

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION
OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Nineteenth session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)
3-8 July 1995

Item 6 of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of
properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:

- 6.1. Revision of nomination form and format for reporting
- 6.2. Work plan for the implementation of regional
monitoring programmes and the examination of regional
synthesis reports by the World Heritage Committee
- 6.3. Reports on the state of conservation of specific
properties

CONTENTS:

Background and progress report	Page 2
A. Revised nomination form	Page 5
B. Format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports	Page 6
C. Work plan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes and the examination of regional synthesis reports by the World Heritage Committee	Page 7
D. Reports on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties	Page 8

BACKGROUND AND PROGRESS REPORT

At its eighteenth session in December 1994, the Committee adopted the following principles regarding monitoring the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:

- The Committee defined **systematic monitoring and reporting** as the continuous process of observing the conditions of World Heritage sites with periodic reporting on its state of conservation.
- It decided that systematic monitoring, the day-to-day observation of the sites, is the prime responsibility of the States Parties, in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority.
- The Committee also decided that the States Parties should present every five years a scientific report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites on their territories, and that, to this end, the States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat or the advisory bodies and that the Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties.
- The World Heritage Centre will synthesize the monitoring reports per region and present these to the World Heritage Committee for examination.
- The Committee defined **reactive monitoring** as the reporting by the World Heritage 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. The Committee also invited the States Parties to submit to the Committee, through the World Heritage Centre, specific reports and impact studies each time exceptional circumstances occur or work is undertaken which affect on the state of conservation of the site.

In order to implement these decisions, the Committee requested the Secretariat to undertake a series of specific actions and it invited the Secretariat to report to the Bureau at its nineteenth session on their implementation. The actions requested by the Committee and the subsequent activities undertaken by the Secretariat are the following:

- (1) Prepare a **revised nomination format** for presentation to the nineteenth sessions of the Bureau and the Committee, so as to provide adequate baseline information at the time of inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.

ad (1) The basic structure of a revised nomination format was already presented to the Bureau and the Committee at their eighteenth sessions. An annotated version is presented in Section A of this working document.

- (2) Develop a **format for monitoring reporting** as an aid to the States Parties and to facilitate the processing of the reports and the information contained in them through a computerized data base.

ad (2) Following the structure of the revised nomination format, a format for monitoring reporting has been prepared. This is presented in Section B of this working document.

- (3) Organize in early 1995, with the participation of the advisory bodies and other relevant institutions, a meeting of experts on **World Heritage Information Management**, in order to develop guidelines for the establishment of a World Heritage Data Base.

ad (3) A consultative meeting was held with the advisory bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM), the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) and individual experts to draw up the terms of reference for an expert meeting on World Heritage Information Management. The expert meeting will be held at UNESCO Headquarters in the week of 25 September 1995. The World Heritage Centre, assisted by a working group of three experts, prepared the working document for this meeting which is made available to the Bureau as information document WHC-95/CONF.201/INF.5.

- (4) **Inform the States Parties** of the decisions of the Committee, invite them to put monitoring structures in place and to report on the state of conservation of the property to the Committee on a 5-year basis.

ad (4) The Secretariat informed the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention through a circular letter of the decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee. In this letter the Secretariat also informed them that, in due time, they will be approached on a regional basis to establish jointly the modalities of monitoring and reporting and to define which actions are required to facilitate the observance of the Committee's decisions.

- (5) Present to the nineteenth session of the Bureau an **overall work plan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes** so that States Parties will have sufficient time to prepare the state of conservation reports.

ad (5) A draft work plan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes and the examination of regional synthesis reports by the Committee is presented in Section C of this working document.

- (6) Prepare work plans for and implement **regional programmes** to provide advice and assistance to the States Parties in setting up adequate monitoring and management systems, to promote the preparation of 5-year state of conservation reports, to handle and analyze these reports and to present 5-year Regional State of the World Heritage Reports to the World Heritage Committee.

ad (6) Detailed work plans for the implementation of each of the regional programmes will be prepared so as to meet the targets set in the overall work plan mentioned under ad (5) above.

- (7) Incorporate **monitoring as a management tool** in World Heritage training courses and other activities.

ad (7) The Secretariat and other partners are taking several initiatives to promote monitoring as a management tool and to provide guidance to the States Parties and the site managers in putting day-to-day monitoring in place. The Bureau and the Committee will be informed as soon as possible of these initiatives.

The following sections of this working document present the annotated revised nomination format (Section A), a format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports (Section B), the work plan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes and the examination of regional synthesis reports by the World Heritage Committee (Section C) and reports on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage sites that are under threat (Section D).

A. REVISED NOMINATION FORMAT

A.1. BACKGROUND

Sound baseline information on each of the World Heritage sites is indispensable for any reliable monitoring and reporting system, to maintain a credible World Heritage List, as well as for coordinated and meaningful World Heritage cooperation. The World Heritage Committee, at its eighteenth session, confirmed, therefore, that the nomination form should be revised in such a way that this baseline information be established at the time of the nomination and the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.

The information embodied in the nomination form, together with the evaluation report of the advisory body(ies) and the Committee's statement of the World Heritage values at the moment of inscription, would then serve as the first 'monitoring report' on each World Heritage site. It should be regarded as the basic source of data. For that reason, if the Committee, the Secretariat or the advisory bodies have significant questions to raise about a nomination, they should be answered by way of a specific amendment or revision of the nomination form. No site should be recommended by the advisory bodies for inscription or inscribed by the Committee until they are satisfied with the contents of the nomination dossier.

The basic structure of a revised nomination format was presented to and endorsed by the Committee at its eighteenth session. In consultations with the advisory bodies, an annotated version has now been prepared and is submitted to the Bureau for consideration.

A.2. THE REVISED NOMINATION FORMAT

The annotated revised nomination format is annexed (Annex I).

In case of approval of this format by the Committee at its nineteenth session, it could be introduced for nominations that would be examined by the Bureau and the Committee in 1997.

A.3. ACTION BY THE BUREAU

The Bureau is requested to:

- examine the annotated nomination format and to formulate a recommendation thereon for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session;
- consider when this revised nomination format should be introduced;
- invite the Secretariat to prepare, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session, a draft revised text for paragraph 65 of the Operational Guidelines ('Format and Content of Nominations') so as to reflect the new requirements for nomination dossiers.

B. FORMAT FOR PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS

B.1. BACKGROUND

The procedures for systematic monitoring and reporting, as established by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session and reflected in paragraphs 69 - 76 of the Operational Guidelines, call for a periodic reporting on the state of conservation of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. This implies that every five years the information in the nomination form (the baseline information) should be carefully reviewed and that up-to-date information should be provided to the Committee along with recommended actions to deal with problems or threats identified. These periodic state of conservation reports would, therefore, logically follow the structure of the revised nomination format. Consequently, in the case of sites which are already inscribed on the List, the main objective of the first monitoring and reporting cycle would be to establish or complete the baseline information on the site by preparing, as if it were, an updated nomination dossier.

The Committee, at its eighteenth session, requested the Secretariat to develop a format for the periodic monitoring reporting as an aid to the States Parties and to facilitate the processing of the reports and the information contained in them through a computerized data base.

B.2. THE FORMAT FOR PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS

The proposed format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports is annexed (Annex II).

In case of approval of this format by the Committee at its nineteenth session, it could be introduced immediately.

B.3. ACTION BY THE BUREAU

The Bureau is requested to:

- examine the format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports and to formulate a recommendation thereon for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session;
- recommend to the Committee to introduce this format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports immediately.

C. WORK PLAN FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAMMES AND THE EXAMINATION OF REGIONAL SYNTHESIS REPORTS BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

C.1. BACKGROUND

The Committee decided that the site specific periodic state of conservation reports will be synthesized by the Secretariat and be examined by the Committee on a regional basis. It will decide for which regions state of conservation reports should be presented to its forthcoming sessions so that the States Parties concerned can be informed at least one year in advance so as to give them sufficient time to prepare the reports. A global work plan, on the basis of a five-year cycle, will have to be established to this effect.

C.2. WORK PLAN FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAMMES AND THE EXAMINATION OF REGIONAL SYNTHESIS REPORTS BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Considering the requirement to report on a five-year basis on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, the following work plan is proposed for the examination of regional synthesis reports by the Committee:

Year	Natural properties	Cultural properties
1994	--	Latin America and the Caribbean
1995	Africa	Asia and the Pacific (partial)
1996	Asia and the Pacific (partial) Latin America and the Caribbean	--
1997	Asia and the Pacific	Asia and the Pacific
1998	North America	Africa
1999	Arab States	Arab States
2000	Europe	Europe and North America

2001	Latin America and the Caribbean	Latin America and the Caribbean
2002	Africa	Africa
2003	Asia and the Pacific	Asia and the Pacific
2004	Arab States	Arab States
2005	Europe and North America	Europe and North America

C.3. ACTION BY THE BUREAU

The Bureau is requested to:

- examine the work plan proposed above and to formulate a recommendation thereon for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session.

D. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC PROPERTIES

D.1. INTRODUCTION

This section 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 50-85 of the Operational Guidelines) and in relation to properties inscribed, or to be inscribed, on the List of World Heritage in Danger (paragraphs 83-90 of the Operational Guidelines).

This section of the working document, therefore, includes reports on sites that are inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as reports prepared in response either to requests of the World Heritage Committee or to information received by the Secretariat or the advisory bodies that specific World Heritage sites are under threat.

The eighteenth sessions of the Bureau and the World Heritage Committee examined reports on the state of conservation of the eight natural and of seven cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and sixty-eight reports on sixteen natural and thirty-seven cultural properties on the World Heritage List.

As appropriate, the Secretariat informed the States Parties concerned of the observations made by the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau and requested to be informed of any follow-up taken. In those cases where relevant information has been received from the State Party or other sources, the Secretariat and/or the advisory bodies will report on it to the nineteenth session of the Bureau.

D.2. NATURAL HERITAGE

D.2.1. Natural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

At the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat and IUCN reported on the eight natural sites which are now inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. These are: the Air-Ténéré Reserve, Niger (inscription 1981, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Manas Wildlife Sanctuary, India (inscription 1985, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve, Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire (inscription 1991, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Plitvice Lakes National Park, Croatia (inscription 1979, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Sangay National Park, Ecuador (inscription 1983, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Srebarna Nature Reserve, Bulgaria (inscription 1983, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992), the Everglades National Park, United States of America (inscription 1979, List of World Heritage in Danger 1993) and Virunga National Park, Zaire (inscription 1979, List of World Heritage in Danger 1994).

