



Master

CC-78/CONF.010/10
Washington, 8 September 1978



UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL
AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Second Session

Washington, D.C. (USA) 5 to 8 September 1978

Draft Report

*Discussion by
workshop by
Drew 1 Week*

INTRODUCTION

1. The second session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee") was held in Washington from 5 to 8 September 1978. The session was attended by the following members of the World Heritage Committee: Australia, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Iran, Iraq, Nigeria, Poland, Tunisia, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

2. Representatives of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property, the International Council of Monuments and Sites, and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (hereinafter referred to as "ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN" respectively) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. *change name & now official*

3. A number of States Parties *held none of the* to the Convention presently not members of the World Heritage Committee and representatives of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations attended the session as well as a wider public audience.

4. The full list of participants will be found in Annex III to this report.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

5. The second session of the World Heritage Committee was opened by its Chairman, Mr. Firouz Bagherzadeh. In welcoming members of the World Heritage Committee, and representatives of advisory organizations to the World Heritage Committee, he recalled the great progress already achieved in the

implementation of the Convention thanks to the efforts of the States Parties, Bureau members, the Secretariat and the advisory organizations. He concluded by expressing his confidence that the session would be a fruitful and enjoyable one.

6. Mr. David Hales, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, welcomed delegates to Washington on behalf of the United States of America. He conveyed to the Committee a written message from the President of the United States of America,

Mr. Jimmy Carter, the text of which is given in Annex I.

*+ appreciation
& response of
Committee*

7. The Deputy Assistant Director General for Operations (Culture and Communications) responded on behalf of the Director General of UNESCO.

Mr. Bolla expressed UNESCO's sincere appreciation for the invitation by the Government of the United States of America to hold the second session in Washington. In greeting members of the World Heritage Committee and wishing them success in their work, he indicated the important role of international organizations such as UNDP, UNEP, IBRD, IDB, WFP, OAS and ALESCO in providing crucial support to conservation measures. In this context, he also expressed UNESCO's gratitude to the host country for its intellectual and financial support to a number of conservation projects throughout the world. He then reported on the present situation regarding the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (hereinafter referred to as "the Convention"). Forty (40) Member States of UNESCO had ratified or accepted the Convention as of 23 August, 1978 and other Member States were about to do so. Thus the Committee will

be enlarged to twenty-one members, as provided for under the Convention, when the next election to the Committee takes place on November 24, 1978, at the second General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention to be held during the next General Conference of UNESCO. He continued with an analysis of the geographical distribution of States Parties to the Convention and pointed out that nine States Parties belong to the Arab Region, eight to the African Region, eight to the European and North American Region, five to the Asian and three to the Eastern European Regions. Mr. Bolla noted that, while this distribution is a fairly balanced one, still greater efforts have to be made to increase further the number of States Parties, particularly in the Asian and Eastern European regions. He then highlighted that a number of outstanding cultural and natural properties had already been nominated by States Parties for inclusion in the World Heritage List, which sets a high standard for future designation of properties for the World Heritage List. In reviewing the present financial situation of the World Heritage Fund, he stressed the crucial importance of voluntary contributions to the Fund. Mr. Bolla then expressed the opinion that the time had probably not yet come to launch a world-wide mass media campaign aimed at the general public for publicizing the Convention, as this might be more effective when a greater number of concrete achievements can be shown. In this connection Mr. Bolla stressed the importance of starting immediately with operations under the Convention and he suggested that necessary action be taken now in order to enhance knowledge of the Convention among decision makers in all Member States of Unesco. However, preparatory work should start now to plan ^{winning of information of the general public.} ~~such~~ future activities. Finally, Mr. Bolla recalled the fact that until now the World Heritage Committee has adopted all its decisions with the full

+
He is
America

consensus of all its members. He concluded with the hope that the decisions adopted at this session would also be unanimous.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

8. The Chairman invited the members of the Committee to examine the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat. At the request of members of the Committee, two new items were added to the agenda:

"Revision of the Rules of Procedure" and "Review of the Procedure for Nomination to the List of World Heritage in Danger."

9. With the above additions, the agenda was adopted (See annexed document)

II. REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

10. The Committee discussed the need to increase the number of officers of the Bureau in view of the greater workload of the Bureau in the future. Committee members also felt that a larger number of officers would be advisable to allow for;

- (i) better representation of geographical regions in the Bureau; and,
- (ii) enhanced expertise for both natural and cultural properties.

