.

In addition to these recurrent problems there are new potential threats to the integrity of this site:

- A project to develop a gas and oil pipeline to China was confirmed by the regional authorities during the IUCN/UNESCO mission. There are a number of options under consideration for this project, including one that envisages the pipeline passing in the vicinity of the south-western watershed area of the World Heritage site (at the headwaters of the Rivers Sneznaya and Utulik). This option may involve considerable risk to the integrity of this site and the people living around in case of accidents due to seismic activities in the area. The Government of the Republic of Buryatia has approved the Declaration of Intent for this project in spite of the fact that for a number of Russian experts the options under consideration are violating the *Federal Law on the Protection of the Environment*. In the case of federal approval of this project, its implementation could create unprecedented environmental risks to the integrity of this site.
- The Government of the Republic of Buryatia has granted a license to Buryat Gas Company that allows for both exploration and exploitation of gas and oil in the Selenga Delta, within the World Heritage site, for a period of 25 years. At the initial phase of this project, in winter 1999/2000 six sampling drillings were done in the southern Selenga Delta (Istok-Golutai area) not far from the border of a RAMSAR site. An EIA for the second part of this project, which implies deep drilling in the Selenga littoral, was presented to the regional authorities but it was denied. The General Procurator of Buryatia also has protested against the issued license for the first phase of exploratory drilling that was approved by the State Committee for Natural Resources of Buryatia. This project is currently under consideration by the Federal

Ministry of Natural Resources but no official response is available yet. However, in the case of a positive decision the potential threats to the integrity of this World Heritage site are considerable, due to the direct and indirect impacts of oil and gas exploration and exploitation. This project is particularly important considering its potential link with the gas and oil pipeline to China. As mentioned above, one of the design options for the pipeline passes close to the Selenga Delta, presumably to be linked to this area if exploitation of gas and oil is allowed.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee notes that little substantial progress has been achieved towards enhancing the protection of Lake Baikal, and addressing issues repeatedly raised by the Committee, and that there are new emerging threats that would pose unprecedented risks to the integrity of this site. The Committee therefore decides to inscribe Lake Baikal in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee notes that this should be viewed as a positive measure to attract international support to enhance the capacity of the State Party to deal with the complex issues related to the conservation of this site.

The Committee furthermore notes the following as key milestones in assessing future progress:

- (1) Development and enforcement of all related regulations and by-laws required for the *Federal Baikal Law* to become fully operational. These regulations and by-laws should be developed through a participatory and transparent process involving local people and all key stakeholders dealing with the protection and management of this site.
- (2) Development and implementation of an integrated management plan for the whole Baikal region, with emphasis on the protection of the World Heritage site. Priority should be given to develop an adequate ecological zoning of this site to enforce the *Federal Baikal Law*. This plan needs to include a comprehensive monitoring system on the state of Lake Baikal. Adequate human and financial resources are required to ensure its long-term implementation.
- (3) Development and implementation of adequate institutional and co-ordination mechanisms for implementing the *Federal Baikal Law*, its regulations and by-laws. This could take the form of a renewed Baikal Commission or a similar institutional arrangement that would enhance co-ordination between federal and regional authorities while involving also NGOs, scientific institutions and other stakeholders.
- (4) Development and implementation of a comprehensive programme to adequately address the pollution problems affecting this site, giving particular priority to the case of BPPM, but also including other sources of pollution that are affecting the integrity of this site.

- (5) Detailed consideration of various scenarios for the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill, including total phasing out of the Mill. This requires a long-term strategy and must be associated with the development of alternative livelihoods for local people as the BPPM is the main source of employment in the region.

In addition, the Committee requests that the State Party provides an urgent response by 1 February 2002 on the development of a gas and oil pipeline to China, and the potential impacts of this project on the integrity of this site, as well as the proposed oil and gas exploration in the Selenga Delta. The Committee furthermore requests the World Heritage Centre to undertake all possible efforts to encourage the World Bank, GEF, UNF, and other relevant international donors to provide urgent support, in the form of soft loans, grants and projects, to enhance the State Party efforts to address the complex conservation and development issues facing Lake Baikal.”

#### **Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation)**

Inscribed in 1996 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (i) (ii) (iii)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph VIII.27 / Annex X page 115.

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.158-162.

Issues:

Gold mining project; road construction; collaboration with local people.

New information:

IUCN has received a copy of the State Party report on Kamchatka prepared following the June 2001 Bureau meeting. It reports that salmon poaching has been increasing on the Peninsula but not within the World Heritage site. It also states explicitly that gold mining is not carried out on “...areas of especially protected natural territories, which are a part of the World Heritage site, and on nearby areas...”, and that the decrease in world prices for gold and the high costs of gold mining is holding up the development of the industry in the region. The report also mentions the construction (already commenced) of the Kamchatskaya oblast gas pipeline, and the planned construction of a hydro-thermal power station at Mutnovsky volcano. Both are outside the World Heritage site.

IUCN has received several reports on the Bystrinski Nature Park (BNP). At a Conference on Mining Industry Investments, held from 18 to 20 April 2001 at Petropavlovsk-Kamchatski, the BNP status was noted as an obstacle to the development of the Kamchatka region, specifically with respect to constraining infrastructure development (roads and buildings) required for gold,

platinum and molybdenum mining. The situation in and around BNP remains uncertain. The Kamchatka Park Service has appointed a new Park Director. However there has been little progress in dealing with threats to the BNP as the Park is receiving no financial support from the Government.

Legal uncertainties continue to surround the BNP: legally, the Park does not have control of its land; the boundaries of the BNP are not officially defined (both on-the-ground and on paper), and zoning of the BNP remains incomplete. This situation constrains the Park Director in taking measures towards monitoring of hunting, prevention of poaching and forest fires. Reports received by IUCN note that hunting and tour operators (registered outside of the District) are actively operating within the BNP without any control or consultation with the Park Administration, and concerns have been expressed by indigenous populations.

It is reported that gold mining operations have started at Manuch, following an unannounced change to the boundary of the BNP. Neither the Forest Service, the Park authorities, nor leaders of local indigenous communities were informed of the mine development. The site is 5km from the ‘new boundary’ of the Park in the south-eastern section. The gold mine operation underway in Manuch is approximately 12km inside the boundary of the BNP as inscribed by the World Heritage Committee. IUCN notes that in the original nomination of 1995 there was a small area excluded from the Park in the south, which corresponded to the Aginskoye deposit. In 1996, there was a revision of the boundary of the BNP, releasing a section in the south for mining. This was the same year that the World Heritage site as a whole was inscribed. The latest boundary change has cut off a further section in the south for gold mining, moving the boundary inwards by about 17km. IUCN notes that it is unclear what a boundary change of 17km means in terms of the total area excised from the BNP.

IUCN has received a report that a road is planned connecting Esso, the administrative centre of Bystrinski District located in the centre of the BNP, with Palana, the capital of Koriak Autonomous Region. The road will bisect the Park, and no monitoring or control programmes have been outlined. IUCN notes this road will open up large areas to poaching and hunting. With no monitoring or control programmes in place, and in light of the extremely limited capacities of Park authorities and the Forest Service, the potential for major threats to the fauna and flora of the Park are high.

Since February this year, IUCN it has been working with local and indigenous communities in Esso and Anavgai in the Bystrinski Nature Park within the framework of the CIDA-funded project “*Building partnerships for forest conservation and management in Russia*”. The project aims to build partnerships with local communities for the development and marketing of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) such as mushrooms, berries, herbal teas and medicinal plants, thereby improving livelihoods and conserving the forest.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee notes with concern threats to the Bystrinsky Nature Park and notes conflicting reports relating to the gold mine operation and its relationship to the World Heritage boundary. The Committee urges the State Party to invite a mission to the site to review the state of conservation including the issues noted above and to ascertain whether a case exists for inscribing this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.”

#### **Western Caucasus (Russian Federation)**

Inscribed in 1999 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (ii) and (iv).

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-third session of the Committee – paragraph . A.1

Issues:

Tourism development, illegal hunting, road construction; boundary changes

New information:

IUCN has received a copy of the State Party periodic report for the Western Caucasus prepared following the June 2001 Bureau meeting. The report mentions that illegal trespassing continues to be significant, largely related to tourism activities and the proximity of tourist centres and hostels to the preserve’s boundaries. Furthermore, there has been a weakening of conservation controls over the last 5-10 years, with an absence of such controls in the Lagonaki Plateau and Fisht-Oshtensky Massif which are popular areas for trekking, mountaineering etc. In September, IUCN received reports that the Court of Adygea intended to exclude part of the Western Caucasus Zapovednik (the World Heritage site) to allow for tourist development and the construction of a road.

*Tourist Development:* Regarding the tourist development, IUCN received a report that the Adygean Administration is proposing to develop ski facilities in the Plateau Lagonaki, and that this area of the World Heritage site has been incorporated into the "Fisht Ecological Tourist Territory" (ETT Fisht). On 6 August 2001, the Court of Arbitration of the Republic of Adygea ruled on an appeal made by the Administration of the Maykop District and ETT Fisht. The ruling deems void the decisions of the Republic authorities to include Plateau Lagonaki, Fisht-Oshtensky Massif and the Bambaki tract into the Caucasus Nature Preserve. IUCN notes that all these areas are part of the World Heritage site. The Court decision follows a land withdrawal deed filed on the 13 July 2001 for construction of tourist facilities and a cableway in the area.

*Road:* In relation to the road, IUCN received word that the Head of the Committee of Natural Resources of the

Republic Adygea has reiterated his promise made in his previous letter to the World Heritage Committee regarding the proposed road. IUCN notes that this letter states:

*“The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of the Republic of Adygea informs you that at the present time the authorities of the Republic of Adygea are considering a new route for the Maikop-Black Sea Coast highway, avoiding the Caucasus Natural Reserve and other specially protected territories, including the Caucasus nomination. The above-mentioned activities are being carried out for the purpose of execution of the order by President of the Republic of Adygea Dzharimov. So the insinuations that the Adygean authorities have tried to build the highway right through the Caucasus State Natural Biospheric Reserve have no grounds.”*

*Illegal Hunting:* IUCN is concerned with reports received noting the increasing use of helicopters, the use of a variety of high impact fire-arms, and the increase in trophy hunting. The direct and indirect impacts associated with helicopters are likely to be substantial. The use of machine guns enables multiple killings and creates noise distress. Unregulated trophy hunting can alter the male-female balance to the extent that population viability may be threatened.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau notes that the issue of the road through the Lagonaki Plateau was discussed at the time of inscription of this site and that assurances of the State Party to abandon this route was key to the site being inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requests the State Party provide an update on the status of the road and its routing. The Bureau requests the State Party to provide detailed information on the developments mentioned above, and specifically the status of the removal of areas from the site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.”

#### **Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation)**

Inscribed in 1998 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (iv)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph VIII.26 / Annex X page 115.

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.163-165.

Issues:

Road construction project.

New information:

Following the UNESCO-UNDP mission to the site and the Bureau’s deliberations, information was received in

August 2001 from the UNESCO Moscow Office of support for an international consultant to provide expertise to the Republic of Altai with regard to the road project. The Russian authorities via the Vice Head of the Section of Especially Protected Natural Territories informed the Centre that the Federal Road Fund agreed to finance the preparation of technical and economical grounds (TEG) for the road project, carried out by the Omsk Academy of Architecture and Construction, which will review the three variants of the proposed highway. At present this has not been considered by the Government of the Republic of Altai.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau notes the need for an international consultant to assist the State Party and the Government of the Republic of Altai and encourages the authorities to submit a well defined international assistance proposal. Such a project should be reviewed and carried out in close consultation between the State Party, IUCN, the Centre and the UNESCO Moscow Office.”

#### **Doñana National Park (Spain)**

Inscribed in 1994 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (ii) (iii) (iv)

*International assistance:* None

#### *Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – paragraph VIII.27 / Annex X page 116.

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.166-167.

#### *Issues:*

Mining spill in 1998; species decline; pilgrimage impacts; grazing impacts, illegal water extraction; plans for up-stream port expansion.