The Secretariat presents the following information on the natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)

The site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1983 and placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992. The Centre is continuously in contact with the Bulgarian authorities, and a report was presented on their restoration efforts at the last session of the Bureau. Two small-scale international assistance projects from the World Heritage Fund are presently under way at the site, as well as international assistance from other sources. The Centre is waiting a detailed report to be presented orally to the nineteenth session of the Bureau.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: In the absence of a detailed report, the Secretariat is not able to recommend any specific action to the Bureau at this point.

Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)

The site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992. Missions to the site were carried out in 1992 and 1993.

The situation remains critical due to armed conflict and the political situation in the region which remains unchanged. The Committee at its eighteenth session decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and another fact-finding mission to this area, particularly to the Korkaova Uvala Virgin forest is to be scheduled for 1995-96.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: "Given the continued armed conflict in the region, the Bureau urges the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Sangay National Park (Ecuador)

The site was inscribed in 1983 and placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 due to threats from poachers, boundary encroachment and unplanned road construction. A technical assistance project from the World Heritage Fund is under way. The equipment component of this project was carried out in 1994. Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre received in March 1995 a detailed report by INEFAN (Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Areas Naturales y Vida Silvestre) on the environmental impact of the construction of the Guamote-Macas road in the Park. The report states that the road construction will likely entail damage to the Park, such as uncontrolled human settlements (with side effects of poaching, waste deposit, small industries among others) and uncontrolled tourism. The first 8 kms of the works which have already been executed have led to serious, partially irreversible, environmental damage. The most serious issue is the impact on the Laguna Negra (Black Lagoon) consisting of landslides etc. and the inappropriate waste deposits which threaten the Upano River. The continuing road construction activities may have a negative impact, mainly with potential landslides. A number of suggestions were made to reduce the problems including to avoid the use of bulldozers, and to implement minimal drainage works. Necessary control mechanisms after the termination of the road project have been defined, including an inventory of landowners and a review of the legal owner situation, to control spontaneous settlements, to establish an intensified park control, control tourist development in cooperation with/through INEFAN. A technical commission will be established to look into the details and a final report is foreseen.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: "The Bureau, taking note of the preliminary report on the state of conservation of Sangay National Park prepared by INEFAN (Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Areas Naturales y Vida Silvestre), decides to await the final report to define any further action."

Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire)

The site was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 because of a proposed iron-ore mining project and threats due to the arrival of a large number of refugees from neighbouring countries. An expert mission was undertaken in 1993 and proposals to revise the boundaries of the site were endorsed

by the seventeenth session of the Committee in 1993. An international assistance project under the World Heritage Fund was carried out in 1994 and a report was presented to the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The French Ministry of the Environment, in cooperation with IUCN-France, is carrying out a study and review of the site with regard to potential future investment. A report on this project is expected in time for the Bureau session. The Centre also met with the UNDP Resident Representative from Conakry to discuss the situation at the site and future cooperation. A UNESCO-UNDP coordination meeting was held on 29 and 30 March 1995. Furthermore, IUCN and the Centre received a letter from the President of the Italian Botanical Society raising concerns about the massive clearance, lumbering and logging at the Côte d'Ivoire part of the site. The Centre contacted the authorities concerned to obtain an official statement.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: "Considering the information received on the state of conservation of this site, the Bureau concludes that the site remains under serious threat and recommends the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

At its eighteenth session, the World Heritage Committee took note of the information provided by the Indian Government through the Permanent Delegate that "if the representatives of the World Heritage Centre and of the World Heritage Committee desire to visit New Delhi, Assam and Manas for discussion, or see the site" then they "would be welcomed by the concerned authorities of the Government of India". In the same letter the Indian authorities also indicated that the Indian Government will involve local level NGOs in monitoring the state of conservation of the site.

At present cooperation between the management of Manas of India and Bhutan prevails on a bi-lateral basis. To enhance cooperation between India and Bhutan in the conservation of the Manas ecosystem, the Government of Bhutan should be invited to ratify the Convention as soon as possible.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: "The Bureau invites the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Government of India, to elaborate the terms of reference for a mission to New Delhi, Assam and Manas in India."

Air-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)

The site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 as it was affected by civil disturbances and its staff held hostage. The World Heritage Committee took note that a peace accord was signed on 9 October 1994 and encouraged the authorities to implement it and to undertake all efforts to safeguard the site. The Centre in cooperation with the authorities of Niger sent a consultant to the site in

February/March 1995 and the Centre is awaiting a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: At the Bureau meeting, an oral presentation will be made on the detailed report of the state of conservation of the site, which was not available at the time of the preparation of this document. The Bureau may then consider to recommend to the Committee that the site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Everglades National Park (United States of America)

The site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1993 due to an increasing number of threats since the date of its inscription on the List in 1979. Federal State and local governments as well as private foundations have joined forces in providing significant financial support for the management of the site and for its long-term restoration. The Committee took note of a detailed report prepared by the American authorities which was presented at its eighteenth session.

The World Heritage Centre received a monitoring report from the National Park Service in May 1995 indicating that the Federal Government is engaged in restoration planning for the Everglades National Park under the aegis of a Federal Restoration Working Group. The Group provided a comprehensive statement listing priorities, recent accomplishments and critical next steps in the Federal programme for the Everglades restoration. The Governor and Cabinet of the State of Florida approved the acquisition of portions of the Frog Pond, a historically transitional wetland on the eastern boundary of the Park, crucial to the restoration of ground water levels and surface flow. Recent negotiations have led to agreement with property owners.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: "Although conservation work has been strengthened, the Bureau concludes, nevertheless, that the site remains seriously threatened and recommends that the site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Virunga National Park (Zaire)

Virunga National Park, inscribed under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) in 1979, was included in the List of World Heritage in Danger in December 1994, due to the tragic events in Rwanda and the subsequent massive arrival of refugees from that country. Virunga National Park, situated at the border between Rwanda and Uganda has been destabilized by the uncontrolled arrival of refugees causing deforestation and poaching at the sites. The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee approved a total of US\$ 50,000 emergency assistance for both Kahuzi-Biega National Park and Virunga National Park. The project is carried out by WWF and the World Heritage Centre is awaiting a detailed report on the site by 15 June 1995. Preliminary reports indicate that the Park is a primary source of fuelwood and construction wood for the refugees and that 30 to 40,000 people are entering the Park daily. The Centre is cooperating closely with the IZCN (Institut

Zairois pour la Conservation de la Nature), and obtained the information that the European Cooperation, in the framework of a special rehabilitation programme for the neighbouring countries to Rwanda, provided 3.2 Million ECU to Virunga and Kahuzi Biega National Parks, out of which 2 Million ECU are earmarked for Virunga National Park. Through the Centre's cooperation with UNDP, a detailed report on the "Emergency response to the refugee-driven biodiversity crisis in Zaire" has been obtained from UNDP/GEF in February 1995 which includes an environmental impact study for Virunga National Park. UNDP/GEF informed the Centre on 6 April 1995 that an environment coordinator will be based in Goma to provide monitoring, coordination and leadership as well as technical support.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: "The Bureau commends UNDP/GEF for its support for the protection of the site and encourages continuous cooperation between the newly-appointed environmental coordinator and the World Heritage Centre. It recommends that the site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

D.2.2. Natural Properties on the World Heritage List

The Bureau may recall that state of conservation reports were presented to the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee on the following sites: Great Barrier Reef, Shark Bay and Willandra Lakes Region (Australia), Mount Athos (Greece), Keoladeo National Park (India), Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania), Te Wahipounamu (New Zealand), Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania), Serengeti National Park (Tanzania), Redwood National Park (USA), Mosi-oa Tunya/Victoria Falls National Park (Zimbabwe/Zambia), Mana Pools, Sapi and Chewore Reserves (Zimbabwe) and Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Zaire).

Additional and/or new information has been received on several sites. None of these indicate major threats which would justify World Heritage in Danger listing. Summary information, however, is provided below. The Secretariat and the advisory bodies stand ready to present oral reports upon request by the Bureau.

Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)

It is recalled that a fire devastated some 8,000 hectares of Isabela Island in 1994, part of the Galapagos National Park, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978. Emergency assistance was provided to the site under the World Heritage Fund (US\$ 50,000). Meanwhile, the World Heritage Centre is in continuous contact with the authorities concerned, including the President of Ecuador, the President of the Environmental Commission, UNDP, the Galapagos National Park authorities and the Charles Darwin Foundation concerning both the preservation of the site and further action concerning the Galapagos Marine Reserve. A representative of the World Heritage Centre attended the annual meeting of the Charles Darwin Foundation on 5 and 6 April 1995.

Simen National Park (Ethiopia)

The site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978. A workshop on the "Simen Mountains National Park Management" was held in Gondar from 15 to 17 February 1995 and a 40 pages report on the seminar was sent to the World Heritage Centre. The workshop involved different government agencies, the park management, the local communities as well as international participants and donors. The need to facilitate coordination between the government levels was stressed. It was underlined that the park can only be developed in close cooperation with the local communities. It was therefore recommended to set up village committees to be consulted. At the workshop a report on the Simen Mountains Baseline Study, (University of Berne, Switzerland) was presented recommending a prime protection zone for the Walia Ibex, which has an estimated population of 80 to 110 inside and 120 to 150 outside the Park. The study underlined the importance of the well regulated tourism management as well as local community involvement and social-economic development.

The site receives considerable funding by Danish, Austrian and other European assistance agencies as well as the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF).

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

The Centre received a report from the Fundacion Rio Platano concerning the site, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982. The report concerns the agricultural intrusion at the Western border of the site. Additional information was obtained on 12 April 1995 on the land reform programme and its implementation in North-eastern Honduras. The settlement programme threatens several protected areas. The Centre contacted the authorities concerned to obtain further information.

Shirakami-Sanchi (Japan)

The Centre has received several letters concerning the logging of beech forests outside the World Heritage site and has transmitted them for review to IUCN. It is recalled that the site was inscribed in 1993 and that the Committee at the time recommended to review the site after three years.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: "The Bureau invites the Centre to organize a mission to review the progress made in the implementation of the management plan with regard to the requirements of the World Heritage Convention."

Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi)

The UNESCO Equipment Divisoon in cooperation with the Centre sent a mission to this World Heritage site in April 1995 to review the current international assistance projects at the site and to carry out an evaluation and assessment of future needs. A detailed report of the mission will be available at the time of the Bureau meeting.

