

Limited distribution

~~H. Cassin~~  
Maye  
WHC-94/CONF.001/10  
Paris, 19 August 1994  
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD  
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Eighteenth session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 4-9 July 1994

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OPENING SESSION	1-2
III.	ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	2
IV.	REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT SINCE THE SEVENTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE	2-4
V.	UNESCO'S MEDIUM-TERM PLAN FOR THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE FOR 1996-2001 AND WORLD HERITAGE CONSERVATION: ELEMENTS OF ORIENTATION	4-7
VI.	THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	7-31
VII.	INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR TRAINING PROVIDED UNDER THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND: REVIEW, EVALUATION AND STRATEGY	31-34
VIII.	EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER	34-45
IX.	REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE	45-50
X.	MARKETING AND FUND-RAISING STRATEGY	50-51
XI.	ORGANIZATION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES IN 1995 AND ELECTION OF SEVEN MEMBERS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	51-53
XII.	GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	53-57
XIII.	PREPARATION OF THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, INCLUDING A DRAFT AGENDA	57
XIV.	OTHER BUSINESS	57-58
XV.	CLOSURE OF THE SESSION	58

## ANNEXES

- ANNEX I                      List of Participants
- ANNEX II                     UNESCO's Medium-Term Plan for 1996-2001 and  
World Heritage Conservation
- ANNEX III                    Progress report on the implementation of the  
decisions of the World Heritage Committee  
regarding the methodology of systematic  
monitoring
- ANNEX IV                    Expert Meeting on the "Global Strategy" and  
thematic studies for a representative World  
Heritage List
- ANNEX V                     Proposal by Thailand regarding General  
Assembly election procedures

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

**I.1** The eighteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 4 to 9 July 1994. The following members of the Bureau attended: Ms Olga Pizano (Colombia), Chairperson, representatives of China, Oman, Senegal, Thailand and the United States of America as Vice-Presidents and Mr D. José Guirao Cabrera (Spain) as Rapporteur.

**I.2** Representatives of the following States Parties to the Convention attended the meeting as observers: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Japan, Laos People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Luxemburg, Mexico, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Slovak Republic and the Syrian Arab Republic.

**I.3** Representatives of the Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) also attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The full list of participants appears in Annex I.

## **II. OPENING SESSION**

**II.1** The Representative of the Director-General, Mr Henri Lopes, Assistant Director-General for External Relations, having welcomed the members of the Bureau, the representatives of the advisory bodies and the observers, began his statement by underlining the recent threats to World Heritage sites which have increased in the past period. He therefore congratulated the Committee for having decided, at its seventeenth session, to establish an emergency fund of one million dollars, which is an important first step in responding rapidly to emergency situations. This, however, needed to be complemented by the efforts which each of the States Parties must undertake by itself to implement the Convention on its own territory. The World Heritage properties cannot be properly protected, he emphasized, unless they are adequately staffed and financed. He therefore urged the representatives of all 138 States Parties to ensure that governments provide adequate financial resources for the effective management of properties under their jurisdiction.

**II.2** Having pointed out the rapid progress of the implementation of the Convention, reflected in the fact that to date 138 States Parties have signed the Convention and that there are presently 411 sites on the World Heritage List (89 natural, 306 cultural and 16 properties which meet both cultural and natural criteria), Mr Lopes further stressed that UNESCO will for its part ensure, particularly through the work of the World Heritage Centre, that the preservation of cultural and natural properties of outstanding universal value remain among the Organization's priority tasks by: ensuring prompt intervention in the case of natural and man-made disasters; mobilizing international support for safeguarding operations and by strengthening training of specialists; enhancing preventive

action by the Member States of the Organization and particularly by States Parties to the Convention, for the protection of cultural and natural properties, including sites of potential World Heritage values; ensuring systematic and continuous monitoring of the state of conservation of sites, and lastly, by promoting the World Heritage Convention among Member States and the general public.