Having also in mind that the membership of the World Heritage Committee itself will be increased from 15 to 21 delegates at the second General Assembly, the Committee agreed to elect, from now on, 7 officers for the Bureau which would then consist of the Chairman, five Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur.

11. The Committee agreed to amend Articles 12.1 and 13 of the Rules of Procedure accordingly.

III. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN, VICE-CHAIRMEN AND RAPPORTEUR

12. The Committee elected by acclamation Mr. David Hales (USA) as its Chairman. The Committee then proceeded to elect by acclamation the representatives of Ecuador, Arab Republic of Egypt, France, Iran and Nigeria, as Vice-Chairmen, and Professor Krzysztof Pawlowski (Poland), as Rapporteur.

The new Chairman called then for a standing ovation to thank Mr. Firouz Bagherzahneh for the excellent leadership he had provided to the Committee during the past year.

IV. CONSIDERATION OF A DRAFT TEXT OF A STANDARD AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND STATES RECEIVING TECHNICAL COOPERATION

13. At the first session of the World Heritage Committee it was agreed that a draft text of the standard agreement would be prepared by the Secretariat. Subsequently, a first draft was submitted to the Bureau by the Secretariat (Document.. C-78/CONF.010/5). The Bureau recommended that the proposal of the Secretariat be considered by the Committee.

14. After presentation of this background by the former Rapporteur, the Committee discussed the draft text in depth. The delegate of Canada pointed out that the Treaty Section of the ~~Foreign Office~~ ^{Department of Foreign Affairs} of his country had carefully examined the proposed draft text and found it unacceptable,

in particular because the Convention provides only for arrangements and not agreements for technical cooperation with States Parties. However, several delegates expressed their views on this matter and saw no obstacles in concluding such agreements. In addressing this point, Mr. Bolla drew attention to Article 26 of the Convention which stipulates the establishment of "agreements" for technical cooperation with States Parties. The Committee, after reviewing and commenting on each article of the draft text agreement, asked the Secretariat to take note of the observations made by the delegates and to elaborate a new, less detailed text for consideration by the Committee at its next session. It was also noted that the new text should be formulated in such a way as to accommodate the specific requirements and practice of States Parties. In doing so UNESCO's general principles for the provision of technical cooperation should be retained.

15. Until the adoption of such an agreement by the Committee, UNESCO's rules and procedures will be followed in the provision of technical cooperation to States Parties.

16. The Committee expressed the wish that the Secretariat, in the preparation of a new draft text agreement, takes note of the following observations and recommendations made by delegates during the discussion:

17. With regard to Article 2 paragraph 5

-rewording is recommended to avoid expenses payable in convertible currency *for medical treatment* for countries with a non-convertible currency. (Delegate of Poland)

-governments should be encouraged to employ the fellow to the extent possible upon his return, in the field for which he has been trained under the fellowship rather than to force governments to do so as a *conditio sine qua non*.

18. With regard to Article 3, as the delegate of Canada pointed out, not all States Parties acceded to the Convention on the privileges and immunities of specialized agencies of the UN system. He, therefore, recommended that the wording of Article 3 be reconsidered by taking into account specific regulations by which some of the States Parties may be bound.

19. With regard to paragraph 3 of Article 3, the stipulation not to impose commercial bank charges should be reconsidered as it may be difficult to apply this clause in some countries. (Delegate of USA).

20. With regard to paragraph 5 of Article 3, the delegate of Canada expressed doubt that the "save harmless clause" would be an appropriate provision, as its legal value from the point of view of his government is questionable.

21. Article 4 should also contain a provision for the use in the agreement of the official language(s) of the country receiving assistance.

22. As regards paragraph 3 of Article 4, the delegate of Canada recommended the following clause: "In the event of termination, the undertakings assumed in this arrangement will continue to apply to the extent necessary to permit the orderly withdrawal of personnel and funds and the settlement of accounts, provided that in no case will the arrangement continue to apply for a period longer than (- x - months or years)."

Other
 (Written comments received by 31 December 1978 will be considered by the Committee at its next session. These written state ments would be sent to all members of the Committee until 31 December 1978.)
 + ~~Written state ments were invited for consid eration at the next Committee meeting~~

V. EXAMINATION OF THE FORM AND PERIODICITY OF PUBLICATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST, THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND THE LIST OF PROPERTIES FOR WHICH TECHNICAL COOPERATION IS GRANTED.

