

In your reply, please refer to:
En répondant, veuillez rappeler:

IUCN REVIEW

World Heritage Nomination

1. NAME: Ensemble Naturel et historique de la ville
D'ohrid et de ses Environs
2. LOCATION: Macédonie, S.W. Yugoslavia
3. NOMINATED BY: Branko Lumovac
Secretary General, Yugoslavian Commission
to UNESCO
4. DOCUMENTATION:
 - i) Nomination form and attached photos (black and white);
location map.
 - ii) All documentation not sent to IUCN (i.e. colour film (12 mm)
and dispositives).
 - iii) No additional documentation available at IUCN.
5. EVALUATION:

The submission does not put forward a rationale for the nomination vis-à-vis its natural qualities. The existence of "L'Institute hydro-biologie" since 1935 has led to a very detailed bibliography on the aquatic and associated organisms of the lake, some of which are unique.

The boundaries proposed for the site do not appear from a natural sciences perspective to meet the criteria of integrity, i.e. "the area should be of sufficient size and contain the necessary habitat requirements for the survival of the species". From this aspect, the watershed should be included.

IUCN has not evaluated the cultural content of the submission and there are undoubtedly close links between these and the natural environment.

The lack of additional documentation and the late arrival of the submission prevents a comprehensive evaluation of the natural values of the area for its World Heritage Listing.

RECOMMENDATION:

Any decision to place on the World Heritage List should be based on cultural values. Current data does not warrant listing on the basis of natural values.



IUCN REPORT TO THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Paris, France, May 1979

SUMMARY

Sixteen nominations related to the natural heritage were reviewed in 1979. Ten of these areas are being recommended for the World Heritage List, one is recommended for rejection and five are recommended for deferral of a decision. No change is recommended for the status of nominations deferred in 1978.

I Recommended for World Heritage List:

1. Dinosaur Provincial Park, Canada
2. Kluane/St. Elias/Wrangell National Park, Canada/USA
3. Tikal National Park, Guatemala
4. Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Tanzania
5. Everglades National Park, USA
6. Grand Canyon National Park, USA
7. Plitvicka Jereza National Park, Yugoslavia
8. Virunga National Park, Zaire
9. Mont. St. Michel, France
10. Sagarmatha National Park, Nepal

With the 1978 sites; Nahanni, Galapagos, Simen and Yellowstone, the World Heritage List includes 14 natural areas.

All are truly areas of outstanding universal value. Some require technical assistance to ensure that these values are adequately protected.

II Defer:

A. Recommended for deferral because of inadequate data and time (late nominations) to carry out a proper evaluation:

1. Bale Mountains, Ethiopia
2. Abiyatta-Shalla Lakes, Ethiopia
3. Durmitor National Park, Yugoslavia

A further consideration in relation to 1 and 2 above is that they are proposed national parks but they have not yet been declared. In addition, both of these areas are under extreme external pressures from surrounding residents. The problem is somewhat similar to Simen National Park which was approved last year. It is IUCN's view that the nomination of these areas is basically utilizing every method possible to find funds for their conservation. There is no doubt that both areas are valuable conservation areas, doubt remains as to their World Heritage value.

- B. Recommended for continued deferral because of external threats of major impact from pollution, hydrological interference and land use or industrial practices:
1. Parc national D'Joudq, Senegal
 2. Parc national d'Ichkeul
- C. Recommended for deferral because current proposal does not meet the conditions of integrity for natural areas:
1. Bialowieza National Park, Poland
 2. Ville D'Ohrid et de ses environs, Yugoslavia
- III Not recommended for World Heritage List as they do not meet criteria of outstanding, universal value:
1. Zembra and Zembratta, Tunisia
 2. Isles de la Madeleine, Senegal

General Considerations

In its consideration of potential World Heritage Sites IUCN considers alternative means of achieving conservation objectives. These include Biosphere Reserves (research, education and conservation); scientific reserves (research); national parks, international wetlands, etc. If areas nominated were not rigidly screened the World Heritage List would soon lose its significance. (There are in excess of 2,000 national parks and equivalent reserves over 1000 ha. in size; there are in excess of 12,000 wetlands recognized to be of international importance.)

In its review of the 1979 recommendations IUCN came to the difficult conclusion that the World Heritage Convention cannot provide adequate funding to support other than the most outstanding world heritage sites of universal value.

The World Heritage is a mosaic formed from many areas of national or regional significance. The guidelines or criteria can be interpreted very loosely or very rigidly with regard to universal values. IUCN has chosen to interpret the guidelines rigidly. This means that sites of high national or regional value but of low universal value have been deferred or rejected. Generally, this has been done with the knowledge that more outstanding areas exist elsewhere which for various reasons have not been nominated. IUCN accepts a responsibility to encourage the nomination of these alternative areas with a view to ensuring a World Heritage List of outstanding universal value.