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)

The eighteenth session of World Heritage Committee requested that IUCN present to the Bureau an evaluation of the revised boundaries of this site, based on the report of a mission scheduled to take place early April 1995. However, the Omani authorities, who have hired the consultant, have requested a re-scheduling of the report for 30 July 1995. Upon receipt of the report, an evaluation will be prepared for presentation to the nineteenth session of the Committee.

Bwindi National Park (Uganda)

Bwindi National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994. Reports from different sources, including WWF, have indicated that four mountain gorillas were killed at the site in March 1995.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: "The Bureau requests the Centre to inform the Ugandan authorities of its serious preoccupation concerning the depletion of the population of mountain gorillas and to obtain information about the steps undertaken in this respect."

Redwood National Park (United States of America)

The World Heritage Centre was advised on 15 September 1994 of a proposed road project within the site. The proposal involves 2 miles of highway relocation which has been subject to an Environmental Impact Study. The United States National Park Service and IUCN were requested by the Committee to follow up this matter.

In May 1995, the Centre received a preliminary monitoring report from the National Park Service, indicating that the California Department of Transportation (CDT) has proposed to realign 3,2 Km (2 miles) of Highway 101 near Cushing Creek in Del Norte County to correct safety and operational problems. A Draft Environmental Impact Statement was prepared by the National Park Service and the California Department of Parks and Recreation and 76 comments were received, mostly opposing the alternative, which would have required the removal of at least 200 old growth redwood trees for highway widening.

In response to the public and agency opposition, a Value Engineering Team considered other solutions and developed strategies to alleviate safety and traffic problems, which were presented at a public meeting in March 1995.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: As the site was placed on the World Heritage List specifically in recognition of the conservation values of the "Redwoods", the Bureau may wish to request IUCN to carry out as soon as possible a mission to evaluate whether the World Heritage values of the site are imperilled, and recommend that the Committee consider putting the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)

The Centre has received documentation concerning Yellowstone National Park from a group of fourteen North American conservation organizations. The documents raise serious questions about potential damage to Yellowstone National Park in particular from a proposed mining operation. A draft environmental impact statement is under way. The Centre contacted the American authorities to advise them of the concerns of the World Heritage Centre.

In May the Centre received a letter from the State Party requesting a joint mission by the Centre and IUCN to make an interim assessment of the mining proposal and that the Committee give consideration to placing Yellowstone National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Zaire)

On 31 August 1994 the World Heritage Centre was informed that a UNHCR refugee camp for 50,000 people was going to be established near a three-kilometer strip of the Kahuzi-Biega National Park near Ihembe. The World Heritage Centre immediately contacted the UNHCR (Geneva), the Director of IZCN, Mr Mankoto Ma Mbaelele, (Kinshasa), who was carrying out monitoring missions at World Heritage sites in Zaire, and a bilateral project by the GTZ (Germany). The Centre obtained relocation of the camp near Uvira which relieved the pressure from the site. With the relocation of the camp, the Kahuzi-Biega World Heritage site seemed to be less threatened in comparison with the situation at Virunga National Park, which still remains very critical. The Centre was informed by the Zairois authorities (IZCN) that a new visitor centre was built with funding from German authorities and the GTZ. Furthermore, Kahuzi-Biega obtained funds from the European Cooperation.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: "The Bureau commends the German and European authorities for their support to the site."

D.3. CULTURAL HERITAGE

D.3.1. Cultural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

At the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat and ICOMOS reported on the state of conservation of seven of the nine cultural sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger: Royal Palaces of Abomey, Benin (inscription 1985, List of World Heritage in Danger 1985), Angkor, Cambodia (inscription 1992, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992), the Old City of Dubrovnik, Croatia (inscription 1987, List of World Heritage in Danger 1991), Timbuktu, Mali (inscription 1988, List of World Heritage in Danger 1990); Bahla Fort, Oman (inscription 1987, List of World Heritage in Danger 1988); Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, Peru (inscription 1986, List of World Heritage in Danger

1986) and Wieliczka Salt Mines, Poland (inscription 1978, List of World Heritage in Danger 1989).

The Secretariat provides the following information on sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin)

At its eighteenth session, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre to send a "monitoring" mission to the group of eleven of the Palaces of Abomey to evaluate their state of conservation. The Centre transmitted this information to the Benin authorities by letter of 8 January 1995. Furthermore, following the approval by the Committee in December 1994 of a request of US\$ 33,000, a contract has already been established with ICCORM/PREMA and the GAIA project for the training of a professional team and craftsmen-technician team for the restoration and maintenance of the palaces.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: "The Bureau recommends the Centre and the Benin authorities to organize this mission as soon as possible, as the report should not only describe the state of conservation of each palace and define the measures to be undertaken to remedy the situation, but also define in general terms the conservation techniques suitable for the natural environment of the site (history, typology, materials, etc.)."

Angkor (Cambodia)

Within the framework of assistance provided by the UNESCO Secretariat to the Cambodian authorities for the implementation of obligations following the inscription of Angkor on the List of World Heritage in Danger, (sixteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, Santa Fe, 14 December 1992), a legal expert was sent by UNESCO in March 1995, to finalize for adoption and application, the legislation with regard to the protection of cultural heritage.

As far as the establishment of a national organism for protection and the management of the site is concerned, UNESCO notes with satisfaction that the Cambodian authorities have issued, on 19 February 1995, a decree announcing the creation of the Authority for the Protection of the Site and the Management of the Region of Angkor (APSARA).

Furthermore, the International Coordination Committee, created in October 1993 by the Intergovernmental Tokyo Conference for the Safeguarding and Development of the Historic Site of Angkor and for which UNESCO provides the permanent Secretariat, held in Phnom Penh, under the co-Chairmanship of France and Japan, a session of the Technical Committee on 31 March 1995. This enabled the Committee to ensure, in cooperation with the Cambodian authorities, the coordination and monitoring of international actions undertaken to conserve the site, restore its monuments and protect its environment.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: "The Bureau confirms the Declaration adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session and commends the Cambodian authorities on the progress made in the implementation of the requests formulated by the Committee at the time of inscription of Angkor on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requests the Secretariat to provide a detailed report to the World Heritage Committee at its forthcoming session."

Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)

The site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1991. The Committee examined at its eighteenth session a state of conservation report and approved an amount of US\$50,000 for setting up in the Old City a documentation centre and coordination unit for the restoration work done after the damage caused by the bombardments. Work is currently being done by the local and national authorities, in cooperation with the Centre and other partners, in organizing such a unit, training the necessary personnel and purchasing needed equipment.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: "The Bureau requests the Secretariat to monitor the implementation of the assistance and to present a progress report to the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session."

Timbuktu (Mali)

By letter of 13 March 1995, the Mali authorities presented to the World Heritage Centre the modalities for the implementation of a pilot work site project to which would be associated the management committees and the builders responsible for the maintenance of the three mosques of Djingareiber, Sankore and Sidi Yahia, inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

This project, which aims at solving the most serious and acute conservation problems, will be carried out by the Cultural Mission at Timbuktu and a Mali architect designated by the Mali Ministry of Culture and Communication. The GAIA project will provide the operational Unit to be set up in Mali with expertise in the field of the reinforcement and conservation of earthen constructions.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: "The Bureau congratulates the Mali authorities and requests them to keep the Committee informed of the implementation of the project."

Bahla Fort (Oman)

Following information implying that restoration work being carried out on the Bahla Fort had not respected its authenticity, the Omani authorities accepted the Centre's proposal to send to the site the ICOMOS expert who had carried out its evaluation in 1988, prior to its inscription on the List, to evaluate the work methods used and make new proposals if necessary.

The expert undertook the mission from 11 to 18 December, 1994, and made the following observations and recommendations:

- a) The conservation of the site has deteriorated, creating the threat of severe structural damage, particularly the collapse of the *mihrab* wall of the smaller extra-muros mosque and the appearance of crevices in several walls, especially of the Old Citadel, the foundations, the naves and terrace of the Great Mosque. Remedial action must be undertaken without delay.
- b) As concerns authenticity, the work accomplished up to now has resulted in a renovation rather than restoration, the aim pursued being to give the monument the look of a new construction. The work was undertaken without prior archaeological, topographic, architectural and technical surveys. The original building materials (mud-bricks, mortar and plaster) were not studied nor used. Stone was often unjustifiably used in place of the original mud-bricks, and cement was added to the mud-bricks. This material containing cement (*sarooj*) was also widely used to coat the walls, concealing all traces of the old masonry and giving the walls a harsh and uniform appearance, which contradicts the ancient character of the monument.

During his mission, the ICOMOS expert made two series of recommendations to the Omani authorities, who received them very favourably:

- I)
 - a) resume and complete the architectural surveys of the buildings,
 - b) respect their authenticity through the use of the original materials and techniques, conserve the original renderings as far as possible, and preserve the historic character of the monuments,
 - c) reproduce the ancient building materials through scientific laboratory analysis of their original composition,
 - d) repair the most severe structural damage,
 - e) respect certain restoration priorities, given in detail in the report.
- II) Prepare a Master Plan for the rehabilitation of Bahla Fort and its Oasis, and create a coordinating unit to integrate all national and international inputs.

The consultant's report and recommendations were discussed in his presence in a working session with the Ambassador, Permanent

Delegate of Oman, on 31 January. This report was officially transmitted to the national authorities on 3 February, along with the proposal that an expert specializing in earth constructions be sent to the site to ensure that necessary measures are taken to respect the authenticity of material and buildings whilst the restoration work is being carried out.

In his letter of 5 April to the Centre, the Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Oman, confirmed the national authorities' agreement that this mission of two experts be jointly financed and organized during the month of May 1995, in order to decide, together with those responsible for the restoration, which kind of earthen material should be used in order to preserve the authenticity of the monument.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: "The Bureau endorses the recommendations made by the expert mission and commends the Government of Oman on its positive response. The Bureau invites the Secretariat to report to the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session on the outcome of the expert mission that will be undertaken in May 1995."

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)

The Chan Chan Archaeological Zone was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1986 in view of the fragility of its adobe structures. An extensive monitoring report on the conditions of the site, prepared in the context of the regional monitoring programme for Latin America, was presented to the seventeenth session of the Committee. It was concluded that the conservation and maintenance of the site require continuous efforts as well as the recuperation of the land within the protected area that is presently being occupied by farmers.