23. The Committee followed the recommendation of the Bureau and agreed to publish and disseminate annually the World Heritage List, the World Heritage in Danger List and the list of properties for which technical cooperation for assistance from the World Heritage Fund has been granted as combined lists. (See document...) It was pointed out that this arrangement would allow for timely updating of these lists after each annual session of the Committee.

24. The representatives of ICOMOS and of France drew the attention of the Committee to the introductory part of the combined list in which some terms used in the French text did not correspond to the English text. In order to overcome this the Committee adopted the following changes in the French text: the criteria against which cultural properties would be evaluated, which are set out in point a) (ii) should read..."sur le developpement de l'architecture, de la sculpture monumentale, de la conception des jardins et des paysages, des arts connexes, de l'urbanisme ou de l'habitat...instead of..."sur le developpement ulterieur de l'architecture, de la sculpture monumentale, de la conception des jardins et des paysages, des arts connexes ou de l'habitat;"...

Point a) (v) should read..."formes d'habitats humains traditionnels et significatifs ^{ou} de conception urbanistique"... instead of "formes d'habitats humains traditionnels et significatifs"... Upon the Rapporteur's proposal, the Committee decided to amend also the corresponding English text in order to maintain the same wording.

*miss
English
a final
be over
with
changes of
Percent.
or close
to translation
as possible*

VI. CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

25. The former Rapporteur presented the views of the Bureau on this matter. He pointed out that the Bureau agreed that consideration should be given urgently to a general ongoing publicity campaign to promote the objectives of the Convention and the work of the Committee. Such a campaign would help to inform the public of the importance of conserving the World Heritage, accelerate accessions by Member States to the Convention, stimulate contributions to the World Heritage Fund, and generally start fulfilling the educational mandate outlined in the Convention.

26. After considerable discussion, the Committee agreed to form a sub-Committee for in-depth study of future public information and educational activities of the Committee.

27. The Chairman then nominated Mr. Peter Bennett as Chairman and appointed delegates of Ecuador, France, Iraq, Iran, USA and representatives of advisory organizations as members of the sub-Committee.

VII. STUDY OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE

28. The Committee recalled Article 20 of the Convention under which international assistance may not only be granted to property already included in the World Heritage List but also to property which has not been added to the World Heritage List. This international assistance

for property which has not yet been included in the World Heritage List, for which the working term "preparatory assistance" has been adopted by the Committee may be granted

(i) for identification of cultural and natural properties/ and of universal importance preparatory work with a view of nominating properties for inclusion in the World Heritage List (see Article 13, paragraph 2 of the Convention), and

(ii) for drawing up technical assistance requests, including preparation of feasibility studies for future technical cooperation projects in accordance with Article 13 paragraph 1, and Article 21, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the Convention.

29. The Chairman further drew attention to Article 22, subparagraph (c) and Article 23 of the Convention under which, regardless of whether a property has been entered in the World Heritage List, assistance may be granted to States Parties for the training of staff and specialists in the field of identification, protection, conservation, preservation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage and/or for relevant training centers.

30. After examining the budgetary situation of the World Heritage Fund (see document CC-78/CONF.010/INF.2) and discussing in depth appropriate use of the fund, the Committee decided to authorize the Chairman to grant, in consultation with the Director General of Unesco, preparatory assistance to States Parties up to a total amount of US \$140,000 (as shown in document CC-78/CONF.010/8) with a budgetary ceiling of US \$15,000 per ~~country~~ ^{project} ~~project~~.

VIII. REVIEW OF NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

31. The former Rapporteur presented to the Committee the list of properties which, according to the Bureau, would be eligible for inclusion in the World Heritage List. He then called the attention of the Committee to three properties on this list which would meet criteria for inclusion in the World Heritage List but lacked the required documentation.

32. The Committee examined these three cases first and stated with satisfaction that appropriate documentation for two properties had been received meantime. As regards the third case (National Park of "Ichkeul") the Committee decided in agreement with the delegation of Tunisia to defer decision to its next session subject to receipt of the requested information.

33. The Committee, upon finding itself in full agreement on the list proposed by the Bureau, decided to enter the following 12 properties in the World Heritage List:

NAME OF PROPERTY INCLUDED IN THE WORLD
HERITAGE LIST

STATE

L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Park
Nahanni National Park

Canada

Galapagos Islands
City of Quito

Ecuador

Simien National Park
Rock Hewn Churches, Lalibela

Ethiopia

Aachen Cathedral

Federal Republic
of Germany

Historical urban and architectural
area of the city of Krakow
Wieliczka - salt mine

Poland

Island of Goree

Senegal

Mesa Verde
Yellowstone

United States
of America

34. The Committee further decided to defer consideration of all other nominations listed in document CC-78/CONF.010/7 until its third session.