#### *New information:*

*Project Doñana 2005:* IUCN has received a report on the Doñana National Park, which welcomes the initiation of a number of recommendations from the *Project Doñana 2005*, but notes that progress continues to be slow despite the importance of this project. In May 2001 the Project established its Scientific Board, however there has been little scientific input into the Project's activities. A new co-ordinator for the project has been appointed and it is expected that this will help to speed up project implementation. The report notes that some of the recommendations from the October 1999 Seminar are still to be acted upon, for example, in relation to: coordination; definition of public riverine domain; watershed restoration; promotion of sustainable agriculture; development of pilot projects; and prospective studies.

*Expansion of the Port of Seville:* The information received also noted with concern a proposal to expand the Port of Seville, up the Guadalquivir River and outside the World

Heritage site. This project will be funded by sea shipping subventions of the EU. The project includes the construction of new port facilities, for which it will be necessary to correct the course of the Guadalquivir River, the estuary of which is the west boundary of the World Heritage site. This will require dredging and deepening of the river channel, removing around 9.5 Million cubic meters of sediment that will be dumped in the estuary. An EIA, prepared for this investment by the Port Authorities of Seville, met with considerable criticism and, as a result, the project was temporarily stopped. It has been reported in local press that an agreement has been found between the rice farmers of the area and the Guadalquivir Hydrographical Confederation that may help to promote the implementation of the project – e.g.: the inclusion of a sluice to mitigate the effects from new saline intrusions.

IUCN has received detailed information on the state of conservation of the site. It provides the following information:

1. **Management Plan:** The National Park Management Plan is still under discussion and as such is behind the original schedule, however notable progress has been made in the prevention and reduction of possible conflicts with stakeholders, and a new draft is expected to be publicly released soon.
2. **Iberian Lynx:** The Iberian lynx is experiencing a major decline in numbers due to the scarcity of its major food source, the rabbit. The lynx population fell from 50 individuals in 1990 to 30 in 2000, with not more than 5 reproducing females (National Census by Pereira & Robles, 2000). Further, the lynx habitat is being damaged and reduced by overgrazing, by annual pilgrimages, and there is concern with regard to the impact road infrastructure outside the Park is having on the lynx population (since 1982, 25 lynx have been killed by vehicles).
3. **Imperial Eagle:** The imperial eagle population has also declined, with only seven territories being occupied in 2000, compared to fifteen in 1988. The electricity line mortality has fallen; however the lack of rabbits, environmental pollution (with effects on fertility) and poisoning continue as the major causes of death outside the Park.
4. **Rocío Pilgrimage:** The Rocío Pilgrimage, which takes place twice a year, involves large numbers of pilgrims (1,500,000 in June, 400,000 in September), travelling from their origins to El Rocío village at the northern boundary of the Park. Those originating in the Cadiz Province (south of Doñana) travel two-three days/nights through the Park. The problems faced by the Park are mostly related to garbage, forest fires, and traffic congestion. However, a small northern stretch of the Park is not fenced and this is where pilgrims from Sevilla pass through. This northern crossing also lies in the middle of the important lynx habitat, and therefore requires joint control and management by the Park and Regional authorities. It is reported that a major campaign was launched last year to raise awareness amongst various institutions on the impacts of the pilgrimage on the Park. Nonetheless, this year's pilgrimage left huge amounts of garbage, and a vandalised Doñana Research Centre. An agreement to

- reduce traffic on the Rocío-Cádiz route through the Park has been signed after long negotiations.
5. **Grazing:** After long negotiations, the Park and livestock holders have approved a Plan for management of grazing, and a Committee has been established to implement it. To date, no concrete reductions in grazing levels have been achieved, and, as mentioned previously, this is impacting on the restoration project in the Matagordas.
  6. **Road Construction:** The impact of road building outside the Park on Doñana and its wildlife populations is of concern. Almost every road in the area has been renewed or enlarged in the last decade, leading to an increase in speed and volume of traffic. Many of the roads have significant impacts on the migration routes of mammals, including the endangered lynx.
  7. **Illegal Water Extraction:** Illegal water extraction for rice, cotton and strawberry farming is occurring on the Northern and Western boundaries of the Park. This could lead to long term effects, which include degradation of the groundwater body, and drying out of temporary lagoons and ash forests.
  8. **Restoration Plan for Aznalcollar Mine:** Environmental organisations and institutions in the area are concerned with the Restoration Plan that Boliden-Apirsa has submitted for the Aznalcollar mine. Although 76% of the planned restoration work has already been completed, there are concerns with insufficient isolation of the broken tailings dam in the Southern border, an insufficient cover of the rock dumps, and the reliability of data about the water-sludge level in the mining pits, which could effect the groundwater layer in future. Another concern lies with the funding for the required restoration works: Apirsa has declared bankruptcy, Boliden Ltd has denied any responsibility, and no official statement has been made by the Regional Department for Works.

The requested follow-up Conference has been scheduled from 26 to 28 November 2001 in Huelva and UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention have been invited to participate. The Bureau therefore may wish to review any new information available at the time of its session and may wish to revise the proposed decision below.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau commends the State Party on the *Doñana 2005* initiative, which provides an excellent framework for integrated land management. The Bureau notes a number of concerns have been raised in relation to the integrity of this site. Accordingly, the Bureau requests the State Party to provide a full report on the threats to the site, and on how they will be addressed, by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Bureau (April 2002). On the basis of this report the Bureau may wish to consider whether or not there is a case of listing this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger”.

### **St Kilda (United Kingdom)**

Inscribed in 1986 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (iii) (iv)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraph V.168-169.

Issues:

Oil exploration in the Atlantic frontier, protection of marine area, management plan.

New information:

The Scottish Executive provided a report on the state of conservation of St. Kilda dated 18 September 2001 that was transmitted to IUCN for review. It recalled that the Committee proposed that the boundaries of the site be expanded to include the marine area and the management plan be revised. The authorities informed the Centre that they would be targeting a submission date in time for the twenty-sixth session of the Committee.

On the basis of the State Party report IUCN would like to:

- commend the State Party on the research and surveys, both those completed and ongoing, which are mapping the seabed and identifying key seabird communities
- note the collaboration of a number of organisations in the process of delineating the proposed new boundaries of the site based on these research activities
- commend the State Party for maintaining the moratorium on the issuance of new oil licenses nearer to the site than those already in existence, and request that details of the risk assessment process to be put in place be provided along with the draft management plan as soon as possible
- encourage the State Party to include in the revised management plan strict prohibition of all oil, gas and other exploration, in both the site and the buffer zone.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau commends the State Party for the progress report provided and requests the authorities to submit a report by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau. The Bureau encourages the State Party to complete the new boundary identification as soon as possible so that work can commence in earnest on the management plan. It requests the State Party to clarify the role and involvement of the site authorities in the decision-making process for issuance of licenses in the site, in the buffer zone and outside the buffer zone. The Bureau also welcomes the outcome of the consultation meetings held as part of the preparation of the management plan. The Bureau would like to remind the State Party that any revised nomination dossier for cultural values and revised boundaries should be submitted by the deadlines established by the Committee.”

### **Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom)**

Inscribed in 1986 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (i) (iii)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations: N/A

Issues:

Major constructions, visitor centre.

New information:

The Centre received a number of letters, including from the National Trust, raising concerns with regard to commercial development in the area surrounding the site, and the private sale and redevelopment of a complex for visitor facilities. These letters were transmitted to the State Party for comments and to IUCN for review. IUCN notes that the Department of Environment has announced it will bring forward proposals for the production of a management plan for the entire Causeway Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which includes the World Heritage site, later this year. IUCN considers that any major development, including the re-development of the visitor centre, should be considered in the context of such an integrated management plan and must be compatible with its status as a World Heritage site. The State Party had not responded at the time of preparation of this document.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau requests the State Party to provide a report on the situation of the site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau, to include progress with the production of the management plan for the Causeway. The Bureau expresses its concern with piecemeal development in and around the site, in the absence of such a plan.”

### **Great Smoky Mountains National Park (United States of America)**

Inscribed in 1983 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (i) (ii) (iii) and (iv)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations: N/A

Issues:

Air pollution.

New information:

In April 2001, the US National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) included Great Smoky Mountain National Park – the most visited park in the National Park System - in its list of America's Ten Most Endangered Parks for the third consecutive year. This listing was based on the continuing decline in air quality, largely the

result of air pollution caused by nearby coal-fired power plants. The NPCA reports that a controversial grandfathering clause in the Clean Air Act exempts older coal-fired power plants from current environmental protection standards—allowing the plants to continue polluting at a rate up to 10 times worse than newer plants. Experts estimate that a mandatory phase-out of older coal-fired plants would alleviate 70 percent of sulphur dioxide emissions in the Great Smoky Mountains—the pollutant primarily responsible for the Park's smog and visibility issues. A law suit has been presented by NPCA and the Sierra Club against the Tennessee Valley Authority for illegally emitting thousands of tons of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides every year. Scientific evidence links this air pollution to numerous health problems, visibility degradation, and plant damage in Great Smoky Mountains.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau requests the State Party provide information on the impacts the air pollution is having on the flora and fauna of the site as well as information on plans to address this problem by 1 February 2002 for consideration by its twenty-sixth session.”

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

### **Kakadu National Park (Australia)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1981; extended 1987, 1992 C (i) (vi); N (ii) (iii) (iv)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations: WHC-99/CONF.204/15  
Twenty-third session of the Bureau -paragraph IV.47

WHC-99/CONF.205/5 Rev. Third extraordinary session of the Committee, 12 July 1999

WHC-99/CONF.208/5 Twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau

WHC-99/CONF.209/22 Twenty-third session of the Committee - paragraph X.32 and Annex VIII

WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.6 Australia's Commitments: Protecting Kakadu National Park (Progress Report to the World Heritage Centre, 15 April 2000)

WHC-2000/CONF.202/17 Twenty-fourth ordinary session of the Bureau, June 2000– paragraph IV.46

WHC-2000/CONF.202/17 Twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau, June 2000– paragraph IV.46

WHC-2000/CONF.204/10 Twenty-fourth session of the Committee, paragraph VIII.29

WHC-2001/CONF.205/10 Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau, paragraphs V.170 - V.194

Issues: Proposed Jabiluka uranium mine and mill within an enclave of the World Heritage property; first sightings of cane toads (*Bufo marinus*), an invasive species, in Kakadu National Park

New Information:

Dialogue with the Traditional Owners

The twenty-fourth session of the Committee (Cairns, 2000) encouraged the State Party and the Mirrar Traditional Owners to resume and continue their efforts in a constructive dialogue, in order to develop together a process leading towards the protection of Kakadu's cultural heritage. The twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (June 2001) noted new information on the dialogue and requested the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre regularly informed of progress. The State Party has informed the Centre that it will report on progress in protecting the cultural values of Kakadu National Park at the end of November and would be pleased to provide an oral update to the Committee.

Cane toads

At its twenty-fifth session in June 2001 the Bureau noted reports on the first sightings of cane toads (*Bufo marinus*) in Kakadu National Park and commended the State Party for its approach on monitoring and research activities. The Bureau requested the State Party to report regularly to the World Heritage Centre on results of monitoring programmes and research activities. No new information has been received on this subject.

Landscape and ecosystem analysis, recruitment of the water resource specialist and establishment of the Independent Science Advisory Committee

As requested by the Bureau at its 25th session in June 2001 the State Party has provided new information on the progress with the (i) landscape and ecosystem analysis, (ii) recruitment of the water resource specialist and (iii) establishment of the Independent Science Advisory Committee.

(i) The State Party has provided information on discussions with stakeholders on the scope and content of a program which will:

- focus on the conservation of the natural World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park;
- be capable of distinguishing possible mining and related impacts at the landscape scale from effects due to other causes; and
- inform Australia's periodic report in 2003.

The first project, which has commenced, will describe the distribution of and map the extent of the major ecosystems in the Alligator Rivers Region.

(ii) A water resource specialist has been selected and is being appointed.

(iii) Details of the composition of a newly established Independent Science Advisory Committee (ISAC) for Jabiluka, as recommended by the ISP (Independent Scientific Panel) of ICSU, have been received from the State Party. Membership of the previous existing statutory scientific review committee, the Alligator Rivers Region Technical Committee, has been amended. The terms of reference for the ISAC are as recommended by the ISP. The next meeting of the new committee is to take place in October.