In order to carry the research and training in adobe conservation further, the Peruvian authorities have taken the initiative to organize in early 1996 a regional/international training course in Chan Chan jointly with ICCROM, CRATerre and the Getty Conservation Institute. Parallel to the course, the participants and international experts will also evaluate the conservation practices and experiences in Chan Chan and define new conservation policies.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: "Awaiting the results of the assessment of the conservation policies and practices at the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, to be undertaken in the context of the course on adobe conservation that will be held at Chan Chan early 1996, the Bureau recommends the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Wieliczka Salt Mines (Poland)

The site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1989. A detailed report on the actions that had been undertaken to safeguard the mines was examined by the Committee

at its eighteenth session. At that same session, the Committee approved an amount of US\$ 100,000 for the purchase of dehumidification equipment required for the preservation of the salt sculptures in the Mine. The relevant technical information submitted by the Polish National Commission for UNESCO having been examined by the UNESCO services, a call to tender to sixteen specialized companies was sent out at the beginning of this year. Three quotations have been received and transmitted to the Polish authorities. The equipment will be purchased upon receiving their decision.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: "The Bureau requests the Secretariat to monitor the implementation of the technical assistance and the impact of the equipment on the conditions of this site and to keep the Committee informed of the results. The Bureau recommends the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the results and a report of the impact of technical assistance on the project is known."

Natural and Culturo-historical Region of Kotor (Yugoslavia)

The Natural and Culturo-historical Region of Kotor was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1979 after an earthquake caused severe damage to the site. No recent information is available on its state of conservation.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/ action: "The Bureau requests ICOMOS to examine the conditions of the Natural and Culturo-historical Region of Kotor and to present a comprehensive report to the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session, together with a recommendation if this site should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

D.3.2. Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List

The Bureau, at its eighteenth session in July 1994, reviewed the state of conservation of the following twenty-three cultural properties: Butrinti (Albania), five cultural sites in China, Arles (France), Lübeck (Germany), Delos and Samos (Greece), Pisa (Italy), Petra and Quseir Amra (Jordan), Puebla (Mexico), Kathmandu Valley (Nepal), Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation), Gorée (Senegal), Burgos Cathedral (Spain), Damascus and Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic), Göreme and Cappadocia (Turkey), Pueblo de Taos (United States of America) and Stonehenge (United Kingdom).

Twenty-two new and/or additional reports were examined by the Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994 on: Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria), Serra da Capivara (Brazil), Memphis and its Necropolis - the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt), Medieval City of Rhodes (Greece), Quirigua (Guatemala), Florence (Italy), Petra (Jordan), Megalithic Temples, Hal Saflieni Hypogeum and the City of Valetta (Malta), Puebla (Mexico), Island of Mozambique (Mozambique), Kathmandu Valley (Nepal), Historic

Centre of Lima (Peru), Rio Abiseo (cultural part) (Peru), Kremlin and Red Square and Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation), Burgos Cathedral (Spain), Historic Areas of Istanbul and Xanthos-Letoon (Turkey), Pueblo de Taos (United States of America) and the Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam).

The Secretariat provides information on the state of conservation of the following sites:

Asia-Pacific Region

Historic Mosque City of Bagerhat and Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh)

UNESCO's Division for Physical Heritage organized a project monitoring mission in December 1994 to these two cultural sites in Bangladesh inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1985. The mission reported on the progress of the two projects financed under the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust for Cultural Heritage within the International Safeguarding Campaign for Paharpur and Bagerhat. The mission, while noting with satisfaction, the progress made in the archaeological and architectural documentation, recommended *inter alia* that: (i) national norms and standards be developed with regard to archaeological investigations, recording and documentation, and conservation and construction work to be carried out within the World Heritage protected zones; (ii) a national mechanism for planning, execution, monitoring and evaluation of conservation work and research be established by the Department of Archaeology; (iii) reports on the recently conducted archaeological research and conservation work be completed and published; (iv) the conservation laboratory at the Department of Archaeology, in terms of building facilities, equipment and staff be improved; (v) sign posts and boards indicating the World Heritage protected area be improved; and (vi) training strategy and programme, perhaps within the SAARC regional framework be developed.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: "The Bureau noted the joint statement signed by UNESCO and the Department of Archaeology at the conclusion of the review mission of the International Campaign for Bagerhat and Paharpur, calling for the organization of a World Heritage monitoring mission for a thorough review and recommendations on measures to improve the legal protection, enforcement mechanism and administration of the Department of Archaeology, as well as to develop appropriate training and international assistance programmes. The Bureau requests the World Heritage Centre to conduct a joint mission with the Bangladeshi authorities concerned as soon as possible and to report to the Committee at its nineteenth session."

Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia)

The UNESCO representative to the Third International Experts Meeting on Borobudur, held on site in January 1995 reported that the Expert Group expressed satisfaction on the state of

conservation of Borobudur, which has been the object of a UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign launched in 1972, although the site was only inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991. The meeting however made, *inter alia*, the following recommendations:

- (i) avoid any future actions or activities that would unnecessarily disturb the traditional appearance of the site, e.g. construction of park features that have little relationship with the local landscape, indigenous plant species; functions which would devalue the dignity of the site;
- (ii) develop regulations to protect Zones III, IV and V outside the Borobudur Park boundaries against inappropriate new construction, etc;
- (iii) develop mid-term (5 year) and long-term (10 year) strategic planning policies and programmes in consultation with appropriate national, regional and local authorities to identify and prioritize conservation measures; institution-building; quality and quantity of staffing level and their training needs;
- (iv) review of information management system;
- (v) develop tourism management policy to ensure protection of site and distribution of tourism revenue for conservation activities;
- (vi) develop information material including multi-media material; and
- (vii) further research and publication on stone conservation and biological growth concerns.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: "The Bureau, having noted the outcome of the International Campaign Review Meeting, commends the Government of Indonesia, UNESCO and their partners for their conservation work over the past two decades and requests the World Heritage Centre to arrange with the Indonesian authorities, the most suitable modalities for the preparation of the periodic state of conservation report to be submitted to the World Heritage Committee in accordance with the agreed procedures."

Meidan Emam of Isfahan (Iran)

The UNESCO Physical Heritage Division undertook a mission to Iran in December 1994 which included a preliminary survey on the state of conservation of the World Heritage cultural property of Meidan Emam in Isfahan. Observations focused on the following:

- (i) concern over the heavy traffic in the old town, particularly on the Meidan Emam place, which along with the surrounding monuments are in the protected zone. The proposed construction of an underground passage to alleviate the traffic congestion had been shelved due to the high water table preventing its construction and the city magistrate, instead, transformed the main part of the Meidan Emam into a pedestrian zone. The UNESCO mission reported that a project to create a new traffic axe, immediately south of the Meidan Emam, by widening an existing

street is currently under study. As the creation of this axe entails cutting the old town and destroying a large number of traditional houses and ancient mud-brick city ramparts, UNESCO has requested the authorities to reconsider the feasibility of this project in view of the conservation concerns.

The UNESCO mission also recommended the involvement of the Cultural Heritage Organization of the Government of Iran in another on-going feasibility study on the construction of a Isfahan Regional Metro, to ensure that cultural heritage conservation concerns, particularly regarding disturbances to archaeological features, are properly reflected.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: "The Bureau, having noted the concerns raised over the impact of the various transportation infrastructure proposals, requests the Iranian authorities to consider the establishment of meaningful buffer zones to protect the World Heritage site and to inform the Committee through the systematic monitoring report to be prepared by the Government."

Tchogha Zanbil (Iran)

The first joint Japan/UNESCO project identification mission to this World Heritage Site inscribed in 1979, which took place in February 1995, observed that in spite of the application of a good traditional method of conservation, consisting of covering the exposed structures each year with "kargel" (mud and straw mixture), the site has continued to deteriorate in the absence of a viable method for sustainable conservation of the mud-brick structures which are annually exposed to heavy rainfall.

The mission also noted some movement of the supporting brick walls of the Ziggurat, pointing to the probability of structural problems.

The Physical Heritage Division of UNESCO urges the deployment of a second technical team including a structural engineer to define better the scope of the conservation measures required and to finalize the project document for submission to funding sources.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: "The Bureau requests the Iran authorities to inform the Committee on the state of conservation of Tchogha Zanbil through the procedures established for systematic monitoring and reporting."

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

The World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session expressed its appreciation for the monitoring report prepared by the Department of Archaeology on the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Committee at its seventeenth session. The Committee approved in December 1994, a technical cooperation request under the World Heritage Fund to finance a six-month mission of an international technical adviser to Kathmandu to assist the authorities in the preparation of a package of

projects for international funding and to establish a development control unit within the Department of Archaeology to prevent further encroachment of the protected monument zones of this World Heritage site, and to implement the other recommendations made by the UNESCO/ICOMOS mission of November 1993. The international expert has been identified and deployment is scheduled for August 1995.

On 23 February 1995, the World Heritage Centre officially transmitted its concern to the Government of Nepal on reports concerning the demolition of Joshi Agamchen in Kathmandu Darbar Square Monument Zone. By letter of 14 March 1995, the Director-General of the Department of Archaeology informed the Centre of its intervention with the private trust which is the owner of this historic building to ensure that the conservation works in progress meet the international standards of conservation practice.

The continued demolition of historic buildings located on the fringe of the existing boundaries of Patan Darbur Square Monument Zone has been reported. This area is part of the suggested expansion zone to be included in the revised boundary which was accepted by the Government following the UNESCO/ICOMOS mission recommendation. The new gazette of the revised boundary has not yet been issued.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: "Noting with concern, reports on the continued demolition of and alterations to historic buildings within the World Heritage protected zones and in areas pending official inclusion, the Bureau requests the urgent publication of the Government gazette indicating the new boundaries of the protected areas and the early establishment of the Inter-ministerial Task Force to implement the actions agreed upon by the Government to strengthen the protection of the World Heritage site of Kathmandu Valley. The Bureau requests the Inter-ministerial Task Force and the international technical adviser to report, through the official Government channels, to the nineteenth session of the Committee."

Archaeologic Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan)

The World Heritage Centre undertook a mission in March 1995 to assist the national authorities in preparing the state of conservation reports on the World Heritage cultural properties in Pakistan.

The mission benefitted from the 15th meeting of the International Consultative Committee (ICC) for the Safeguarding Campaign for Moenjodaro, launched in 1974, to gather information for a monitoring report on this site currently under preparation in collaboration with and at the request of the national authorities. Amongst the observations made were: (i) the need to ensure the sustainability of activities presently funded by UNDP and the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust by integrating the national experts trained under these projects as staff of the Department of Archaeology and Museums; (ii) clarification of the division

of responsibilities between the various government entities dealing with the protection and conservation of Moenjodaro; (iii) cost-benefit appraisal of the electricity-generated water pumping work to lower the water table intended to protect the sub-surface archaeological remains; (iv) need for an international technical adviser based in Moenjodaro or in Karachi to provide more regular advice to the on-site conservation team.