All these nominations, as well as those received after the Bureau meeting and listed in document CC-78/CONF.010/7 Add. 1 (for which it had been impossible to complete the technical review, translation and transmission to all States members of the Committee in time before the first session) would be transmitted for examination by the Bureau prior to their consideration by the Committee at its next session.

35. The Chairman then thanked the States Parties for their efforts, which made it possible to establish the World Heritage List from here on. He also

recalled that the time and order of entry of a property in the World Heritage List should by no means be interpreted as an indication of the qualification of a property or judgment on its value in comparison to other properties in the list, as all of them had met the criteria adopted by the Committee.

36. The Committee continued its work by discussing suitable future closing dates for the submission of nominations and agreed that nominations, in order to be examined at the next Bureau meeting, have to be received by the Secretariat on the first of March 1979 at the latest. From there on, however, the deadline for submission of nominations will be ~~December 31~~ ^{January 1} so that more time would be available to the Secretariat, ICOMOS and IUCN for the processing and technical review of the new nominations.

37. There followed considerable discussion on whether the number of nominations per country and year should be limited or not and how to solve the problem of the increasing workload for all parties involved in the evaluation process, which may become rather time consuming and may even exceed the capacity of the advisory organizations, the Bureau, the Committee and the UNESCO Secretariat in the future.

38. In this connection, reference was made to Article 11 (1) of the Convention which stipulates no limit for the number of nominations by a single State Party. However, in recognizing this stipulation the Committee, for purely practical reasons, authorized the Chairman to convene, if necessary, a special Bureau meeting after the closing date for submission of

nominations, in order to examine, "together with advisory organizations and the Secretariat, the possibility for evaluating all new nominations and to adopt a procedure which takes into account the capacities of all parties involved in the processing of nominations.

39. Following a proposal made by the representative of Yugoslavia who underlined the importance of any decision of the Committee in connection with the list provided for the ~~the~~ Convention, the Committee agreed that in the future any such decision will be taken separately, property by property.

40. The representative of Poland then drew the attention of the Committee to paragraphs 20 and 21 of the report of the Rapporteur on the first meeting of the Bureau. As noted in the report, Poland was the only State affected by the decision that on this first occasion, States Parties would be limited to nominating only two properties each for inclusion in the World Heritage List, since it had nominated three sites which clearly qualified for inclusion and for which complete documentation had been submitted: Auschwitz, Krakow and the Salt Mines of Wieliczka. It would, therefore, appear justified that the nomination of Auschwitz be referred to the ~~third~~ ^{second} session of the ^{Bureau} ~~Committee~~, with a favorable recommendation.

40. In response to this proposal the Committee ^{agreed that in all future cases where eligible} ~~decided to give priority to an examination of this~~ ^{were deferred} ~~nomination~~ ^{such nominations would be given priority} by the Bureau. ^{consideration of the following Bureau meeting, assuming that these} ~~nomination~~ ^{are not} ~~in the meantime will be shown by the State~~ ^{concerned}

41. At the suggestion of the Vice-President (France) a general discussion took place on the problems of typology, comparability, complementarity and universality of cultural and natural properties of universal importance.

Some delegates felt it desirable that States Parties, sharing cultural or natural properties of a comparable series, consult each other for the purpose of harmonizing approaches in the selection of properties for the World Heritage List. It was also said that criteria for selection of properties for the World Heritage List should be discussed in more detail in the future in order to facilitate selection and evaluation of candidate World Heritage properties.

IX. EXAMINATION OF REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

42. The Committee examined a request from Ethiopia for technical cooperation to enhance preservation of the Simien National Park, which has now been declared a World Heritage Site. The Committee, fully aware of the urgency to assist Ethiopia in the great task of preserving this threatened property agreed to offer Ethiopia preparatory assistance, deemed necessary by the Committee for elaboration of a more comprehensive technical assistance request and the conduct of a feasibility study. Subject to the outcome of this preparatory work the Committee may grant technical or emergency assistance for the Simien World Heritage Site as appropriate.