The new appointments to the committee include independent members nominated by the independent Federation of Australian Scientific and Technological Services (FASTS) and appointed by the Minister, and representatives of the key stakeholder groups (Parks Australia; Energy Resources of Australia Ltd; Hanson Australia Pty Ltd; the Northern Land Council, and the Northern Territory Department of Mines and Energy). The Supervising Scientist is also a member of the committee.

IUCN has noted that it is not proposed at present to include a representative from an environmental NGO in the ISAC, and believes that this is an omission that should be rectified in order to ensure the credibility of the Committee's work, especially as other stakeholder groups are to be represented. In this connection, IUCN notes that the final ISP report recommended that « *the Committee's terms of reference, membership, secretarial support etc. would need to be agreed between the Australian Government and the WH Committee* » (report number 3, section 8.1).

Australian environmental NGO Report on Jabiluka

A report has been received from three Australian environmental NGOs: the Australian Conservation Foundation, the Environment Centre NT Inc. and Friends of the Earth. The State Party and IUCN have commented on the report.

IUCN notes that the report raises the following concerns:

- There remains no publicly available current mine plan. As the project has changed considerably from the approved proposal it is impossible to quantify the potential impacts of the mine.
- The principal environmental hazards at the Jabiluka site are the mineralised ore stockpile and the 'interim' water management pond (IWMP). The IWMP is now serving as the primary component of a long-term water management system at Jabiluka though it was only designed to be operational for a period of 12 months. Project delays could result in the use of the interim pond for a much greater period than it was designed for.

The report also refers to water management problems over the last two wet seasons:

- In the 1999/2000 wet season the IWMP filled almost to capacity. Energy Resources of Australia committed to installing a Reverse Osmosis (RO) plant in early 2000 to capture contaminants and filter the water to a standard suitable for irrigation on the Jabiluka mineral lease. This was installed towards the end of 2000.
- In mid-February 2001 the company was forced to resort to pumping water from the IWMP into the mine decline and underground shafts in order to avoid the IWMP overflowing. This process has led to further contamination of accumulated water at the Jabiluka site with a subsequent significant elevation in the contaminant load. The report notes that the IWMP water is contaminated with elevated levels of uranium and other minerals. According to the Supervising Scientist “the contact with the ore body at the very bottom has increased the concentration of uranium in the water in the decline to 1,500 parts per billion. By the end of the wet season around 20ML of water was in the decline.
- There is concern that ERA will be unable to treat all the contaminated water prior to the 2001/02 wet season."

IUCN also notes that the report raises concerns over the storage of the estimated 20,000 tonne stockpile of mineralised ore unearthed during the construction of the Jabiluka decline, which is currently covered with a tarpaulin.

Furthermore IUCN notes the report ends by saying that the cessation of construction and the future uncertainty of the project raise considerable opportunities for the Australian Government to prevent further development at Jabiluka and safeguard the region’s World Heritage values and properties. The NGO report recommends that there are grounds to include Kakadu in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN considers that the reported water management problems are of concern, and recommends this issue be tabled at the next meeting of the ISAC and that a report be requested from the State Party to the next meeting of the Bureau.

The State Party has informed the Centre that water management planning at Jabiluka for the 2001-2002 wet season has included earthworks by ERA Ltd to reduce the catchment of the Interim Water Management Pond and minimise inflows. In addition, pond water is being treated by reverse osmosis and the decontaminated water is irrigated on disturbed areas on the mining lease.

Furthermore the State Party considers that there is no evidence to justify repeated claims that the mine poses a serious threat to the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park or that it should be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### Rehabilitation of the Jabiluka mine site

The World Heritage Centre has received an exchange of correspondence between the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation (GAC) and Environment Australia on the subject of rehabilitation of the Jabiluka mine site. At its twenty-fifth session in June 2001 the Bureau did not request the State Party to report on rehabilitation options at the site.

The GAC has expressed its desire to see an assessment of rehabilitation options for the Jabiluka mine site undertaken. The GAC believes that the March 2001 announcement by ERA majority share holder Rio Tinto that it would not develop Jabiluka in the short-term triggers an assessment of rehabilitation options for the site, as indicated in the ISP of ICSU Report no. 3, page 24 which states:

*“the Supervising Scientist has indicated that, should further developments at Jabiluka be delayed for a protracted period or, if the mining company propose to mothball the site, the Supervising Scientist would consider what arrangements would be necessary to ensure that the site continues to pose no significant threat to the World Heritage Property. Options that the SS should consider include revegetation of the waste stockpiles, emplacement of the mineralised material stockpile in the decline, sealing of the decline, and decommissioning the water management facilities”.*

The State Party reply to the GAC dated 13 August 2001 on this issue notes:

- The Jabiluka mineral lease was granted in 1982 for 42 years. There is currently no legal requirement, which would prevent the mining company from continuing to manage the Jabiluka site on a standby and environmental management basis until it is required to begin rehabilitation work before the end of the lease period in 2024. Such rehabilitation would need to commence about five years before the end of the lease period, thereby in about 2019.
- Recent statements made by Rio Tinto are consistent with the ERA’s 1999 commitment to the World Heritage Committee, that full scale commercial mining at Jabiluka, if it was to commence, would only be reached at about 2009 following the scaling down of production at the Ranger mine.
- At its 2000 AGM, Rio Tinto confirmed ERA’s existing commitments regarding sequential development and added that Rio Tinto does not believe that Jabiluka can be developed without the consent of both the Northern Land Council and, through the Northern Land Council, the traditional land owners of the area.
- Such statements confirm the current status of the mine on standby and environmental management for at least 8 years.

- The Supervising Scientist has advised that the current delay does not trigger an immediate assessment of the status of the Jabiluka site. Whilst assessment of the site is not required, options for the possible future rehabilitation of Jabiluka continue to receive the utmost consideration by the Supervising Scientist as part of his assessment and supervisory program.

Taking account of the Terms of Reference of the ISAC, IUCN acknowledges the concerns raised by the GAC about the rehabilitation of the Jabiluka mine, and recommends that the above matters be referred to the first meeting of the ISAC and reported on to the next meeting of the Bureau.

The State Party has informed the Centre that the Plan of Rehabilitation for the Jabiluka Project is updated annually and reviewed in conjunction with the Northern Land Council as the organisation responsible for representing the Traditional Owners. The rehabilitation plan, last revised in February 2001, specifies the strategies and activities required for rehabilitation of the site from its current state. The plan has been accepted by the Commonwealth supervising agency.

**Action by the Bureau:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

"The Bureau commends the State Party on its efforts to implement the Independent Scientific Panel (ISP) of ICSU recommendation by establishing the ISAC in such a way that it will be able to report openly, independently and without restriction. The Bureau urges the State Party to:

- a) invite a representative from the conservation NGO community to join the ISAC
- b) refer as a matter of urgency the two issues - the urgent rehabilitation of the Jabiluka mine and the water management problems – to the next meeting of the ISAC.
- c) provide a report, by 1 February 2002, on these two issues.

#### **Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982 and 1989 under criteria N (i) (ii) (iii) and (iv) and C (iii) (iv) and (vi)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations: N/A

#### Issues:

Proposed change to operating regime of hydropower system within the site; proposed ecotourism resort.

#### New information:

IUCN has received information on the proposed *Basslink* project. The project involves constructing an electricity connector between Tasmania and the Australian mainland in order to connect the Tasmanian hydropower system with the mainland grid. The project involves changed

operating regimes at the current Gordon River Hydro Electric Scheme. Changes to the regime involve changes in the utilisation of the turbines (both number of turbines and the time of their activation) and associated changes in water release. The Gordon River Hydro Electric scheme is entirely within the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA).

IUCN notes that at the time of World Heritage Listing, the World Heritage Committee expressed concern about the impact of the Gordon power scheme on the Gordon River and imposed a set of conditions including monitoring of riverbank erosion and the health of the meromictic lakes, that are key features of this World Heritage site.

There are numerous concerns with the *Basslink* proposal, including its impact on the World Heritage site. Concerns raised by different experts include:

- The maintenance of meromixis in the meromictic lakes depends on saline recharge as a result of salt wedge intrusion in the Gordon River upstream of the lakes. Analysis shows that suitable flow conditions for extensive salt wedge intrusion have been limited by the Gordon Power station. The changed flow regime required by *Basslink* may exacerbate the effects on the meromictic lakes.
- Under *Basslink*, the Middle Gordon is forecast to develop an even more extremely to highly variable flow, thus impacting ecological processes in the inter-tidal zone and causing degradation to the riparian vegetation.
- The proposed mitigation and adaptation measures may not stop the increased erosion due to scour, increased seepage erosion, acceleration of riparian vegetation decline, the loss of mid-tidal macro invertebrate communities or further loss of snag habitat.

IUCN is concerned that the proposed *Basslink* project may impact negatively on the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area and that the existing impacts associated with the Gordon River Hydro Electric Scheme may be exacerbated by the *Basslink* proposal.

IUCN has also received a report on a proposed ecotourism resort at Planters Beach, Cockle Creek in the South West National Park. The resort will comprise of a lodge, 60-80 accommodation units, an 800-metre extension of the current road into the Park, a jetty, walking tracks, spas, a tavern, 92 car park spaces and four bus bays. Water will be sourced from ground water and all waste including treated sewage will be disposed of by seepage into the dune system. It is reported that the development will impact on a shell-collection site used by indigenous communities. The resort is sited within the boundaries of the South West National Park, but outside the World Heritage site. It is however within the area covered by the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan 1999 (WHA Plan). Therefore, for the development project to proceed, the Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment proposes that the WHA Plan be amended to allow for addition of a new 'Visitor Services Site'. The proposal and proposed amendment to the WHA

Plan were publicly announced and submissions called for in April 2001.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau expresses concerns regarding the Basslink project and the resort development project, both of which may have potential adverse impacts on the integrity of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. The Bureau invites the State Party to submit detailed status reports on both projects, including outcomes of any EIAs prepared for these projects, to the Centre before 1 February 2002, in order to enable a comprehensive review of these two projects in relation to the conservation of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area at its twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.”

### **Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1990 and 1993 under criteria C (vi); N (ii) (iii)

#### International assistance:

US\$20,000 Training Assistance for World Heritage Site Manager's Workshop, October 2000

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-second ordinary and extraordinary session of the Bureau, 1998

Twenty-third session of the Bureau, 1999

#### Issues:

The eruption of Mt. Ruapehu in 1995/1996 caused a large build-up of ash that blocked the outlet of Crater Lake. There is concern that when the Lake refills, a rapid collapse of the ash dam could occur followed by a major lahar (ash flow). Options to manage this risk need to take account of the protection of both the natural and the cultural values, as interference with the summit area and Crater Lake has implications for the protection of spiritual, traditional and cultural values to the Maori people.

#### New information:

A new report on the management of the ash build-up at Crater Lake refers to a Department of Conservation environmental risk assessment for the mitigation of the hazards from Crater Lake at Mt. Ruapehu. The report notes that following extensive and wide ranging consultation and reviews of various aspects of the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) the Conservation Minister has approved the installation of an early warning system and construction of a bund to prevent the lahar overflowing into the Tongariro River Catchment from the Whangaehu Valley. The Minister is currently preparing a final decision on whether engineering works at Crater Lake are a necessary measure for the mitigation of the lahar hazard.

The report expresses concerns that the proposed engineering, in the form of major earthworks (including the possible construction of an artificial outlet for the Crater Lake), is an over-reaction to the degree of threat and will significantly

harm both the cultural and natural values associated with the Crater rim. In the World Heritage nomination of Tongariro National Park, the Crater Lake on Mt Ruapehu was specifically identified as one of the three vulcanological features that justified this status.

The report also expresses concern that proposed engineering works might establish a dangerous precedent within Tongariro and other national parks. Eruptions within the Crater Lake are a regular and ongoing natural feature. Continual follow-up engineering works would be required following subsequent eruptions. Furthermore, the mountains of Tongariro National Park are sacred to the Maori people of New Zealand. The report comments that it is more consistent with National Park legislation and principles to allow natural process to function and to develop and implement measures that will protect both public safety and infrastructure.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

"The Bureau requests the State Party to report on the state of conservation of Tongariro National Park and to specifically outline alternative options to the proposed engineering works so as to maintain the outstanding natural and cultural values of the site. The Bureau requests the State Party to provide a report by 1 February 2002 for review at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002."