The ICC expressed concern over the damage caused to the original walls by heavy rainfall in 1994, but noted that the recent protection measures applied was successful in limiting the damage.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: "The Bureau, having noted the concerns raised at the 15th meeting of the Moenjodaro ICC, requests UNESCO to strengthen its support to the Pakistani authorities over the next two years to enable the termination of the International Campaign in 1997, as requested by the General Conference of UNESCO. The Bureau suggests that UNESCO and the national authorities concerned, review the need for the nomination of an international expert based in Karachi or in Moenjodaro for the duration of the remaining period of the Campaign and if affirmative, seek international funding to finance the consultant post."

Taxila (Pakistan)

With regard to Taxila, the World Heritage Centre's mission in March 1995 observed that the nomination file, on the basis of which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List, did not clearly indicate the number of sites it contained. The site of Taxila, under the national registry of historic monuments is composed of some 55 sites spread over an area of about 18 kms x 8 kms of the Taxila Valley.

The states of conservation of the sites visited varied but, on the whole, were in very good condition given the enormous maintenance work the property entails by its size and dispersed components. A scientific study on the application of non-toxic herbicide is urgently needed in view of the vegetation overgrowth which cannot be cleared mechanically. The mission noted concern over the gradual expansion of the industrial estates located within the Taxila Valley which, despite their location outside the very limited buffer zone surrounding the registered archaeological sites, nonetheless risk impacting upon the overall integrity of the Taxila World Heritage site in its ensemble. The limestone blasting and quarrying activities in the Taxila Valley also need to be monitored in view of the alleged impact on the structural stability of the Jaulian site, Dharmajika Temple and the Bhir Stupa.

International and national funding to establish a site conservation laboratory in Taxila, both for the conservation of movable objects of the impressive Taxila Museum collection and for in-situ sculptures must be sought. Specific recommendations

on stucco preservation, roofing, drainage and other conservation measures will be presented in a monitoring report currently under preparation with the Sub-regional Office for Taxila of the Department of Archaeology and Museums.

The mission noted with great satisfaction the extremely positive attitude on the part of the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism and notably, its Department of Archaeology and Museums, on the establishment of a national monitoring mechanism as a management tool for the conservation of World Heritage sites in Pakistan.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: "Having noted the interim oral report on the state of conservation of Taxila, the Bureau requests the Department of Archaeology and Museums, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, to: (i) carry out the required scientific studies on vegetation control to minimize the damage to the masonry and structure of the monuments, and (ii) to appraise the impact of the heavy industries and the stone quarrying in the Taxila Valley areas."

Europe and North America

Medieval City of Rhodes (Greece)

During its eighteenth session, after having examined the state of conservation of the Medieval City of Rhodes, the Committee requested precise information on the legal protection of the Medieval City and the establishment of a legal framework for the main principles guiding the restoration of its buildings.

The Permanent Delegate of Greece to UNESCO informed the Centre by letter of 30 March 1995, that the Medieval City of Rhodes is a mixture of architecture dating from the time of the Knights, Ottoman architecture and eclectic buildings. The City was declared a historical monument, protected by the Archaeological Service, which applied the 1932 decree (Decree K.N. 5351). The protection concerns all the buildings, but the most interesting ones, declared historic monuments, receive special attention on the part of the Archaeological Service.

In 1984, in order to improve protection of the Medieval City, a conservation and restoration bureau was created thanks to a contract between the Ministry of Culture, the Town Hall of Rhodes and the Archaeological Fund. The objective of the Bureau is to protect the City, relodge its inhabitants and develop activities which are adapted to its character, such as small-scale artisanal activities and tourism, etc. The Bureau encourages activities for the restoration of monuments as well as roads, pedestrian areas, sewage works, rainwater drainage networks and anti-fire facilities, etc.

The Archaeological Service controls the following activities: a) the restoration of public or private buildings: facade, stone decorations, doors and windows, wooden constructions, wall colourings, etc.; b) the use of the buildings; c) the size and

height; d) the construction of new buildings; e) the compulsory purchase of buildings of specific architectural interest; f) the cleaning and transformation of archaeological sites; g) intervention on the facades of stores and shops, and control of the use of unsuitable publicity signs, not in conformity with the monumental character of the City; h) the conservation of the existing plan; and, finally, archaeological research, excavation and the conservation of the fortifications and monuments.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: "The Bureau takes note of the information provided by the authorities of Greece on the legal protection and the management arrangements for the City."

Megalithic Temples (Malta)

During its eighteenth session, the Committee was informed of the very serious situation at this site: the collapse of a wall of the monument and the exploitation of big quarries adjacent to Mnajdra, the risk of collapse of a part of the Ggantija Temple and the general absence of surveillance of the site. By letter of 6 January 1995, the Centre transmitted to the Maltese authorities the request expressed by the Committee that all safeguarding measures should be undertaken without delay and that a detailed report on the actions carried out be provided by 1 April.

Having received no information by 1 April, the Centre requested the Permanent Delegation of Malta to UNESCO, by letter of 4 April, to inform whether they had received any direct information regarding the safeguarding measures.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: In the event that this information is not received by the Centre in time for its nineteenth session, the Bureau may wish to adopt the following position: "The Bureau expresses its regrets to the Maltese authorities that they have not responded to the requests of the Committee, and stresses the importance that the requested information be submitted to the Centre by 1 October 1995, so that the World Heritage Committee may evaluate the situation at its nineteenth session and take the measures it deems necessary".

Hal Saflieni Hypogeum (Malta)

During its eighteenth session, the Committee was informed of the very serious situation at the site which is partially flooded and in a state of rapid dilapidation due to numerous leaks in the adjacent drainage and sewage system, whereas the air-conditioning work, partially financed from the World Heritage Fund two years ago, has not yet begun.

By letter of 6 February 1995, the Centre transmitted to the Maltese authorities the Committee requests concerning the repair of the drainage system in order to evacuate the water from the Hypogeum and to commence the work of conservation and equipping, particularly that which was financed by the World Heritage Fund,

as well as to provide a detailed report by 1 April of the work undertaken.

Having received no information by 1 April, the Centre requested the Permanent Delegation of Malta to UNESCO, by letter of 4 April, to inform whether they had received direct information concerning these safeguarding measures.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/action: In the event that this information is not received by the Centre in time for its nineteenth session, the Bureau may wish to adopt the following position: "The Bureau expresses its regrets to the Maltese authorities that they have not responded to the requests of the Committee, and stresses the importance that the requested information be submitted to the Centre by 1 October 1995, so that the World Heritage Committee may evaluate the situation at its nineteenth session and take the measures it deems necessary".

Taos Pueblo (United States of America)

The site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1992. The World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session was informed by the Delegate of the United States on the actions taken by the Taos Pueblo and the US National Park Service to ensure the conservation and the integrity of the site. The Committee reiterated its concerns about the airport extension plans and invited the authorities to report back to the nineteenth session of the Committee.

The Centre received a preliminary monitoring report and information on the airport extension from the Taos Pueblo Warchief and the National Park Service. The major issues are the size of the area determined to be affected by the proposed airport improvements. On 9 May 1995, Taos Pueblo received a document from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) which defined the geographical area to be studied for impacts to traditional cultural properties resulting from the proposed airport extension. The Taos Pueblo land tracts immediately surrounding the proposed flight routes and the Pueblo village were included for the study, whereas the Blue Lake Wilderness, a federally protected area for Tribal religious activity was excluded. Most of the Tribe's complaints about expected impacts relate to this sensitive area. Neither the Taos Pueblo nor the National Park Service have been consulted by the FAA.

Suggested Bureau recommendation/action: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the authorities of the United States that an impartial professional review of the FAA report be carried out with the cooperation of ICOMOS, the Taos Pueblo, the USNPS and the FAA, and that this report be submitted to the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The State Party may wish to table further information with respect to this brief report.

Arab States

Memphis and its Necropolis- the Pyramid fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)

Following an exchange of correspondence between the Director-General of UNESCO, the World Heritage Committee and the Government of Egypt, a UNESCO expert mission visited Egypt from 1 to 6 April 1995 at the invitation of the national authorities, in order to propose safeguarding measures for the World Heritage site of the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur, after studying with the Egyptian authorities concerned the possibilities of adopting a new route for the motorway under construction which at the present time cuts across the site.

The UNESCO mission report is contained in information document WHC-95/CONF.201/INF.6).

Following the presentation and examination of this report, the Bureau may wish to adopt the following recommendation:

"After having noted the content of the mission report of the UNESCO experts invited by the Government of Egypt, from 1 to 6 April 1995, to assist in identifying measures to ensure the conservation of the World Heritage site of the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur, the Bureau congratulates and warmly thanks the Egyptian authorities for the decisions taken to date and the actions already undertaken:

- 1) the choice of a new route passing north of the World Heritage site for the highway link to the ring-road, which will follow, once the necessary detailed studies are achieved, either the Mariouteyya Canal, the Mansoureyya Canal or both of them;
- 2) work already undertaken to improve one of the rubbish dumps and work foreseen to abolish the second;
- 3) the undertaking to halt all further housing construction at Kafr-el-Gabal and to eliminate, in the coming years, the unauthorized buildings and roads encroaching on the buffer zone of the World Heritage site.

It requests them to examine carefully, with the authorities concerned, the relocation of the different military camps and army factories which encroach upon the site and its buffer zone.

It thanks the Egyptian authorities represented at the Joint Committee meeting for their excellent cooperation with the mission, their display of comprehension and high level of expertise which contributed towards a successful outcome.

It extends thanks to the President, Hosni Mubarak, the Director-General of UNESCO, and the Minister of the Culture of Egypt, Mr.

Farouk Hosni, for their instrumental role in seeking and reaching a satisfactory solution to the problems caused by the branch of the motorway, as well as to Dr. Abdel-Halim Nour-Eldin, Secretary-General of the Supreme Council of Antiquities, for his personal commitment in favour of the site, the manner in which he organized the work of the mission and chaired the meetings. It requests the Egyptian authorities to keep the World Heritage Committee informed, through its Secretariat, of the progress made in the implementation of the safeguarding measures already undertaken or foreseen, and in particular the question concerning the encroachment of military camps on the World Heritage site and its buffer zone".