X. REVIEW OF THE PROCEDURE FOR NOMINATION TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER.

43. The Chairman invited the Delegate of Canada to take the floor since this item had been added to the agenda upon his proposal. The delegate of Canada explained that after discussing with the Secretariat of UNESCO the terms of Article 11.4 of the Convention he considered that there was no need for a special procedure to be adopted for the establishment of the List of World Heritage in Danger.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Consideration of a Proposed World Heritage Emblem

44. The Secretariat of UNESCO presented to the Committee the initial and ~~another~~ another version modified, according to the suggestions of the Bureau, of the proposed World Heritage Emblem, prepared by Mr. Michel Olyff.

45. As conceived by the artist, this emblem symbolizes, "in a form sufficiently simple to be inserted on a map and to identify sites," the interdependence of cultural and natural properties. The central square is a form created by man; the circle represents nature, the two being intimately linked. The emblem is round, like the world, but it is also a symbol of protection. The two designs, identical in their concept, differ in their graphic approach. (Both designs are shown in Annex II.)

46. Following the Bureau's suggestions, the author presented two versions of the designs, one in black and white, the other in blue and white, the latter being the colors of the United Nations.

47. The Committee examined the proposed designs very carefully. The Delegate of Yugoslavia emphasized that the choice of an emblem is of great importance. The emblem will symbolize for future generations the principles embodied in the Convention. The Committee felt that the proposed emblem fully satisfies the criteria of universality and simplicity, and conveys the essential objectives of the Convention. Consequently it decided to adopt the emblem in its two graphic versions both to be used, and in any color, depending on the use to be made of them, the technical possibilities and considerations of an artistic nature.

2. Booklet on How to Prepare World Heritage List Nominations

48. Following the recommendations of the Bureau the Committee decided that a booklet explaining how nominations to the World Heritage List should be prepared, should be produced by ICOMOS and IUCN instead of the model nomination files which they had previously been asked to prepare and that the Secretariat of UNESCO should follow this decision up. This booklet shall be published in Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

49. In this connection the representative of France pointed out that there was also need to develop tools for alleviating the workload involved in the processing and technical review of reports by the Secretariat of UNESCO, ICOMOS and IUCN. The Secretariat informed the Committee that forms to simplify the correspondence necessary to complete the nominations and relevant documentation were already used and others will be worked out.

3. Authorization of Expenditures in 1978-1979

50. Upon the invitation of the Chairman, the representative of the Director General presented the proposed expenditures for 1978-1979 (document CC-78/CONF.010/8) divided into five different chapters. The first three chapters concerned what could be considered as purely operational activities - preparatory assistance, technical cooperation including training, and

emergency assistance. The fourth chapter provided for programme support - IUCN and ICOMOS participation, and public information activities. The fifth and last chapter covered "~~overhead~~" i.e. temporary assistance for the UNESCO Secretariat in order to cope with part of the additional workload. The figures in the document were only indicative.

51. In connection with the provisions made for training, the representatives of Canada and of the Federal Republic of Germany stressed the importance of the training of administrators and reference was made to the annual International Seminar for parks administrators organized by the School of Natural Resources / ^{in cooperation with} the U.S. National Park Service at the University of Michigan. The representative of the Director General of UNESCO confirmed that fellowships for such a course could be granted, if requested by a State Party for one of its nationals.

52. The representative of Iraq stated his government's intention to submit for approval, at the next session of the Committee, a project for the holding of a course for administrators the Regional Centre in Baghdad.

53. The Committee agreed with the proposal of the representative of France that the provision for emergency assistance be increased from US\$ 100,000 to US\$150,000.

change
scarcely
to note
of the text

54. The proposed expenditures for programme support, i.e. contracts with ICOMOS and IUCN and public information activities, as well as the expenditures for temporary assistance for the UNESCO Secretariat were supported by the representatives of Canada, France, The Federal Republic of Germany, Iran, Nigeria and the United States of America. The latter having suggested that a certain amount of flexibility be introduced for Chapters IV and V of the proposed expenditures, the Committee, on the proposal of the representative of Canada, decided to provide for a contingency allocation of 3% of the total amount for all activities proposed.

+ all members of Committee

55. The representative of the United States of America expressed his concern with the workload imposed on the UNESCO Secretariat by the various activities carried out under the Convention. The attention of the Director General ~~and of the General Conference~~ of UNESCO should be drawn to this situation and remedies should be sought in order to ensure the appropriate implementation of the Convention. These views ^{are} were shared by all members of the Committee.

show
mention attention DG
in document 9.