### **Hierapolis-Pamukkale (Turkey)**

Inscribed in 1988 on the World Heritage List under criteria N (iii), C (iii), (iv)

#### International assistance :

Technical co-operation for the International Workshop on Pamukkale – Preservation and Development Plan.(1991)

#### Previous deliberations:

Fourteenth session of the Committee (1990)

#### Issues:

Discolouring of the limestone cliffs.

#### New information:

IUCN has received preliminary worrying reports on the state of conservation of Hierapolis-Pamukkale World Heritage site. The reports note that the limestone cliffs are becoming discoloured. Furthermore, despite the authorities prohibiting visitors from entering the travertines, and the placement of signs explaining the fragility of the site, many visitors continue to enter the travertines. Collection of limestone souvenirs is also occurring. Few guards patrol the site, and there is little enforcement.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau requests the Turkish authorities to prepare a report on the situation of the limestone cliffs at site, as well as the overall management by 1 February 2002

for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.”

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

### Europe and North America

#### **Historic District of Québec (Canada)**

Inscribed in 1985 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (iv), (vi)

International assistance: US\$ 26,000: Technical co-operation in 1991 (Actes Québec)

#### Previous deliberations:

Sixteenth session of the Committee, paragraph VIII.9  
Twenty-fifth ordinary session of the Bureau – paragraph V.254

#### Issues:

Building plans for a cruise-ship landing at Point-à-Carcy.

#### New information:

As requested by the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau, ICOMOS will undertake an assessment mission on the site from 15 to 21 October 2001.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided by ICOMOS at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

#### **City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta (Georgia)**

Inscribed in 1994 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (iii) and (iv).

#### International assistance :

1999 Technical co-operation - US\$ 19,000 for the preparation of the heritage and tourism masterplan for Mtskheta; 1999 Preparatory assistance - US\$ 20,000 for the preparation of the nomination dossiers for Vardizia-Khertvisi Historical Area and Tbilissi Historic District.

Previous deliberations: None

#### Issues:

Degradation and construction projects at Svetitskhoveli Cathedral

#### New information:

A UNESCO-ICOMOS mission, for the UNDP-SPPD project for the *Study and Development of a Heritage and Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia*, discovered serious problems at the Svetitskhoveli Cathedral. In the grounds of the Svetitskhoveli Cathedral, the most significant of the City of Mtskheta's monuments, the mission members identified the following issues:

- 1) the local church authorities have constructed two large underground storage areas, irreversible and disproportionate to the monument;

- 2) a new bell tower is being built right over the original gate of the wall enclosing the cathedral grounds;
- 3) the behaviour of the Cathedral in future earthquakes will be difficult to calculate, due to the large deposits of earth sloping down from the external walls to the monument removed in 1978, together with the fact that the underground basements are now open a short distance from the foundations of the Cathedral;
- 4) the local church authorities have built, at a short distance from the Cathedral, additional constructions in concrete and aluminium, entirely changing the external appearance of the walls of the courtyard.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“In view of the on-going constructions and degradations at the site, the Bureau requests the Government authorities to ensure that all these works are halted and that no further restoration works or constructions in close proximity to the Cathedral be continued. It further requests the Georgian Government authorities to invite an UNESCO-ICOMOS evaluation mission to the site to ascertain the state of conservation and to jointly identify corrective measures and solutions in order to establish appropriate protection and management mechanisms for the Cathedral. The Bureau requests the State Party of Georgia to prepare a report on the state of conservation of the site as well as updated information on all the restoration and construction projects at the site, before the 1 February 2002, for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.”

#### **Classical Weimar (Germany)**

Inscribed in 1998 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (iii) and (vi).

International assistance: None

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – page 42, paragraph V.259

#### Issues:

Road proposal close to Tiefurt Castle and its Park in Weimar. The report of the ICOMOS expert mission to Weimar in April 2001, clarified that the road proposal (Variant 1) would not have a negative impact on the fabric of the Castle and its grounds

#### New information:

The Bureau had requested the German authorities to prepare a progress report by 15 September 2001 on the mitigation measures taken. No report has been received at the time of the preparation of this document.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau requests the German authorities to prepare a progress report for 1 February 2002 for

examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.”

### **Hanseatic City of Lübeck (Germany)**

Inscribed in 1987 on the World Heritage List under criterion C (iv).

*International assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:* None

#### Issues:

Shopping centre and office building construction project at the market place in the centre of Lübeck.

#### New information:

In July 2001 the Secretariat learnt of a construction project in the centre of the World Heritage City of Lübeck. Following discussions and reservations expressed by ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre and the German authorities, concerning the proposed height and architectural style of the buildings, an extensive report was sent to the Secretariat on the construction project by the Mayor of Lübeck on 12 September 2001. According to this report the current buildings (post office building and townhouse) which are located in the area of the construction project, have no national heritage character and are not considered worthy of protection. The height of the two new buildings will be compatible with the other buildings in the street/square and will therefore not have a negative visual impact on the World Heritage site. The modern architecture of the new buildings provides a neutral framework for the town hall opposite. The report was transmitted to ICOMOS for review.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to take note of the advice provided by ICOMOS at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Roman Monuments, Cathedral of St Peter, and Church of Our Lady, Trier (Germany)**

Inscribed in 1986 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i), (iii), (iv) and (vi).

*International assistance:* None

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee - VIII.37, page 30  
Twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau - Annex X, paragraph III.2 (iii), page 127.

#### Issues:

Safeguarding and conservation of the remains of the water system north of the amphitheatre as well as overall planning regulations.

#### New information:

The Bureau, at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session, requested the German authorities to formulate and implement planning regulations that will ensure the long-term preservation of the archaeological remains in this

area. At the request of the Minister of Culture of the Land Rhenanie-Palatinat, ICOMOS undertook a mission to the site on 23 – 24 September 2001 to study the situation regarding developments in the neighbourhood of the Amphitheatre, and also to report on the state of conservation of the other monuments inscribed on the World Heritage List. The ICOMOS expert noted that the Roman Amphitheatre is well conserved, however, there is a conservation problem notably connected with the water table, concerning the important Roman remains revealed at the site of the former brewery. Some degradation and weathering were noted at the Barbara Baths, the Porta Nigra and the Imperial Baths. In general, the ICOMOS mission observed deficiencies in staffing, a shortage of maintenance personnel who could monitor the state of conservation of structures as well as the inadequate on-site interpretation. Furthermore, the ICOMOS expert has identified two potential extensions to the existing site which are: the Viehmarkt, where extensive rescue excavations have revealed substantial remains of a large Roman thermal establishment and the Simeonstift, the history and location of which are intimately linked to those of the Porta Nigra. The ICOMOS mission recommends that:

1. A major project for the study and re-excavation of the Barbarathermen, followed by scientific conservation and the implementation of a management plan, should be initiated without delay;
2. There should be a scientific study of the rate and nature of degradation of the stones of the Porta Negra, followed by the implementation of appropriate conservation measures;
3. Serious consideration should be given to the appointment of additional security and maintenance personnel at the archaeological sites;
4. Projects should be undertaken to improve the interpretation and signage at the archaeological sites;
5. Consideration should be given to the nomination of the Viehmarktthermen and the Simeonstift as extensions to the World Heritage site, subject to the opening to the public of the Viehmarktthermen and appropriate changes so as to restore the ambience of the latter.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau takes note of the ICOMOS mission report and asks the German authorities to urgently take all the necessary steps to implement a management plan for the site. Furthermore, scientific studies on the rate and nature of degradation as well as conservation measures should be initiated. The Bureau further urges the German authorities to improve interpretation and signage at the site as stipulated in Article 5 (d) of the Convention and requests the preparation of a progress report on all the above to be prepared by 15 January 2003, in time for the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau in April 2003.”

### **Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)**

Inscribed in 1990 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i), (ii) and (iv).

*International assistance:* None

#### *Previous deliberations*

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau - page 42, paragraph V.259.

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee - page 127, paragraph VIII.37, Annex X.

#### *Issues:*

Impact of the Havel waterway improvement project (German Unity Project 17) on the cultural landscape of Potsdam.

#### *New information:*

The Bureau had requested the German authorities to collaborate with ICOMOS in the assessment of the project and to submit a report for examination by the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau. The German Permanent Delegation informed the Secretariat that a report would be sent in time for the session. Via the German National Committee of ICOMOS a report was prepared by Stiftung Preussischer Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg which calls attention to the threat the Havel waterway improvement project will cause to the buildings located at the Havel waterfront. Notably, the Heilandskirche in Sacrow and the Maschinenhaus Park Babelsberg could be adversely affected by the project.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that may be provided by ICOMOS at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Acropolis, Athens (Greece)**

Inscribed in 1987 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

*International assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:* None

#### *Issues:*

Proposal of a 32m high building in the vicinity of the Acropolis.

#### *New information:*

Following examination by ICOMOS of information provided by a group of residents on this building proposal, ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that it considers the project to be unacceptable due to its proximity to the World Heritage site, significantly blocking the view from certain points, and causing adverse visual impact at the historic site. A request for further and detailed information regarding this building proposal has been forwarded to the Permanent Delegation of Greece. However, at the time of the preparation of this document, this information had not been received by the Secretariat.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine the information that will be available at the time of its session and adopt the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee notes with concern the proposal to erect a building in the vicinity of the World Heritage site which can have a potential negative impact on its visual setting and integrity. The Committee requests the State Party to provide a detailed report on the project, and in particular maps showing the exact location of this project, by 1 February 2002.”

### **Historic Centre of Naples (Italy)**

Inscribed in 1995 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (ii) (iv)

*International assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:* at the time of the inscription of the site in 1995.

#### *Issues:*

The Secretariat had been informed on several occasions of a project initiated by the Italian authorities threatening a number of ancient buildings in the Historic Centre of Naples.

#### *New information:*

The Secretariat has been informed on 20 July by the Italian authorities that the project for the demolition of 27 ancient buildings situated in the Historic Centre of Naples has been cancelled.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau notes that the Italian authorities have taken action to halt the demolition of 27 ancient buildings in the Historic Centre of Naples and congratulates the State Party for protecting the World Heritage values of the site.”

### **The Curonian Spit (Lithuania/Russian Federation)**

Inscribed in December 2000 on the World Heritage List under criterion C (v).

#### *International assistance:*

The Curonian Spit was badly damaged by a storm in 1999/2000 and benefited from emergency assistance of US\$ 50,000 (US\$30,000 Lithuania; US\$20,000 Russia) prior to the inscription of this transboundary site in December 2000.

#### *Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee - pages 45-46.  
Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau - paragraph X.4, page 67.

Issues :

In June 2001 the Lithuanian authorities informed the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-fourth session, of a proposed oil extraction operation by a Russian enterprise in the Baltic Sea from a platform at a point 22km distant from the coast of the Spit.

New information:

At the request of the State Party, an ICOMOS/UNESCO (UNESCO Moscow Office) mission in August 2001 assessed the situation. The ICOMOS expert visited the Lithuanian part, while the UNESCO Moscow Office representative had discussions with the Russian side (including the Lithuanian Consulate and World Ocean Museum in Kaliningrad, Russian Federation). In principle both experts obtained similar information. Despite requests for information by the Lithuanian authorities and by the World Heritage Centre via the Russian Permanent Delegation no response has been received from Russia. The UNESCO Moscow Office received documentation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the project. The D-6 Krakovskaya oil deposit is located at a depth of 27 – 30m in the Baltic Sea shelf, 22km off the coast of the Curonian Spit. In 1985 the USSR established that the environmental aspects of the project were not safe and that the existing technology could not ensure a safe oil exploitation. In August 2000 the company Lukoil announced that work would commence. The Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs repeatedly requested official information on the project from the Russian Federation. However no reply was received. During a boat visit of the area the mission noted that construction work is being carried out on the platform and that the construction will be completed by 2002. The Moscow Office was informed that Lukeoil announced that all licenses and permissions were obtained and that oil exploitation would start in 2003. According to the documents on the EIA, which was carried out by the Atlantic Research Institute of Fishery and Oceanography and the Baltic Institute of Hydrosphere Ecology (Kaliningrad, Russia), the D-6 project is called a “peaceful cooperation with nature” and recommendations for confining spills and eliminating consequences of unavoidable currents in stormy weather have been worked out. While the platform has no visual impact on the World Heritage site, ICOMOS considers the potential impact of an oil spill as immense. In case of accident, the wind and sea currents would drive the oil spill in the direction of the Baltic shores of Lithuania, the Spit and as far as Latvia. The recommendations of the ICOMOS mission are:

1. An environmental impact assessment (EIA) should be carried out, by either a joint Russian-Lithuanian team of experts or by an independent international consultancy;
2. The Russian company should allow Lithuanian experts access to the technical data relating to safety provisions;
3. The two countries should collaborate in the preparation of a risk-preparedness programme.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau takes note of the information provided by the ICOMOS expert and the report on the mission of August 2001. It thanks the Lithuanian authorities for their efforts to ensure the protection of the Curonian Spit. In view of the urgent situation, the Bureau requests the State Party of the Russian Federation to submit a report before 1 February 2002 on the project concerning the Russian part of this transboundary site and on technical data relating to safety provisions, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002. Furthermore, the Bureau requests that the environmental impact assessment shall be carried out, without delay, jointly by a Lithuanian-Russian team of experts and that the outcome of this study shall be communicated to the Bureau, at its next session.”