Hatra (Iraq)

Voluminous convergent information received at the Centre reports on major looting of Iraqi archaeological sites, and in particular of Hatra, chiefly due to the grave economic situation and the social instability prevalent in the country since 1991.

Parallel to the initiatives undertaken by the UNESCO Physical Heritage Division to try to halt the illicit traffic of stolen objects from the Iraqi museums, the World Heritage Centre requests, as an initial safeguarding measure, that States Parties to the Convention alert their competent services for the repression of traffic of stolen antiquities in order that they pay particular attention to objects and sculptures likely to originate from this site dating from the first centuries AD, one of the most important Parthian civilizations.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: "The Bureau, having been informed of looting of archaeological sites in Iraq, particularly at Hatra, requests the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to do their utmost to prevent the illicit traffic of archaeological objects and sculptures from this site."

Petra (Jordan)

During its eighteenth session, the Committee was informed of the different threats (hotel construction near the site, insufficient waste water evacuation systems, uncontrolled urban development, proliferation of shops....) menacing the preservation of the integrity of the site.

By letter of 5 January 1995, the Centre informed the Jordanian authorities of the grave concerns of the Committee and transmitted its requests, notably the prohibition of all new hotel constructions near the site, the official creation of the Petra National Park and the implementation of the Petra National Park Management Plan prepared by UNESCO experts, including the establishment of eight protective zones, a buffer zone and a management authority, and requested them to send to the Centre by 1 May, a full report on the safeguarding measures undertaken.

By letter of 13 March, the Permanent Delegation of Jordan sent the Centre a proposal for an extension of the site under the name

Petra Natural and Archaeological Park, of which the boundaries and the different protection zones exactly meet the recommendations of the UNESCO experts, and by letter of 18 March, the Minister of Tourism and Antiquities informed the Centre of a certain number of measures undertaken to improve the protection of the site: limiting the daily intake of visitors and horses, improvement of sanitary arrangements, regrouping of street stalls, recruitment of a refuse team, creation of a centre for stone conservation and a team to study rock erosion, the improvement of some sites through descriptive panels and trails, establishment of a special Bureau to follow up these different projects.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: The Bureau may wish to adopt the following position: "The Bureau thanks the Jordanian authorities for having undertaken the measures outlined by the Committee without delay and congratulates them on their desire to ensure long-term conservation of the site. In order to have available all the necessary elements for the evaluation of the proposed extension of the site, it requests the authorities to confirm by 1 October that all new hotel construction is now forbidden at Wadi Musa and along the Taybeh road, that the Petra National Park Management Plan will be fully implemented and that a specific management authority will be created at the site."

Latin America and the Caribbean

Puebla (Mexico)

The World Heritage Committee was informed, at its eighteenth session, that the Chairperson of the Committee approved in 1994 technical assistance in order to advise the national and local authorities of Puebla on the conservation and rehabilitation policies for this city. To this effect, in the last half of 1994 and the beginning of 1995 an expert undertook a series of missions to Puebla. The final report of these missions is expected to be submitted to the Bureau and a presentation will be made during that session.

Suggested Bureau Recommendation/ action: The Bureau is requested to examine the report at its session and to decide which actions or recommendations should be made in this respect.

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION
NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION ON
THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Table of Contents

1. Identification of the Property

- a. Country (and State Party if different).
- b. State, Province or Region
- c. Name of Property
- d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
- e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area proposed for inscription and of any buffer zone
- f. Area of site proposed for inscription (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.) if any.

2 Justification for Inscription

- a. Statement of significance
- b. Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar sites)
- c. Authenticity/Integrity
- d. Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)

3. Description

- a. Description of Property
- b. History and Development
- c. Form and date of most recent records of site
- d. Present state of conservation

4 Management

- a. Ownership
- b. Legal status
- c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
- d. Agency/agencies with management authority
- e. Level at which management is exercised (e.g., on site, regionally) and name and address of responsible person for contact purposes

- f. Agreed plans related to property (e.g., regional, local plan, conservation plan, tourism development plan)
- g. Sources and levels of finance
- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques
- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives (copy to be annexed)
- k. Staffing levels (professional, technical, maintenance)

5 Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture)
- b. Environmental Pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change)
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)
- d. Visitor/tourism pressures
- e. Number of inhabitants within site, buffer zone
- f. Other

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises

7 Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts of other plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

8. Signature of behalf of the State Party

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Explanatory Notes

INTRODUCTION

- (i) These notes are intended to provide guidance to those nominating sites for inclusion on the World Heritage List. They relate to the headings under which information is sought, which appear in front of each section of notes. Nomination dossiers should provide information under each of these headings. They should be signed by a responsible official on behalf of the State Party.
- (ii) The nomination dossier is intended to serve two main purposes.

First it is to describe the property in a way which brings out the reasons it is believed to meet the criteria for inscription, and to enable the site to be assessed against those criteria.

Secondly it is to provide basic data about the property, which can be revised and brought up to date in order to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the site.
- (iii) In spite of the wide differences between sites, information should be given under each of the categories set out at the head of sections 1 - 7 of these notes.

General Requirements

- (iv) Information should be as precise and specific as possible. It should be quantified where that can be done and fully referenced.
- (v) Documents should be concise. In particular long historical accounts of sites and events which have taken place there should be avoided, especially when they can be found in readily available published sources.
- (vi) Expressions of opinion should be supported by reference to the authority on which they are made and the verifiable facts which support them.

- (vii) Dossiers should be completed on A4 paper (210mm x 297mm) with maps and plans a maximum of A3 paper (297mm x 420mm).

1. Identification of the Property

- a. Country (and State Party if different).
- b. State, Province or Region
- c. Name of Property
- d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
- e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area proposed for inscription and of any buffer zone
- f. Area of site proposed for inscription (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.) if any.

- 1.1 The purpose of this section is to provide the basic data to enable sites to be precisely identified. In the past, sites have been inscribed on the list with inadequate maps, and this has meant that in some cases it is impossible to be certain what is within the World Heritage site and what is outside it. This can cause considerable problems.

- 1.2 Apart from the basic facts at 1a - 1d of the dossier, the most important element in this section of the nomination therefore consists of the maps and plans relating to the nominated site. In all cases, at least two documents are likely to be needed and both must be prepared to professional cartographic standards. One should show the site in its natural or built environment and should be between 1:20,000 and 1:100,000. Depending on the size of the site, another suitable scale may be chosen. The other should clearly show the boundary of the nominated area and of any existing or proposed buffer zone. It should also show the position of any natural features, individual monuments or buildings mentioned in the nomination. Either on this map, or an accompanying one, there should also be a record of the boundaries of zones or special legal protection from which the site benefits.

- 1.3 In considering whether to propose a buffer zone it should be borne in mind that, in order to fulfil the obligations of the World Heritage Convention, sites must be protected from all threats or inconsistent uses. These developments can often take place beyond the boundaries of a site. Intrusive development can harm its setting, or the views from it or of it. Industrial processes can threaten a site by polluting the air or water. The construction of new roads, tourist resorts or airports can bring to a site more visitors than it can absorb in safety.

In some cases national planning policies or existing protective legislation may provide the powers needed to protect the setting of a site as well as the site itself. In other cases it will be highly desirable to propose a formal buffer zone where special controls will be applied. This should include the immediate setting of the site and important views of it and from it. Where it is considered that existing zones of protection make it unnecessary to inscribe a buffer zone, those zones also should be shown clearly on the map of the site.

2 Justification for Inscription

- a. Statement of significance
- b. Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar sites)
- c. Authenticity/Integrity
- d. Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)

2.1 This is the most crucial aspect of the whole nomination dossier. It must make clear to the committee why the site can be accepted as being "of outstanding universal value". The whole of this section of the dossier should be written with careful reference to the criteria for inscription found at paragraphs 24 and 44 of the Operational Guidelines. It should not include detailed descriptive material about the site or its management, which come later, but should concentrate on what the site represents.

2.2 The statement of significance (a) should make clear what are the values embodied by the site. It may be a unique survival of a particular building form or habitat or designed town. It may be a particularly fine or early or rich survival and it may bear witness to a vanished culture, way of life or eco-system. It may comprise assemblages of threatened endemic species, exceptional eco-systems, outstanding landscapes or other natural phenomena.

2.3 The comparative analysis (b) should relate the site to comparable sites, saying why it is more worthy than they are for inscription on the World Heritage list (or, if they are inscribed, what features distinguish it from those sites). This may be because the site is intrinsically better, or possessed of more features, species or habitats.

It may also be because the site is a larger or better preserved or more complete survival or one that has been less prejudiced by later developments. This is the reason for the requirement for an account of the state of conservation of similar sites.

- 2.4 The section relating to authenticity/integrity (c) should flow from the account of the present state of conservation. In the case of a cultural site it should record whether repairs have been carried out using traditional materials and methods and whether the principles of the Venice Charter and other international standards have been observed. In the case of natural sites it should record any intrusions from exotic species of fauna or flora and any human activities which may have compromised the integrity of the site. This section should demonstrate that the site fulfills the criteria of authenticity/integrity set out in paragraphs 24 (b) (i) or 44 (b) (i) - (iv) of the Operational Guidelines, which describe the criteria in greater detail.
- 2.5 Section 2 (d) is therefore the culmination of the section, relating the specific site to one or more individual criteria and saying unambiguously why it meets the specific criterion or criteria.

3. Description

- a. Description of Property
- b. History and Development
- c. Form and date of most recent records of site
- d. Present state of conservation

- 3.1 This section should begin with a description (a) of the property at the date of nomination. It should refer to all the significant features of the property. In the case of a cultural site this will include an account of any building or buildings and their architectural style, date of construction and materials. It should also describe any garden, park or other setting. In the case of an historic town or district it is not necessary to describe each individual building, but important public buildings should be described individually and an account should be given of the planning or layout of the area, its street pattern and so on. In the case of natural sites the account should deal with important physical attributes, habitats, species and other significant ecological features and processes. Species lists should be provided where practicable, and the presence of threatened or endemic taxa should be highlighted.

The extent and methods of exploitation of natural resources should be described. In the case of cultural landscapes it will be necessary to produce a description under all the matters mentioned above.