**II.3** Underlining the Convention's unique character as an international instrument which links nature and culture in its text and spirit, Mr Lopes recalled that the inscription of the first cultural landscape on the List, at the seventeenth session of the Committee, made the World Heritage Convention the first important international instrument to recognize and protect cultural landscapes. Finally, before concluding and wishing the Bureau a successful meeting, the Representative of the Director-General underlined the importance of bringing the World Heritage Convention and its related concerns to the level of local communities, as the World Heritage properties will be truly protected only when the people who live on these sites or near them become fully involved in the conservation endeavours.

### **III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**III.1** The Bureau adopted the agenda as proposed in document WHC-94/CONF.001/1Rev. following the clarification given by the Secretariat, in response to the intervention of the Delegate of Oman, that two additional nominations had been added to the proposed agenda item 6 (Examination of Nominations of Properties to the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger).

### **IV. REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT SINCE THE SEVENTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

**IV.1** As Secretary of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, reported on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the last session of the Committee, held in Cartagena, Colombia, in December 1993. His presentation being just an outline of the key points, Mr von Droste reminded the Bureau that more detailed information was provided in the working documents prepared for this session.

**IV.2** He first delineated the areas in which the World Heritage Centre has succeeded in breaking new ground in the past six months. These are: (i) a further development of conceptual approaches to systematic monitoring; (ii) development, in cooperation with UNESCO's Education Sector, of projects aiming at introducing World Heritage awareness-building into school curricula; (iii) the initiation of a World Heritage marketing and fund-raising strategy; (iv) the progress achieved, through cooperation with ICOMOS, in defining the global strategy on the basis of which a more representative World Heritage List can be

achieved and (v) the progress made in establishing links with other international conventions such as the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (RAMSAR), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES), Convention on Biological Diversity (RIO), Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer ("Vienna"), Framework Convention on Climate Change, Convention on the Law of the Sea, Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict ("The Hague Convention") and the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. In this context, he thanked the Culture Sector for its cooperation in inviting the States Parties which have adhered to both the World Heritage Convention and the "The Hague" Convention to consider placing their World Heritage properties under strengthened protection.

**IV.3** In this context, Mr von Droste informed the Bureau that with four more States Parties having recently adhered to the Convention - Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Myanmar - there were now altogether 138 States Parties to the Convention.

**IV.4** Having presented the Centre's main publications of the past six months, Mr von Droste drew the Bureau's attention to the list of past and forthcoming meetings and special events among which regional World Heritage meetings hold a prominent place. He then focused on the results of the previous consultations regarding the development of a monitoring methodology, pointing out the three types of monitoring that have been suggested so far: (i) systematic monitoring (a continuous process of monitoring the conditions of the World Heritage sites with periodic reporting); (ii) ad-hoc monitoring (reporting on the state of conservation of a site in case of need) and (iii) administrative monitoring (follow-up to ensure the implementation of the Convention by States Parties as well as recommendations of the World Heritage Bureau and Committee). Finally, within this context, he specified also the roles that each of the partners are expected to play in monitoring, i.e., the site managers, the States Parties, the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Centre.

**IV.5** Speaking of the forty-one properties that have been presented for nomination to the World Heritage List in 1994, Mr von Droste drew the Bureau's attention to the continuing imbalance in the nominations coming from different regions: 51% of the newly proposed sites are situated in Europe, 22% are in Asia and the Pacific, 12% are in Latin America, 12% are in Africa and 3% are in the Arab States. It is therefore hoped that with the work on the global strategy, the upcoming regional and sub-regional meetings and the possible future development of regional and sub-regional World Heritage focal points ("Centres") this imbalance may finally be redressed.