**City of Luxemburg: its Old Quarters and Fortifications (Luxemburg)**

Inscribed in 1994 on the World Heritage List under criterion C(iv)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations: None

Issues:

Building of a Judiciary Centre on the Saint-Esprit Plateau of the City of Luxemburg.

New information:

By letter of 25 January 2001, the Minister of Culture of Luxemburg informed the Secretariat of the wish of the national authorities to build a Judiciary Centre on the Saint-Esprit Plateau of the City of Luxemburg. In this regard the Minister has asked UNESCO for advice on this building project. Following this request and in consultation with ICOMOS, two experts undertook a mission to Luxemburg. The mission report of the two experts, which was transmitted to the Permanent Delegation upon reception, underlined that the Saint-Esprit Plateau is not part of the World Heritage site, but that it is included in the buffer zone which has to be treated with the same care as the World Heritage site itself. The report suggested that, despite the advanced state of the project, the most compatible solution should be to abandon the idea of a judiciary centre at this location and to seek another location for this building in order to preserve and conserve the archaeological remains that have been discovered at the site. The authorities of Luxemburg informed the Secretariat that they may provide a written comment on the ICOMOS report which will be sent to the World Heritage Centre. At the time of the preparation of this document, this information had not been received by the Secretariat.

**Action required** The Bureau may wish to examine additional information from the State Party that may be available at the time of its session and adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau notes the view of the ICOMOS mission that, despite the advanced state of the project, the State Party is encouraged to review this project and to identify another location for the Judiciary Centre. The Bureau invites the State Party to take into account the ICOMOS analysis in the implementation of the building project and requests the State Party to provide a progress report on the situation before 1 February 2002 to be submitted to its twenty-sixth session (April 2002)”.

### **Megalithic Temples of Malta ( Malta)**

Inscribed in 1980 / 1992 on the World Heritage List under criterion C (iv)

#### International assistance:

US\$ 72,448 Emergency Assistance for urgent preservation measures (equipment was delivered for an amount of US\$ 22,779). New proposals for the use of the remaining funds (US\$ 49,669) have been received.

#### Previous deliberations:

Nineteenth session of the Committee – paragraph VII.44  
Twenty-fifth ordinary session of the Bureau – paragraph V.261

Issues: Instability of structures; damage caused by vandalism.

#### New information:

The Bureau at its twenty-fifth session requested the State Party to inform the Committee on progress of actions undertaken following damage caused by vandalism that occurred in April 2001. At the time of the preparation of this document, the requested information had not been received by the Secretariat.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine additional information from the State Party that may be available at the time of its session and may wish to submit a text for examination by the Committee.

### **Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)**

Inscribed in December 1979 on the World Heritage List under criterion C (vi).

International assistance: In 1998 (US\$ 20,000): Technical co-operation for the organisation of international expert meetings for the Strategic Governmental Programme for Auschwitz. In 2000 (US\$ 10,000) was approved for another meeting of the International Group of Experts. This meeting was not held and by letter of 9 February 2001 the Permanent Delegation of Poland informed the Secretariat that the meeting would be rescheduled and a new request for financial assistance would be forthcoming.

#### Previous deliberations

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau - paragraph V.268, pages 43-44.

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee - paragraph VIII.34, pages 29-30; Annex X, page 125.

Issues: Planning and management of the surroundings of the Camps; establishment of a buffer zone.

New information: Under the leadership of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Peter King, a site visit to Auschwitz on 1 and 2 July 2001, to assess the issues relating to the management of the site and the establishment of a buffer zone. The mission report contained in Information Document WHC-01/CONF.207/INF.6 was sent to the Polish authorities for review and comments. At the time of the preparation of this document no reply has been received.

As a result of the site visit the mission concluded that the discussions with the Polish authorities and stakeholders were held in an constructive atmosphere to achieve progress with regard to the protection of the site and to achieve confidence for the overall management in consultation with all stakeholders in the future. The mission in particular acknowledged the commitment by the Polish Government to the preservation of the World Heritage site. However, it also underlined the need for a policy of conservation and overall management for the surroundings incorporating a coherent silence and protection zone, an appropriately zoned buffer area and satisfactory long term protection or integration of the area between the two camps. The mission reassures the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau of the excellent quality of management at the World Heritage site and of the commitment and dedication of the staff of the museum. However, a number of issues to be solved were identified: social and commercial development, private property rights in neighbouring areas, longer term suitable investment, appropriate tourism and education programmes, inventory of related sites, co-ordination between the different levels and a dialogue between the city of Oswiezim and the village of Brezinka etc.. The mission also recommended an early determination of the terms of reference and structure for the work of the International Group of Experts and the formation of two sub-committees, one on museology and conservation and another one on urbanism and planning. This will enable the International Group of Experts to proceed with the work on an on-going basis.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision for transmission to the World Heritage Committee for action:

“The Committee takes note of the report of the site visit to Auschwitz Concentration Camp and its surroundings and thanks the Chairperson for his great commitment concerning this site. The Committee urges the State Party to implement the recommendations of the mission as soon as possible and requests the authorities to provide a report by 1 February 2002 with

details on the status of the implementation of the recommendations.“

### **Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania)**

Inscribed in 1999 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (iii) (iv)

*International assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:* None

#### Issues:

The Secretariat has been informed on several occasions of the building project for two theme parks (Dracula Land and Western Land) and a golf course in the vicinity of the site.

#### New information:

The Secretariat transmitted this information to ICOMOS and to the State Party. In its comments, ICOMOS expressed its great concern about this proposal, underlining that whilst the proposed theme parks and golf course lie outside the World Heritage site, and probably outside the buffer zone, their potential impact on its visual setting may be great. Letters requesting further and detailed information on this project have been sent to the Permanent Delegation of Romania. On 1 October 2001, the Delegation provided the Secretariat with an article published in the Romanian Business Journal. This article underlined that the total surface of the Dracula Land project is 60 ha; that, according to the Ministry of Tourism of Romania “the town of Sighisoara represents the ideal place for the implementation of this “special programme” and that the “motivation of this selection has been based on the following arguments [notably] the existence of the unique medieval Germanic citadel further inhabited in Europe, part of the UNESCO patrimony which in the absence of a constant effort of rehabilitation and invigoration will reach – in keeping with UNESCO experts- the stage of total degradation in a maximum 50 years”. Furthermore, the article indicated that the work that will be carried out as part of the “special programme” has taken into account the following objectives:

- the rehabilitation and invigoration of the citadel of Sighisoara and the creation in this space of an exclusive accommodation and entertainment zone (in keeping with the model offered by the well known Vienna based Grinzing)
- the construction of the Sighisoara (Dracula Land) theme park
- the construction of a golf course
- the construction of a cable transport installation likely to facilitate access from the Citadel of Sighisoara to the theme park.
- the rehabilitation of the infrastructure through the building and upgrading of a series of roads (...).

In this context, the Government of Romania adopted on 6 July 2001 an Ordinance pertaining “to the endorsement and implementation of the special programme of tourist development of the Sighisoara area.” Upon receipt of this information, the Secretariat requested the Permanent

Delegation of Romania to transmit as soon as possible a detailed report on this project proposal. At the time of the preparation of this document, the requested information has not been provided by the State Party.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine additional information from the State Party that may be available at the time of its session and adopt the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee notes with concern the building project of the two theme parks and a golf course in the vicinity of the site which can have a potential negative impact on the visual integrity and setting of the site. The Committee requests the State Party to provide a detailed report on the project by 1 February 2001, and in particular maps showing the exact location of the proposed facilities, to be submitted for examination by its twenty-sixth session (June 2002).”

### **Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation)**

Inscribed in 1990 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i) (iv) and (v).

*International assistance:* In 2000 a request for training assistance for a workshop pertaining to the conservation and preservation of the site was not examined by the Bureau, owing to the State Party’s outstanding dues to the World Heritage Fund.

#### Previous deliberations

Seventeenth session of the Committee (page 34)  
Eighteenth session of the Committee (page30/31)  
Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (page 44, paragraph V.279)

#### Issues:

Poor state of conservation of the wooden structures of the site.

#### New information:

The National Commission of the Russian Federation submitted a report on the state of conservation on 2 October 2001 which has been sent to ICOMOS and ICCROM for comments. In general, the report confirms that the wooden structure of the Church is in an alarming state of dilapidation and that urgent restoration measures should be undertaken.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided by ICCROM and ICOMOS at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon, and review whether or not the site should be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **Spišský Hrad and its Associated Cultural Monuments (Slovakia)**

Inscribed in 1993 on the World Heritage List under criterion C (iv).

International assistance: In 1996, technical co-operation US\$ 23,333 for Spišský Hrad

Previous deliberations: None

Issues:

Threat from mining projects.

New information:

In June 2001 ICOMOS received information that a travertine quarry below Drevenik, on the south-western edge of the inscribed site, was operational and that quarrying was going ahead. The permit is of limited duration and is scheduled to end in 2002. ICOMOS considers that the main threat to the site comes from the blasting operations, and to a lesser extent, from the large quantity of dust produced by extraction and transportation.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau takes note of the report provided by ICOMOS and requests the Slovakian authorities to provide a report on the situation for 1 February 2002, for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.”

### **Route of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)**

Inscribed in 1993 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (ii) (iv) (vi)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth ordinary session of the Bureau – paragraph V.280

Issues:

Impact of a dam on a section of the route.

New information:

The twenty-fifth session of the Bureau requested ICOMOS to continue its dialogue with the Spanish authorities to assess the impact of the dam, its enlargement and to discuss proposed mitigation measures. The Bureau requested ICOMOS and the Spanish authorities to report on the results of these consultations.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated sites (United Kingdom)**

Inscribed in 1986 on the World Heritage List under criteria C(i) (ii) (iii)

International assistance: None

Previous deliberations :

Twenty-second session of the Bureau - paragraph V.70  
Twenty-fourth ordinary session of the Bureau – paragraph I.49

Issues:

Infrastructure planning of the site, particularly solution proposed for the A303 road (cut-and-cover tunnel of two kilometres long).

New information:

The Secretariat has received numerous letters of concern about the impact the proposed solution will have on the site. The Secretariat received information from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport of the United Kingdom underlying that in order to improve the site's setting, the Government proposes to remove both roads from the immediate vicinity of the monument. In this regard, it is proposed that the A303 road run through a 2km tunnel near the stone circle, whilst the other road (A344) should be closed and converted to grass. It is also proposed that the present rather poor visitor facilities and car park should be removed and that a new visitor centre (with car parking and interpretative facilities) should be built a short distance away, outside the site. However, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport underlined in its letter that all these proposals will be subject to examination under normal planning procedures and that full consideration will be given to the overall archaeological and environmental implications. ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that it was in full agreement with the proposals and that the cut-and-cover tunnel is a feasible project that will not cause any damage to the archaeology and the environment on the site.