- 3.2 Under item (b) of this section what is sought is an account of how the property has reached its present form and condition and the significant changes that it has undergone. This should include some account of construction phases in the case of monuments, buildings or groups of buildings. Where there have been major changes, demolitions or rebuilding since completion they should also be described. In the case of natural sites and landscapes the account should cover significant events in history or pre-history which have affected the evolution of the site and give an account of its interaction with humankind. This will include such matters as the development and change in use for hunting, fishing or agriculture, or changes brought about by climatic change, inundation, earthquake or other natural causes. In the case of cultural landscapes all aspects of the history of human activity in the area will need to be covered.
- 3.3 Because of the wide variation in the size and type of properties covered by properties nominated as World Heritage Sites it is not possible to suggest the number of words in which the description and history of properties should be given. The aim, however, should always be to produce the briefest account which can provide the important facts about the property. These are the facts needed to support and give substance to the claim that the property properly comes within the criteria of paragraphs 24 and 44 of the Operational Guidelines. The balance between description and history will change according to the applicable criteria. For example, where a cultural site is nominated under criterion 24 a (i), as a unique artistic achievement, it should not be necessary to say very much about its history and development.
- 3.4 Under section 3 (c) what is required is a straightforward statement giving the form and date of the most recent records or inventory of the site. Only records which are still available should be described.
- 3.5 The account of the present state of conservation of the property [3 (d)] should be related as closely as possible to the records described in the previous paragraph. As well as providing a general impression of the state of conservation dossiers should give statistical or empirical information wherever possible.

For example, in a historic town or area the percentage of buildings needing major or minor repair works, or in a single major building or monument the scale and duration of any recent or forthcoming major repair projects. In the case of natural sites data on species trends or the integrity of eco-systems should be provided. This is important because the nomination dossier will be used in future years for purposes of comparison to trace changes in the condition of the property.

4

Management

- a. Ownership
- b. Legal status
- c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
- d. Agency/agencies with management authority
- e. Level at which management is exercised (e.g., on site, regionally) and name and address of responsible person for contact purposes
- f. Agreed plans related to property (e.g., regional, local plan, conservation plan, tourism development plan)
- g. Sources and levels of finance
- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques
- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives (copy to be annexed)
- k. Staffing levels (professional, technical, maintenance)

4.1

This section of the dossier is intended to provide a clear picture of the protective and management arrangements which are in place to protect and conserve the property as required by the World Heritage Convention. It should deal both with the policy aspects of legal status and protective measures and with the practicalities of day-to-day administration.

4.2

Sections 4 (a) - (c) of the dossier should give the legal position relating to the property. As well as providing the names and addresses of legal owners [4 (a)] and the status of the property [4 (b)], it should describe briefly any legal measures of protection applying to the site or any traditional ways in which custom safeguards it. Legal instruments should be given their title and date. In addition, the dossier should say how in practice these measures are applied and how responsibility for dealing with potential or actual breaches of protection is exercised. For example, it should say whether the police, army or local authorities have the responsibility for enforcement and whether in practice they have the necessary resources to do so.

It is not necessary to set out all the elements of legal protection, but their main provisions should be summarized briefly. In the case of large natural sites or historic towns there may be a multiplicity of legal owners. In these cases it is necessary only to list the major land- or property-owning institutions and any representative body for other owners.

4.3 Sections 4 (d) and (e) are intended to identify both the authority or authorities with legal responsibility for managing the property and the individual who is actually responsible for day-to-day control of the site and for the budget relating to its upkeep.

4.4 The agreed plans which should be listed at 4 (f) are all those plans which have been adopted by governmental or other agencies and which will have a direct influence on the way in which the site is developed, conserved, used or visited. Either relevant provisions should be summarized in the dossier or extracts or complete plans should be annexed to it.

4.5 Sections 4 (g) and (h) should show the funds, skills and training which are available to the site. Information about finance and expertise and training should be related to the earlier information about the state of conservation of the site. In all three cases an estimate should also be given of the adequacy or otherwise of what is available, in particular identifying any gaps or deficiencies or any areas where help may be required.

4.6 As well as providing any available statistics or estimates of visitor numbers or patterns over several years, section 4 (i) should describe the facilities available for visitors, for example:

- (i) car parking;
- (ii) lavatories;
- (iii) interpretation/explanation, whether by trails, guides, notices or publications;
- (iv) shops;
- (v) restaurant or refreshment facilities;
- (vi) site museum, visitor or interpretation centre;
- (vii) overnight accommodation;
- (viii) search and rescue.

- 4.7 Section 4 (j) in the dossier should provide only the briefest details of the management plan relating to the site, which should be annexed in its entirety. If the plan provides details of staffing levels it is not necessary to complete section 4 (k) of the dossier and other sections may also be omitted where the plan provides adequate information (e.g. on finance and training).

5 Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture)
- b. Environmental Pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change)
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)
- d. Visitor/tourism pressures
- e. Number of inhabitants within site, buffer zone
- f. Other

- 5.1 This section of the dossier should provide information on all the factors which are likely to affect or threaten a site. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them, whether by application of the protection described at Section 4 (c) or otherwise.

- 5.2 Section 5 (a) deals with development pressures. Information should be given about pressure for demolitions or rebuilding; the adaptation of existing buildings for new uses which would harm their authenticity or integrity; habitat modification or destruction following encroaching agriculture, forestry or grazing, or through poorly managed tourism or other uses; inappropriate or unsustainable natural resource exploitation; the introduction of exotic species likely to disrupt natural ecological processes, creating new centres of population on or near sites so as to harm them or their settings.

- 5.3 Environmental pressures [5 (b)] can affect all types of site. Air pollution can have a serious effect on stone buildings and monuments as well as on fauna and flora. Desertification can lead to erosion by sand and wind. What is needed in this section of the dossier is an indication of those pressures which are presenting a current threat to the site, or may do so in the future, rather than an historical account of such pressures in the past.

5.4 Section 5 (c) should indicate those disasters which present a foreseeable threat to the site and what steps have been taken to draw up contingency plans for dealing with them, whether by physical protection measures or staff training. (In considering physical measures for the protection of monuments and buildings it is important to respect the integrity of the construction.)

5.5 In completing section 5 (d) what is required is an indication of whether the property can absorb the current or likely number of visitors without adverse effects, i.e. its carrying capacity.

An indication should also be given of the steps taken to manage visitors and tourists. Amongst possible forms of visitor pressure to be considered are:

- (i) Damage by wear on stone, timber, grass or other ground surfaces;
- (ii) Damage by increases in heat or humidity levels;
- (iii) Damage by disturbance to the habitat of living or growing things;
- (iv) Damage by the disruption of traditional cultures or ways of life;
- (v) Damage to visitor experience as a result of over-crowding.

5.6 Section 5 should conclude with the best available statistics or estimate of the number of inhabitants within the nominated site and any buffer zone, any activities they undertake which affect the site and an account of any other factors of any kind not included earlier in the section which have the potential to affect its development or threaten it in any way (e.g. terrorist activity or the potential for armed conflict).

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises

6.1 This section of the dossier is intended to provide the evidence for the state of conservation of the property which can be reviewed and reported on regularly so as to give an indication of trends over time.

6.2 Section 6 (a) should set out those key indicators which have been chosen as the measure of the state of conservation of the whole site. They should be representative of an important aspect of the site and relate as closely as possible to the statement of significance. Where possible they should be expressed numerically and where this is not possible they should be of a kind which can be repeated, for example by taking a photograph from the same point. Examples of good indicators are:

- (i) the number of species, or population of a keystone species on a natural site;
- (ii) the percentage of buildings requiring major repair in a historic town or district;
- (iii) the number of years estimated to elapse before a major conservation programme is likely to be completed;
- (iv) the stability or degree of movement in a particular building or element of a building;
- (v) the rate at which encroachment of any kind on a site has increased or diminished.

6.3 Section 6 (b) should make clear that there is a regular system of formal inspections of the property, leading to the recording, at least annually, of the conditions of the site. This should result, every five years, in a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Committee.

6.4 Section 6 (c) should summarize briefly earlier reports on the state of conservation of the site and provide extracts and references to published sources.

7 Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts of other plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

7.1 This section of the dossier is simply a check-list of the documentation which should be provided to make up a complete nomination.

- 7 (a) There should be enough photographs, slides and, where possible, film/video to provide a good general picture of the site, including one or more aerial photographs. Where possible, slides should be in 35mm format.
- 7 (b) Copies of and extracts from plans should be provided.
Management plan.
Legal protection, if necessary summarized.
Maps and plans.
- 7 (c) The Bibliography should include references to all the main published sources and should be compiled to international standards.
- 7 (d) One or more addresses for inventory and site records should be provided.

8. Signature of behalf of the State Party

The dossier should conclude with the signature of the official empowered to sign it on behalf of the State Party.

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION
PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORT
table of contents

0. Executive Summary
1. Identification of the Property
 - a. Country (and State Party if different).
 - b. State, Province or Region
 - c. Name of Property
 - d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
 - e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area inscribed and of any buffer zone
 - f. Area of site inscribed (ha.) and buffer zone (ha.)
- 2 Justification for Inscription
 - a. Statement of significance
 - b. Comparative analysis
 - c. Authenticity/Integrity
 - d. Criteria under which site was inscribed
3. Description
 - a. Description of Property
 - b. History and Development
 - c. Form and date of most recent records of site
 - d. Present state of conservation
- 4 Management
 - a. Ownership
 - b. Legal status
 - c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
 - d. Agency/agencies with management authority
 - e. Level at which management is exercised
 - f. Agreed plans relating to property
 - g. Sources and levels of finance

- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques
- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives
- k. Staffing levels

5 Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture)
- b. Environmental Pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change)
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)
- d. Visitor/tourism pressures
- e. Number of inhabitants within site, buffer zone
- f. Other

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises

7 Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts of other plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

8. Conclusions and recommended actions

9. Signature on behalf of the State Party

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORT

explanatory notes

INTRODUCTION

- (i) One of the essential functions of the World Heritage Committee is to monitor the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

At its eighteenth session, held in Phuket, Thailand from 12 to 17 December 1994, the World Heritage Committee adopted the principles of monitoring, making a distinction between 'systematic monitoring and reporting' and 'reactive monitoring'. These principles are reflected in chapter II of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention which reads as follows:

A. Systematic monitoring and reporting

70. Systematic monitoring and reporting is the continuous process of observing the conditions of World Heritage sites with periodic reporting on its state of conservation.

The objectives of systematic monitoring and reporting are:

***World Heritage site:** Improved site management, advanced planning, reduction of emergency and ad-hoc interventions, and reduction of costs through preventive conservation.*

***State Party:** Improved World Heritage policies, advanced planning, improved site management and preventive conservation.*

***Region:** Regional cooperation, regional World Heritage policies and activities better targeted to the specific needs of the region.*

***Committee/Secretariat:** Better understanding of the conditions of the sites and of the needs on the site, national and regional levels. Improved policy and decision making.*

71. It is the prime responsibility of the States Parties to put in place on-site monitoring arrangements as an integral component of day-to-day

conservation and management of the sites. States Parties should do so in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority. It is necessary that every year the conditions of the site be recorded by the site manager or the agency with management authority.