Concerning Silbury Hill, part of the World Heritage site, the Secretariat has been informed by numerous letters that the site was threatened by collapse. The State Party informed the Centre that the present problem has been caused by the collapse of the filling of a vertical shaft. In May 2000, a squared-shaped hole about 1.8m wide opened up to a depth of just over 10m. This was covered immediately with a scaffolding cover. However, before any plan could be implemented further collapse occurred. Under these circumstances, English Heritage decided to commission a seismic survey, but this was delayed due to the fact that the Hill was situated within an area infected by Foot and Mouth Disease. The State Party informed the Secretariat that appropriate action is being taken to repair Silbury Hill and safeguard it from further damage. Furthermore, ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that the existence of the pit at the top of the Hill had been known for many years and it was not considered a threat to stability until it began to widen under the impact of the unusually heavy rainfall earlier this year. ICOMOS is of the opinion that both the technical and archaeological

problems are being addressed as matters of urgency and that the long-term future of the monument is not threatened.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision :

“The Bureau notes the information transmitted by the State Party concerning the planning and the protection of the site of Stonehenge as well as the views of ICOMOS that this will not cause any damage to the site. The Bureau also notes the views of the State Party and ICOMOS on Silbury Hill which is part of the World Heritage site. It requests the State Party to work in close consultation with the Centre and ICOMOS regarding the planning and protection of the site and to present a progress report to the Bureau at its next session in April 2002.”

### Arab States

#### **M’Zab Valley (Algeria)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982 under criteria C (ii) (iii) (v)

#### International Assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000) : N/A

In 2001 : N/A

Previous deliberations: N/A

#### Issues:

- Uncontrolled urban expansion
- Lack of land-use regulations

#### New information:

Owing to the socio-economic changes which have intervened in past decades, as well as to the demographic growth caused by industrial development of the region, the Valley and the Ksour of M’Zab are currently exposed to very intense pressure from development. This has entailed the deterioration of the natural environment (palm orchards and profile of the surrounding hills) and alteration to the urban fabric.

In the absence of any ground plans, houses have been constructed with materials and of dimensions often incompatible with the local traditions, in the palm orchards, and often in flood areas.

Furthermore, the recent construction of industrial buildings on the heights of the surrounding hills is an additional factor causing the degradation of the overall natural environment. Under the supervision of the Office for the Protection and Promotion of the M’Zab Valley, under the responsibility of the Ministry for Communication and Culture, the 1997-2002 restoration programmes are being implemented for the restoration of the traditional houses of the Ksour of Ghardaia, Melika, El Atteuf, Bounura and Beni Isguen.

Following the request of the Algerian authorities for an expert mission, a UNESCO mission visited Algeria in September 2001 to assist the authorities concerned in the

preparation of international assistance requests for the identification of appropriate urbanism criteria for the implementation of an integrated policy for the safeguarding of the M’Zab Valley, as well as the establishment of a workshop on the island of houses, at Ghardaïa. Two international assistance requests will shortly be submitted by the Algerian authorities.

**Action required :** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following text :

“The Bureau requests the State Party to co-operate with the Centre in the elaboration of the Development and Safeguarding Plan for the M’Zab Valley. The implementation of international assistance, based on international experience and respecting the local artisan traditions, for *in-situ* training in techniques which would contribute towards the presentation of the heritage of the Valley should also be initiated”.

#### **Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1992 under criteria C (ii) (v)

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 37,600

In 2001: N/A

Previous deliberations : N/A

#### Issues:

- Progressive deterioration
- Lack of a safeguarding legislative instrument

#### New information:

According to a state of conservation report prepared in the 1980s, of the 1,700 listed buildings within the Kasbah, 200 had collapsed, while 500 had been evacuated for security reasons. 30% of the remaining buildings were in an advanced state of deterioration. This deterioration process has continued over the last few years, and has provoked a state of imminent danger for the built and social fabric within the Kasbah of Algiers. The modification of the socio-economic structure of the population comprises another major factor of degradation.

The absence of legal instruments for the application of the 98.04 Law for the protection of cultural heritage is a serious obstacle for the safeguarding of the Kasbah. To this end, the Wilaya of the Kasbah has entrusted an association of private urban planning firms with the preparation of a Safeguarding Plan. A technical-administrative structure was established, the Kasbah Unit, which, in cooperation with the Habitat, and Urban Heritage Directorates, has as its mission responsibility for the entire safeguarding operation. Whilst awaiting the adoption of the Safeguarding Plan, some initiatives are being carried out under the responsibility of the Unit, for safeguarding the built heritage, as well as the population through improvement of the living conditions.

At the request of the Algerian authorities for expert advice, a UNESCO mission visited Algeria in September 2001 to

assist the authorities concerned in the preparation of a Safeguarding Plan for the Kasbah of Algiers and in the elaboration of international assistance requests for training, at different levels, of qualified national staff, responsible for the safeguarding of the Kasbah and in general for Algerian built heritage. Two international assistance requests will shortly be submitted by the Algerian authorities for this purpose.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following text :

"The Bureau requests the State Party to cooperate with the Centre in the elaboration of the Safeguarding Plan for the Kasbah of Algiers and in the implementation of the international assistance for training in restoration and safeguarding techniques for Algerian built heritage.»

### **Archaeological Site of Tipasa (Algeria)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982 under criteria C (iii) and (iv)

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000) : US\$ 56,231

In 2001 : Emergency Assistance: Elaboration of an emergency plan and implementation of corrective measures for the Archaeological site of Tipasa, US\$ 35 500.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau : (paragraph VII.36, page 71)

#### New information:

During the mission for the revision of the Periodic Reports for Algeria, the site of Tipasa was visited and the situation was reviewed with the Algerian authorities. No change had been noted in respect to the request for emergency assistance approved by the Bureau in June 2001. It was agreed that the expert mission foreseen in the framework of that request be undertaken at end-October or during November 2001.

Also, the authorities informed the mission of the existence of a PSPP (Permanent Safeguarding and Presentation Plan) elaborated in 1992 with the Urbanism Workshop of the City of Marseilles and UNESCO. This plan, which could have regulated and improved the situation of the site of Tipasa, although approved by the authorities, had not, to date, been implemented.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following text :

"The Bureau recommends to the Algerian authorities to implement without delay the 1992 Permanent Safeguarding and Presentation Plan, to reduce the pressures on the site. Furthermore, the Algerian authorities are requested to keep the World Heritage Centre fully informed for all projects concerning the site of Tipasa, and submit studies for approval prior to their implementation. "

### **Islamic Cairo (Arab Republic of Egypt)**

Inscribed in 1979 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i) (v) (vi)

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 233,900

In 2001: N/A

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph number V.198-V.202)

Twenty-fourth session of the Bureau (paragraph number IV.59)

#### Issues:

- Coordination among institutions
- Authenticity and adaptive re-use in conservation policy
- Training and institutional building

#### New information:

As recommended by the Bureau at its June session in Paris, an ICOMOS expert carried out a mission to Cairo from 6 to 18 August 2001, to evaluate the current restoration projects. Further to this mission, the Director and Chief a.i. of the Arab States Unit of the World Heritage Centre visited Cairo in September 2001.

A major campaign is being implemented in Cairo, with a total of 150 interventions foreseen within a period of eight years and 48 monuments currently under restoration. The campaign is managed by the Ministry of Culture, and support provided by the Historic Cairo Studies and Development Centre, employing about 250 staff comprising six working groups. Projects are developed by external consultants and executed by contractors, invited to restricted bids.

While emphasizing the great efforts and commendable commitment shown by the Egyptian authorities towards the rehabilitation of Historic Cairo, the ICOMOS report highlighted some issues of particular concern:

- Coordination must be strengthened among the various institutions involved in the rehabilitation of the site, to ensure that conservation efforts integrate concerns for social and economic aspects, and are carried out within an integrated strategy. At present, 32 different laws govern the administration of Historic Cairo, shared among six Authorities, while the city does not have a comprehensive Master Plan with clear land-use regulations. 40% of the land within the site is composed of vacant lots.
- Strictly related to the above issue is the question of the adaptive re-use of the restored monuments. At present, several monuments are being restored, but no clear indications are provided as to the future function and management of the building. A strategy based on priorities and actual needs should be established.
- Another issue of concern is the varying quality of the projects and work being executed, ranging from exemplary interventions (e.g. Al Ghuri Mosque) to mediocre standards (e.g. the Sagarthmish Mosque).

This aspect is strictly related to the question of authenticity, and to the tendency towards ‘complete restoration’ (surfaces are generally restored to what may have been their state at a specific time, paying less attention to retention of signs of age and patina that has resulted from wear and tear). This may well have been the result of excessive rush in the execution of so many challenging projects, but sometimes reflects a lack of coherence between historical analysis of a monument and the adopted restoration options.

- Public awareness of the objectives of the restoration campaign and current projects must be promoted. The opening of a debate on the interventions, and confrontation of the different opinions, may contribute to ensure that all projects conform with the standards stipulated in international conventions.
- Specific training on conservation must be provided for the professional staff of the Supreme Council of Antiquities, mostly composed of archaeologists and engineers, taking into account the unprecedented scale and number of restoration projects.

In order to address the above remarks, the WHC and the Egyptian authorities agreed to start implementing together a series of specific actions, to be partially funded through the Egyptian Funds in-Trust at UNESCO. These actions include:

1. An International Seminar on the conservation of Historic Cairo, with multi-disciplinary planning workshops focused on specific projects, to be organized in early 2002. Periodic reviewing seminars of the current projects will also be held.
2. The establishment within the premises of a restored monument, of a permanent Information Centre on Historic Cairo World Heritage site and current conservation efforts
3. The preparation of a Conservation Manual, with technical specifications and detailed descriptions of the types of work most commonly required for the conservation and maintenance of historic building within the city of Cairo.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau commends the State Party for its great efforts towards the rehabilitation of Historic Cairo, and particularly for supporting the three above-mentioned actions in collaboration with the WHC. The Bureau also encourages the State Party:

- to resolve possible coordination conflicts within Historic Cairo and to elaborate a comprehensive institutional framework which would ensure a better management of the site;
- to ensure that appropriate and compatible functions and future management mechanisms are determined, before starting any restoration works on a monument;
- to pay special attention, when restoring a monument, in recording its features and ensuring the respect of its authenticity,

including the traces of history on its layout and surfaces.;

- to invest adequate resources towards the capacity-building in the area of architectural conservation for the staff of the Supreme Council of Antiquities;
- to consider the possibility of slowing down the pace of the current restoration campaign, until such times as this capacity is in place;
- to periodically monitor the restoration works, in close consultation with the WHC.”

### **Abu Mena (Egypt)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 under criterion C (iv)

International assistance: N/A

Previous deliberations: N/A

#### Issues:

- Rise in ground water
- Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

#### New information:

Further to an alarming report prepared in 2000 by an ICOMOS expert, the Director and Chief of the Arab Unit a.i. of the World Heritage Centre carried out a visit to the site in September 2001.

A land-reclamation programme for the agricultural development of the region, funded by the World Bank, has caused in the past ten years a dramatic raise of the water table. The local soil, which is exclusively clay, is hard and capable of supporting buildings when in a dry state, but becomes semi-liquid with excess water. The destruction of numerous cisterns, disseminated around the city, has entailed the collapse of several overlying structures. Huge underground cavities have opened in the north-western region of the town. The risk of collapse is so high that the authorities were forced to fill with sand the bases of some of the most endangered buildings, including the crypt of Abu Mena with the tomb of the Saint, and close them to the public. A large banked road, moreover, was executed to enable movement within the site.

The Supreme Council of Antiquities is trying to counteract this phenomenon by digging trenches, and has enlarged the listed area in the hope of lowering the pressure of the irrigation. These measures, however, have proved to be insufficient, taking into account the scale of the problem and the limited resources available.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau recommends the inscription of Abu Mena on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and requests the Egyptian authorities to coordinate with all the competent national institutions, and the WHC, with a view to identifying rapidly the necessary corrective measures to ensure the safeguarding of the site.”

## **Tyre (Lebanon)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1984 under criteria C(iii) and (vi).

### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$5,000

In 2001 : US\$20,000 for an archaeological survey of the ancient harbours.

### Previous deliberations: N/A

### Issues:

- Impact of new tourist marina on the site
- Protection of archaeological areas

### New information:

Within the framework of the new Master Plan for the City of Tyre, which is under elaboration, the Lebanese authorities had expressed their intention to build a new tourist marina, and have commissioned a feasibility study from a local firm. This study was to evaluate three possible options: 1) the rehabilitation and up-grading of the existing Tyre Port; 2) the extension of the existing Port of Tyre; and 3) the construction of a new port in Mheilib, three km north of Tyre.

After examining the feasibility study, the World Heritage Centre had recommended that option 1) be retained, taking into account the negative impact of the other two alternatives, both for the cultural heritage and natural setting of the site. The Centre, however, conditioned its approval to the accomplishment by the Lebanese authorities of the following:

- Full underwater survey inside the harbour.
- Limiting the number of boats docking in the tourist marina to a maximum of 30
- Using the marina project as an opportunity to upgrade the fishing port with the creation of amenities for fishermen and locations for the interpretation and presentation of the underwater heritage of Tyre.

As for the survey of the underwater heritage, the amount of US\$ 20,000 was approved by the Chairperson of the WH Committee under the WH Fund as a contribution to this activity.

By letter dated 5 October 2001 addressed to the World Heritage Centre, the Director-General of the Antiquities Department of Lebanon confirmed that the Lebanese authorities, in line with the recommendations of the Centre, had eventually adopted the first option (rehabilitation and up-grading of existing port structures). Special attention would be paid to the safeguarding of the integrity and authenticity of the old fishing port.

As concerns the Master Plan, the Department of Antiquities confirmed the listing and protection, within the territory of Tyre, of vast areas around the main archaeological sites. These areas will be mostly surrounded by agricultural land, with building coefficients limited to 5%. The definition of the land-use for all other

areas belonging to the State will be frozen until completion of the archaeological survey. The on-going World Bank projects (rehabilitation of the ancient city and presentation of the archaeological site) would complement the above efforts.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

"The Bureau commends the Lebanese authorities on the important decisions taken for the safeguarding of the World Heritage site of Tyre, and recommends that, prior to any building activity within the ancient port, reports and detailed projects be transmitted to the Centre for submission to the Committee."

## **Ksar Aït Ben Haddou (Morocco)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1987 under criteria C (iv) and (v).

### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 79,500

### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph number IV.68)

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee (Annex X, paragraph III.2.iii)

### Issues:

- Abandonment of the site and progressive deterioration
- Lack of management plan
- Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

### New information:

A mission report dated August 2000 had formulated the following recommendations:

- Status of the site at the national level: finalise the process of listing the site, including the private properties included therein;
- Strengthen the capacities of the CERKAS responsible for the site;
- Create a management commission for the site;
- Create a working group to elaborate a management plan;
- Management plan to be completed by end 2001.

The report also recommended the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

At the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau, in Cairns, the Chairperson of the Committee made it clear that, should the proposed actions not be achieved by the end of 2001, the Moroccan authorities would submit a request for inclusion of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A report on the progress of the activities was also due for submission to the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau. At the time of preparation of the present working document, however, the

Centre has not received such a report.

During a private visit to Ksar Ait Ben Haddou carried out in August 2001, the same expert, author of the first report, found that the above-mentioned actions had not been completed and that a Management Plan for the site had not been prepared.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

The Bureau may wish to examine new information that may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Old City of Sana'a (Yemen)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1986 under criteria C (iv) (v) and (vi)

#### International assistance

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 30,200

In 2001: US\$ 20,000 for research on the Gardens of Sana'a.

Previous deliberations: N/A

#### Issues:

- Modern constructions and uncontrolled expansion of commercial activities
- Lack of a Safeguarding Plan

#### New information:

The international safeguarding campaign for the Old City of Sana'a, launched in 1986, obtained positive results, notably the establishment of infrastructure, paving of the streets, development of the Wadi Saïla and creation of a specialised body responsible for its protection.

However, at present, no safeguarding and urbanism plan has been elaborated and implemented. This deficiency has had worrying consequences, as for example, on the one hand, an uncontrolled spreading of the historical Souk towards the residential areas, and on the other, numerous new constructions using modern structures and materials. These constructions are totally incompatible with the City, and of increasing height for residential buildings, resulting in the establishment in the city of several high-rise constructions, the height of which is in excess by several storeys, of the level of other parts of the Old City.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

"The Bureau requests the Yemeni authorities to take the necessary measures in order to immediately halt new constructions, additions or alterations within the urban fabric of the Old City, until a Conservation Plan has been prepared and adopted. To this end, the Bureau encourages the Yemeni authorities to submit urgently a request for International Assistance to the Committee, to enable the preparation of such a Plan, in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre."

## Africa

No sites to report on.

## Asia and the Pacific

### **The Potala Palace, Lhasa (China)**

Inscribed in 1994 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i), (iv) and (vi).

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): N/A

In 2001: N/A

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph number V.227-232).

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee (paragraph number III 35).

#### Issues:

- Uncontrolled urban development and expansion of tourism-related facilities in and immediately surrounding the World Heritage areas, threatening the traditional urban morphology and undermining the authenticity of the property.

#### New information:

As requested by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session, the Secretariat continued to work in close collaboration with the State Administration of Cultural Heritage of China and the Government of the Tibetan Autonomous Region to prepare the organization of a Mural Painting Conservation Training Workshop at the Potala Palace World Heritage site.

Within the context of the Regional Periodic Reporting Exercise, the Centre is closely co-operating with the State Party to elaborate a plan of action to enhance the conservation and management of the property.

The Centre was informed by independent reports and the international press that there were plans to construct a 35-meter high monument within the World Heritage protected areas of the property. During a UNESCO mission to China in August 2001, the Deputy Director of the Centre consulted representatives from the Administration of Cultural Heritage of the Tibetan Autonomous Region and the State Administration of Cultural Heritage of China, who informed her that this plan had been abandoned.

The Centre was informed that heavy rain in August 2001 caused the collapse of one of the main walls of the Potala Palace as well as other portions of the World Heritage protected areas. In co-operation with the relevant Chinese authorities, a WHC - China fact-finding mission is being organized to the property in early November 2001. The report on the state of conservation of the Potala Palace and Jokhang Temple in Lhasa will be presented to the Bureau at its twenty-fifth extraordinary session.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine further information at the time of its session.

### **Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian (China)**

Inscribed in 1987 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (iii) and (vi).

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 26,000

In 2001: N/A

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph number V 223-226)

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee (paragraph number III. 35)

#### Issues:

- Lack of a regular monitoring system
- Lack of an overall conservation and management plan which will enhance the capacity of the authorities in managing impacts caused by uncontrolled tourism development, construction, uncontrolled mining and quarrying activities, and industrial pollution.

#### New information:

The Secretariat continued to receive numerous independent reports expressing alarm over the state of conservation of the site since the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau, especially concerning Locality 1 and other excavated caves which continue to be exposed and suffer from erosion and plant growth.

At the request of the Government of China, the World Heritage Centre and the Division of Cultural Heritage of UNESCO continued to explore possible extrabudgetary resources to address the priority conservation concerns.

The World Heritage Centre is organizing, in co-operation with the State Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Indonesia and the UNESCO Jakarta Office, an "International Training Course on the Preservation, Conservation and Management of Zhoukoudian and Sangiran Prehistoric World Heritage Sites" (22 - 27 October 2001, Solo, Indonesia). The objective is for experts and managers of the two prehistoric Asian World Heritage sites to exchange experiences in addressing the managerial and conservation problems.

The Centre continued to encourage the Chinese authorities to submit an international assistance request for providing international expertise and support for the elaboration of an overall management plan.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

"The Bureau requests the State Party to inform the Committee on the results of actions taken since the 1999 ICOMOS-ICCROM Joint Mission and the twenty-third session of the Committee, whereby the

authorities informed the Committee of its intentions to seriously examine the recommendations of the Joint Mission. The Bureau requests the authorities to provide information concerning the measures taken to address the conservation and management challenges facing the site, especially with regard to the establishment of a systematic low-cost monitoring system for the entire site. The Bureau also encourages the State Party to elaborate in co-operation with the Centre, an international assistance request for the development of a comprehensive conservation and management plan for the site. Finally, the Bureau requests the Centre to assist the State Party in submitting a state of conservation report for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session."

### **Ajanta Caves (India)**

Inscribed in 1983 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i) (ii) (iii) and (vi).

### **Ellora Caves (India)**

Inscribed in 1983 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i) (iii) and (vi).

#### International Assistance:

Total assistance to date: US\$ 13,331.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-first session Bureau (June 1997)

#### Issues:

- Need for microclimate control
- Difficulties in preventing progressive structural deterioration
- Establishment of appropriate restoration and conservation codes

#### New information:

In May 2001, the World Heritage Centre received information on restoration of sculptures within Ajanta Caves using cement mortar, which has been recognized by the Archaeological Survey of India to negatively impact upon the sculptures and painted walls of this property. The Centre requested the Indian authorities to provide clarification concerning this unfavourable conservation practice.

In May 2001, the Centre also inquired whether or not the panel of conservation experts had been established, and whether new conservation policies, strategies and action plans had been elaborated and adopted since the state of conservation report submitted by the Indian authorities in October 2000.

During a mission by a World Heritage Centre staff in July 2001, the Archaeological Survey of India informed the Centre that the following actions were being taken:

- Unstable slopes confined to the cave portals and adjacent inter-cave slopes which bound them are

being carefully examined and preventive conservation measures are being planned and implemented.

- Site-presentation enhancement measures have been undertaken to increase the quality of visitor experience and to decrease negative tourism activity impact.

Simultaneously, the Centre was requested to organize a reactive monitoring mission by an international wall painting expert to examine the state of conservation of the fragile mural paintings within the Ajanta and Ellora Caves. This would enable the national conservation experts to consider various conservation measures following international standards for long-term protection and presentation of the paintings. Following this request, a mission was organized to take place in early November 2001 by an international mural painting expert nominated by ICCROM. The findings of this mission will be presented to the Bureau at its twenty-fifth extraordinary session.

Finally, the Centre is assisting the Archaeological Survey of India in the organization of a conservation and management workshop to be undertaken in early 2002 for the Ajanta and Ellora Caves, which would bring together all the concerned stakeholders to exchange views on conservation and management of these unique properties. The objective of the workshop is to review and integrate the various tourism and site-enhancement development plans into a comprehensive conservation and development plan.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine further information presented at the time of its session.

### **Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)**

Inscribed in 1979 on the World Heritage List under criteria C(iii) (iv) and (vi).

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 240,374

An additional US\$ 110,000 from sources other than the World Heritage Fund has been mobilized for earmarked contributions benefiting specific rehabilitation projects.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee (paragraph number VIII.32)

Twenty-fourth session of the Bureau (paragraph number IV.70)

#### Issues:

- Uncontrolled and illegal alterations or demolition of historic buildings

New information: At the time of the preparation of this working document, no new information had been received by the Centre.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

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

Inscribed in 1997 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (iii) and (vi).

#### International Assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 20,000

In 2001: N/A

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph number V 235)

Twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee - (paragraph VIII.39; Annex X page 130)

#### Issues:

- Need for conservation for the very fragile archaeological deposits and alcove remains of the Maya Devi Temple exposed to harsh natural elements since the large-scale excavation in 1996.
- Need for non-destructive geophysical survey of archaeological remains non-excavated within the core and the buffer zone (i.e. the Sacred Garden) of the World Heritage site to identify areas where pilgrimage activities may take place and the shelter and drainage for the Maya Devi Temple can be placed.
- Need for garden landscape conservation scheme to ensure long-term conservation, presentation and development of the site.

#### New information:

Following the request of the Government of Nepal, the recommendations of the International Technical Meeting for the Conservation, Presentation and Development of the Maya Devi Temple (5-9 April 2001, Kathmandu & Lumbini, Nepal), and at the request of the Bureau, the Centre organized two technical missions by an international brick expert to examine the state of conservation of the alcove remains of the Maya Devi Temple. During the first mission in July 2001, the international brick expert witnessed the inundation of the Maya Devi Temple archaeological remains and examined the character and structural stability of the alcove remains. During the second mission in September 2001, the expert and the national authorities agreed upon a step-by-step preliminary plan of action to address the main issues which are (a) serious drainage problem, (b) shelter options for protecting the Maya Devi Temple, and (c) long term conservation and presentation of the Maya Devi Temple as both an archaeological property and pilgrimage centre of international significance.

The Centre also assisted the Nepali authorities in implementing the Non-Destructive Geophysical Survey being undertaken by the national site-managers in close co-operation with the University of Bradford Department of Archaeological Sciences team to identify the high and

low sensitive archaeological zones within the core zone of the Lumbini World Heritage property. This activity, commenced in late August 2001, will continue until December 2001. The results of the survey and its analysis will be utilized to finalize the plans for the drainage system, "Golden Pavilion" shelter and conservation of the Maya Devi Temple and to plan a pilgrimage circuit within the core zone of the property.