72. The States Parties are invited to submit to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre, every five years, a scientific report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites on their territories. To this end, the States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat or the advisory bodies. The Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties.

73. To facilitate the work of the Committee and its Secretariat and to achieve greater regionalization and decentralization of World Heritage work, these reports will be examined separately by region as determined by the Committee. The World Heritage Centre will synthesize the national reports by regions. In doing so, full use will be made of the available expertise of the advisory bodies and other organizations.

74. The Committee will decide for which regions state of conservation reports should be presented to its forthcoming sessions. The States Parties concerned will be informed at least one year in advance so as to give them sufficient time to prepare the state of conservation reports.

75. The Secretariat will take the necessary measures for adequate World Heritage information collection and management, making full use, to the extent possible, of the information/documentation services of the advisory bodies and others.

B. Reactive monitoring

76. **Reactive monitoring** is the reporting by the World Heritage 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. To this end, the States Parties shall submit to the Committee through the World Heritage Centre, specific reports and impact studies each time exceptional circumstances occur or work is undertaken which may have an effect on the state of conservation of the site. Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the eventual deletion of properties from the World Heritage List as set out in paras. 50-58. It is also foreseen in reference to properties inscribed, or to be inscribed, on the List of World Heritage in Danger as set out in paras. 83-90.

The States Parties to the World Heritage Convention are, therefore, invited to put on-site monitoring structures in place and to report, every five years, on the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties on their territories.

- (ii) The purpose of these periodic state of conservation reports is two-fold:

to assist site managers and States Parties to maintain systematic records of the state of conservation of each site, identify problems and solutions;

to enable the World Heritage Centre to maintain a database of information relating to the state of conservation of sites, identifying trends and common issues and brief the Committee accordingly.

- (iii) The primary document in respect of each site is the nomination dossier. The format for the periodic state of conservation reports follows, therefore, the format for the nomination dossier. Consequently, where a periodic state of conservation report is being prepared for the first time a complete dossier should be prepared in accordance with the new nomination format that was adopted by the Committee at its nineteenth session in 1995. These notes are intended to be read in conjunction with the notes prepared for the nomination dossier, which should be consulted by those preparing periodic state of conservation reports.

- (iv) The preparation of periodic state of conservation reports should involve those who are responsible for the day-to-day management of the site. It could also include external expert advice if and when the State Party concerned so wishes.

- (v) The format for periodic state of conservation reports repeats the headings under which information is required for a nomination dossier, indicating the extent to which each should be considered in respect of state of conservation reports. The nomination dossier and/or any previous state of conservation report is the basic reference material for the preparation of a state of conservation report. The executive summary and the conclusions and recommended actions are specific requirements for the state of conservation reports.

General Requirements

- (vi) Information should be as precise and specific as possible. It should be quantified where that can be done and fully referenced.
- (vii) Documents should be concise. In particular long historical accounts of sites and events which have taken place there should be avoided, especially when they can be found in readily available published sources.
- (viii) Expressions of opinion should be supported by reference to the authority on which they are made and the verifiable facts which support them.
- (ix) Dossiers should be completed on A4 paper (210mm x 297mm) with maps and plans a maximum of A3 paper (297mm x 420mm).

0. Executive Summary

A summary with a maximum length of one page should precede the state of conservation report.

1. Identification of the Property

- a. Country (and State Party if different).
- b. State, Province or Region
- c. Name of Property
- d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
- e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area inscribed and of any buffer zone
- f. Area of site inscribed (ha.) and buffer zone (ha.)

1.1 The information under 1(a)-1(d) should be verified and repeated in all state of conservation reports because it provides the basic information from which sites can be identified.

1.2 Particular attention should be paid to the existence and accuracy of maps and plans showing the boundary of the site and any buffer zone (1(e)). Where the monitoring process has led to a proposal that the boundary of the site and/or buffer zone should be altered, this should be stated clearly and the existing and proposed boundaries should both be marked clearly on the map.

2 Justification for Inscription

- a. Statement of significance
- b. Comparative analysis
- c. Authenticity/Integrity
- d. Criteria under which site was inscribed

- 2.1 In this section it is necessary to review under item 2(a) if the values on the basis of which the site was inscribed are retained. Under 2(b) and 2(c) it is only necessary to record significant changes since inscription or since the previous state of conservation report. Examples might include further deterioration of similar sites not on the list (under 2(b)) or a programme of repair which has improved the authenticity of the site by removing work using unauthentic techniques and materials and replacing it with traditional ones (under 2(c)).

3. Description

- a. Description of Property
- b. History and Development
- c. Form and date of most recent records of site
- d. Present state of conservation

- 3.1 In each state of conservation report information should be provided under 3(a) and 3(b) about any new significant data on the site or major events that have occurred since the nomination or previous report such as new archaeological excavations, scientific discoveries, natural disasters etc. Information under 3(c) and 3(d) should relate back to the nomination dossier or previous report. When the records described at 3(c) are the same as those previously mentioned this should be made clear. In the case of the state of conservation (3(d)) comparisons should be made with the nomination dossier or previous report. (This subject will also be illuminated by the information provided under section 6 below).

4. Management

- a. Ownership
- b. Legal status
- c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
- d. Agency/agencies with management authority
- e. Level at which management is exercised
- f. Agreed plans relating to property
- g. Sources and levels of finance
- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques

- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives
- k. Staffing levels

- 4.1 In the case of headings 4(a) - 4(e) it is only necessary to record information which has changed since nomination or the previous report.
- 4.2 State of conservation reports should review the information about management provided in nomination dossiers or previous reports and draw attention to any significant changes which have taken place. Information should always be provided under headings 4(f) - 4(k) so that trends in levels of finance and staffing and training can be established and up-to-date copies of plans relating to the site will always be provided.
- 4.3 In the case of all statistics which are available on an annual basis (e.g. income, visitor numbers, staff numbers) information should be provided for each year since nomination or the previous report, so that complete runs of figures can be maintained.

5. Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures
- b. Environmental Pressures
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness
- d. Visitor/tourism pressure
- e. Number of inhabitants within site/buffer zone
- f. Other

- 5.1 Each state of conservation report should provide up-to-date information under each of the headings 5(a) - 5(f), as indicated in the nomination document. This section of the dossier should provide information on all the factors which are likely to affect or threaten a site. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them, whether by application of the protection described at Section 4(c) or otherwise. Once again, where it is possible to do so figures should be provided over a number of years so that trends can be established as accurately as possible.
- 5.2 Section 5(a) deals with development pressures. Information should be given about pressure for demolitions or rebuilding; the adaptation of existing buildings for new uses which would harm their authenticity or integrity; habitat modification or destruction following encroaching agriculture, forestry or grazing, or through poorly managed tourism or other uses; inappropriate or unsustainable natural

resource exploitation; the introduction of exotic species likely to disrupt natural ecological processes, creating new centres of population on or near sites so as to harm them or their settings.

5.3 Environmental pressures [5(b)] can affect all types of site. Air pollution can have a serious effect on stone buildings and monuments as well as on fauna and flora. Desertification can lead to erosion by sand and wind. What is needed in this section of the dossier is an indication of those pressures which are presenting a current threat to the site, or may do so in the future, rather than an historical account of such pressures in the past.

5.4 Section 5(c) should indicate those disasters which present a foreseeable threat to the site and what steps have been taken to draw up contingency plans for dealing with them, whether by physical protection measures or staff training. (In considering physical measures for the protection of monuments and buildings it is important to respect the integrity of the construction.)

5.5 In completing section 5(d) what is required is an indication of whether the property can absorb the current or likely number of visitors without adverse effects, i.e. its carrying capacity.

An indication should also be given of the steps taken to manage visitors and tourists. Amongst possible forms of visitor pressure to be considered are:

- (i) Damage by wear on stone, timber, grass or other ground surfaces;
- (ii) Damage by increases in heat or humidity levels;
- (iii) Damage by disturbance to the habitat of living or growing things;
- (iv) Damage by the disruption of traditional cultures or ways of life;
- (v) Damage to visitor experience as a result of over-crowding.

5.6 Section 5 should conclude with the best available statistics or estimate of the number of inhabitants within the nominated site and any buffer zone, any activities they undertake which affect the site and an account of any other factors of any kind not included earlier in the section which have the potential to affect its development or threaten it in any way (e.g. terrorist activity or the potential for armed conflict).

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises and follow-up to recommendations made by the advisory bodies and/or the World heritage Committee at the time of inscription

6.1 This section is one of the keys to the report, because it should provide the scientific basis for measuring the state of conservation of the property over time. Up-to-date information should be provided in respect of each of the key indicators identified under heading 6(a) in the nomination dossier. Care should be taken to ensure that this information is as accurate and reliable as possible, for example by carrying out observations in the same way, using similar equipment and at the same time of the year and day. This should minimize such factors as the different impression given by photographs taken with different light levels or lengths of shadow.

6.2 It is also important for the reporting process to question the validity of the indicators, especially at the early stages in the monitoring and reporting cycle. The robustness and reliability of the data should be examined, as should its suitability as an indicator of the general state of conservation of the site. If there are doubts on these points the possibility of adopting alternatives should be considered.

6.3 As well as reviewing the data, reports should under heading 6(b) review the administrative management in place for regularly monitoring the state of conservation of the property, proposing amendments if that appears desirable.

6.4 Section 6(c) reviews the results of previous monitoring exercises and should, over time, provide the account of the steps taken to improve the state of conservation of the property. It should also review if any action has been taken in response to the recommendations made by the advisory bodies and/or the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription. In the first report provided according to the format, this section should include a list of all the issues identified in the monitoring and reporting process.

7. Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts from the plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

7.1 The documentation which is provided with state of conservation reports should include all plans revised or completed since inscription or the previous report and any other new material of relevance: photographic records or new references for the bibliography, for example.

8. Conclusions and recommended actions

8.1. The main conclusions under each of the sections of the report, should be summarized and tabulated together with the proposed action to be taken, the agencies responsible for taking the action and the time within which the action should be taken. A column should be left to record the outcome. Once successful action has been recorded in a report, the recommendation can be deleted from the subsequent reports.

9. Signature on behalf of the State Party

9.1. The report should conclude with the names and signatures of all those who have been responsible for compiling it.