The UNESCO Kathmandu Office informed the Centre that it has encouraged the co-operation of the World Food Programme (WFP), which may provide contribution in kind for the hundreds of workers who will be employed by the Lumbini Development Trust to complete the larger drainage system of the Sacred Garden of Lumbini in accordance with the Tange Kenzo Master Plan. This large circular drainage system is located along the periphery of the buffer zone, approximately 2 km away from the core zone and Maya Devi Temple. When the drainage canals are completed, it is expected that the dramatic rise and fall of the water table within the core zone will stabilize, reducing the negative effects to the property caused by capillary actions.

The Centre continued efforts in the mobilization of funds and technical expertise to elaborate a sacred garden landscape plan adapted for the site's character as a centre of pilgrimage in conformity with the Kenzo Tange Master Plan adopted by the State Party and supported by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in 1978.

The full report of the two international brick expert missions and the interim executive brief of the University Bradford – Nepal Non-Destructive Geophysical Survey activity had not yet been submitted to the Centre at the time of the preparation of this working document. The findings and recommendations of these documents will be transmitted to the Bureau at its twenty-fifth extraordinary session.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine further information at the time of its session.

### **Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines)**

Inscribed in 1995 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (iii) (iv) and (v).

#### International Assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$108,200.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-third session of the Bureau (paragraph number IV.74)

Twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau (paragraph number III.C)

Twenty-third session of the Committee (paragraph number X.46)

#### Issues:

- Lack of a systematic monitoring programme and a comprehensive management plan to ensure the

conservation and sustainable development of the evolving and fragile cultural landscape.

#### New information:

The IUCN – ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was organized by the Centre in close co-operation with the State Party between 22 and 26 September 2001. The mission aimed at a) identifying urgent conservation needs of the site; b) elaborating recommendations to the World Heritage Committee for the enhanced management of the site and c) assisting the Philippine authorities in updating the existing tourism development plan, elaborating a comprehensive management plan, and formulating an international assistance request for international technical expertise and support.

The findings and recommendations of this IUCN-ICOMOS Mission will be presented to the Bureau at its session (WHC-01/CONF.207/INF5).

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine further information at the time of its session.

### **Ancient City of Sigiriya (Sri Lanka)**

Inscribed in 1988 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (ii) (iii) and (iv).

#### International Assistance:

None from the World Heritage Fund. However, the Sigiriya site is one of five cultural World Heritage sites in Sri Lanka which benefited from the UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign for the Cultural Triangle.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph number V 236-240)

Twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee (paragraph number VII.43; Annex IV page 109)

#### Issues:

- Proposed expansion of the military airport which, if and when constructed, will negatively impact upon the site.
- Lack of clear demarcation of the core and buffer zones of the site.

#### New information:

Although the State Party was requested by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session to reconsider the proposed expansion of the Sigiriya airport and to provide a report on decisions taken by the Government in this regard by 15 September 2001, the Centre was informed on 20 September 2001 by the Director-General of Archaeology that the final decision was pending, in light of the recent bombing of the Colombo International Airport and national security concerns.

Further information is expected before the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided at the time of its session

## **Latin America and the Caribbean**

### **Brasilia (Brazil)**

Inscribed in 1987 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i) (iv)

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): N/A

In 2001: N/A

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph V.244 - 5)

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee (paragraph VIII.35; Annex X, page 126)

#### Issues:

- Development pressures
- Lack of clarity in decision-making and legislative structures.

#### New information:

The Bureau at its twenty-fifth session requested ICOMOS to study the substantial report on the state of conservation of the site submitted by the State Party in the context of the ICOMOS/UNESCO monitoring mission, which will be fielded in November 2001. The results of the mission will be reported to the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic)**

Inscribed in 1990 on the World Heritage List for criteria C (ii) (iv) and (vi)

International assistance: US\$ 82,207 of which US\$ 24,207 were approved in 2001 for a Study on Cultural Tourism in the Historic Centre of Santo Domingo.

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-second session of the Committee (paragraph number VII.31)

Twenty-third session of the Bureau (paragraph number IV.54)

Main Issues: Development pressures.

New information: The World Heritage Centre received information from the Cultural Heritage Office of the Dominican Republic about building activities in Santo Domingo. The State Party requested an ICOMOS advisory mission to discuss the building project. The mission was fielded in August 2001.

During that mission ICOMOS found that a private international hotel chain, acting under a concession given by

the previous government of the State Party, was in the process of extending a pre-existing hotel use from three to five buildings, all of which have remnants that date from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the earliest settlement period. Original construction of the buildings is attributed to Nicolas de Ovando, founder of Santo Domingo in its present location.

Conceptually, ICOMOS stated, it is clear that the functional requirements of the proposed new use are incompatible with the existing layout of the buildings. The project's feasibility determinations require far more room than is available in the site. Space for the new functions was being created by incorporating and expanding two structures to the south, and by a massive three-story deep excavation meant to accommodate partially underground construction (overlooking the river, and abutting the palisade, which is the natural edge of the city), as well as above-ground construction. The programmatic demands for new construction might overwhelm and distort the extant historic fabric in the southern portion of the site. In conclusion ICOMOS found that damage had already been done to the historic fabric as well as to the historic urban cultural landscape:

- a) Walls dating from the 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> century were demolished in the two buildings being integrated in the hotel;
- b) Unrecorded archaeological material from the 16<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> century was lost in the process of deep excavation;
- c) The massive excavation in the patio of the buildings had destroyed the last remaining natural part of the cliff facing the river.

More damage could be caused by the infra-structural difficulties to be anticipated due to the location of the hotel.

A further point raised by ICOMOS was the lack of a reliable legal framework for interventions in the historic district that protect the State Party's heritage effectively.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau commends the State Party on its initiative to request ICOMOS’ advice. At the same time, however, it expresses its grave concerns about the damage already inflicted on the site through the building activities. It encourages the State Party to take all possible measures to mitigate the impact of the project on the World Heritage values of the site. Furthermore, the Bureau advises the State Party to improve its heritage protection legislation to avoid comparable situations in the future. The Bureau requests the State Party to furnish a report on the state of conservation of the property by 1 February 2002”.

### **Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala)**

Inscribed in 1979 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (ii) (iii) and (iv).

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 100,926

In 2001: N/A

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph V.246 - 7).

Twenty-third session of the Bureau (paragraph IV.15).

#### Issues:

- Earthquake damage to monuments
- Impact of proposed shopping centre.

New information: The State Party is reviewing the report of the ICOMOS monitoring mission, which visited the site earlier this year, in order to give its comments.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided / may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Fortifications on the Caribbean side of Panama: Portobelo – San Lorenzo (Panama)**

Inscribed in 1980 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i) and (iv).

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 73,888

In 2001: N/A

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph V.248).

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee (paragraph VIII.39; Annex X page 130).

#### Issues:

- Impact of expected rise in tourism numbers and degradation of the sites.

#### New information:

The Bureau at its twenty-fifth session requested an ICOMOS/UNESCO monitoring mission, which will be fielded in November 2001. The results of the mission will be reported to the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Archaeological Site of Chavín (Peru)**

Inscribed in 1985 on the World Heritage List under criterion C (iii).

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): US\$ 37,250

In 2001: N/A

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph V.249)

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee (paragraph VIII.39; Annex X).

#### Issues:

- Lack of a Management Plan
- Deterioration of the condition of the site.

#### New information:

At the time of the preparation of this document, the World Heritage Centre had not received the report requested by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session. There is no further information concerning the international assistance request for the site as, since February 2000, the State Party is reviewing the request.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru)**

Inscribed in 2000 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (i) and (iv).

#### International assistance:

Total amount (up to 2000): N/A

In 2001: US\$ 75,000 Emergency Assistance

#### Previous deliberations:

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (paragraph number V.250 - 3)

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee (paragraph VIII.39; Annex X).

#### Issues:

- Damages caused by the earthquake of 23 June 2001.

#### New information:

The State Party sent a report on the "Evaluation of damages in the Historical Centre of Arequipa, following the 23 June 2001 earthquake and a draft reconstruction plan".

The emergency assistance approved by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session is being fully implemented and the first mission of an expert in rehabilitation and restoration, Ms. Dora Arízaga, was undertaken in July 2001. This aim of this mission was to assist the Municipality of Arequipa in revising the Master Plan in the light of the new situation, setting priority projects, defining a mechanism for the implementation of reconstruction and rehabilitation activities in the Historical Centre, and assist the authorities in the formulation of a first project profile to be submitted to the IDB. Ms Arízaga carried out a second mission in August 2001, to examine the draft law for the creation of "The Reconstruction Fund for the Historical Centre and Monumental Area of Arequipa", as well as to advise on the formulation of the emergency and urban reconstruction programme of Arequipa. A consolidated report should be ready by the end of September. The national and municipal

authorities have expressed their appreciation for the expert mission.

ICCROM provided immediate assistance by sending two experts from Chile in June 2001, to assist the Municipality of Arequipa's conservation laboratory for the safeguarding of the movable objects from the damaged monuments.

Assistance has also been provided to the Municipality of Arequipa from the Italian Government, the Spanish International Co-operation Agency and the City of Paris.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

---

## **PART II Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for noting.**

### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

#### **Australian Fossil mammal sites (Riversleigh and Naracoorte) (Australia)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994 under criteria N (i) and (ii)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Previous deliberations:* N/A

*Issues:*

Management issues including infrastructure and visitor management at the Riversleigh section of the site.

*New information:*

IUCN has alerted the Centre to several reports it has received with regards to problems of management of the Riversleigh section of this serial site. They pertain to the lack of infrastructure, such as on-site security and surveillance mechanisms, to deter vandalism or control tourism. Vandalism and theft are reported to have impacted one of the most important deposits - 'Burnt Offering Site'. The reports also express concern with the lack of interpretation, absence of a ranger station and visitor centre, and inadequate research funding to support increased interpretation and better conservation and management of the site. IUCN has noted that the management of Naracoorte and Riversleigh differ significantly, having different physical attributes and being the responsibility of different states, however there is a Scientific & Management Advisory Committee that brings the two management authorities together.

The Bureau may wish to note that IUCN recognizes that currently efforts are underway to address the imbalances of managing this serial site. IUCN is in contact with the State Party to obtain detailed information on problems reported at this site so as to provide a full and comprehensive report to the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

#### **Greater Blue Mountain Area (Australia)**

Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2000 under criteria N (ii) and (iv)

*International assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau – paragraphs V.113 – V.115

Twenty-fourth session of the Committee – Section X, A.

*Issues:*

Potential extension of a mining lease

*New information:*

In response to the Bureau's request for further information on the proposed Clarence Colliery mine extension before 15 September 2001, the State Party, via letter dated 14 September 2001, submitted up-to-date information to the Centre. The Australian Government has examined the referral from the company regarding the possible extension of the Clarence Colliery mining lease and determined that additional information is required on water emissions from the mine. Current mine de-watering emissions have been determined by the New South Wales Environment Protection Agency (EPA) to exceed statutory water quality standards and have been causing pollution problems in the Wollangambe River, which flows through the World Heritage Area. The company and the EPA have agreed to a plan for a trial water transfer system that if successful, would result in the cessation of mine de-watering emissions to the Wollangambe River. A decision by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and Heritage on the referral on the proposed expansion of the Clarence Colliery mining lease has been deferred until after the establishment of the trial water transfer system. It is anticipated that a decision will be made on the referral by mid-2002.

The Bureau may wish to note with satisfaction the actions taken and the information provided by the State Party and request a status report from the State Party for submission at the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

## MIXED (NATURAL AND CULTURAL) HERITAGE

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

#### **Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal)**

Inscribed in 1995 on the World Heritage List under criteria C (ii), (iv), (v).

*International assistance:* None

*Previous deliberations:*

Twenty-fourth session of the Bureau, paragraph IV.75

Twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau, paragraph I.64

*Issues:* Following the ICOMOS/IUCN mission of 2000, a restoration programme and improvement of the management of the site was to be undertaken by the State Party during the next six years.

A full report has been requested from the State Party to be submitted by the end of December 2001 and a report will be provided at the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.