**IV.6** Sketching briefly the accomplishments in the area of World Heritage training, Mr von Droste informed the Bureau that

an analysis of the training carried out in the period from 1988 to 1992 shows that as regards the natural World Heritage sites, altogether 61 group training courses and 37 individual fellowships were financed by the World Heritage Fund (totaling US\$ 1,274,000) and 56 fellowships and 10 courses in-situ (totaling US\$ 1,514,000) for the cultural heritage sites. This training focused mainly on wildlife management, ecology and conservation, protected areas management, conservation of stone, wood, mural paintings and architecture and the conservation and rehabilitation of historical cities. Mr von Droste seized this opportunity to thank the Centre's main partners in the World Heritage training programmes for their cooperation. These include: ICCROM, the Brazilian Institute for Cultural Heritage and the Federal University of Bahia, Brazil, and ICOMOS for the cultural part, and IUCN, the Wildlife Colleges in Africa, CATIE (Costa Rica) and Dehra Dun (India) for the natural sites.

**IV.7** The Bureau was also informed of the marketing and fund-raising study which had recently been undertaken, as requested by the Director-General of UNESCO and in pursuance of the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its sixteenth session (Santa Fe, USA, 1992). This was entrusted to two internationally known experts, Mr Charles de Haes, former Director-General of the World Worldwide Fund for Nature, and his collaborator, Mr David Mitchell. A summary of their findings was to be presented to the Bureau before the end of the session (see Chapter X).

**IV.8** The Chairperson thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for the report and congratulated the Centre on its work of the past six months.

**V. UNESCO'S MEDIUM-TERM PLAN FOR THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE FOR 1996-2001 AND WORLD HERITAGE CONSERVATION: ELEMENTS OF ORIENTATION**

**V.1** The Bureau studied document WHC-94/CONF.001/2 (see Annex II of this report) regarding which the Director of the Centre reminded that this was a preliminary reflection and an intellectual framework for the Centre's contribution to UNESCO's Medium-Term Plan to be submitted for adoption by UNESCO's General Conference in November 1995. The Bureau members were invited to propose suggestions, on the basis of which the Centre would prepare a more "operational" document for the Committee's eighteenth session in December 1994.

**V.2** The Director then briefly presented its main components:

**I.** Future action of the Centre: to move from the quantitative to the qualitative:

1) to ensure optimum representativeness of the List and thus increase its credibility, as proposed by the meeting of experts on global strategy whose recommendations are attached in Annex IV.

2) to improve the methods of reporting on the state of conservation of the sites, i.e. developing systematic decentralized and preventive reporting at the regional and sub-regional level, within the framework of a continuous dialogue with the States Parties, and in consultation with NGOs and the civil communities, as outlined in working document WHC-94/CONF.001/3aAdd.1 (see Annex III).

3) to change the scale of international assistance, to seek additional resources over and above those of the World Heritage Fund by means of a fund-raising policy; to develop the educational aspects and create awareness of the values inherent in World Heritage and the necessity for its safeguard; to establish intersectoral partnerships within UNESCO and with its decentralized structures and especially with local populations, local NGOs and experts in the field;

4) to define and implement an effective project policy: establish technological partnerships and involve the local populations;

5) to orient promotional activities towards education in World Heritage and its values, the activities at individual sites, concerted activities in forthcoming major international events as well as the celebrations for the 50th anniversaries of the United Nations and UNESCO, and further develop audiovisual and multimedia projects.

## II. Two major lines of action:

1) to broaden intellectual reflection on the content and the present scope of the concept of the heritage of humanity, the symbolic and ethical values of World Heritage, and new attitudes to nature and its relationships with humankind;

2) to define a more decentralized approach, especially by the progressive establishment of several "small world heritage centres", in the regions or sub-regions.

## III. To undertake action in three directions:

1) centrifugal, to bring us closer to the sites and humankind;

2) centripetal, to increase our information and benefit from the knowledge and intellectual collaboration of professionals of the scientific international community and the great variety of world cultures;

3) transversal and transectoral within UNESCO, to make the concept of world heritage an activating and federative force.

**V.3** The Delegate of Thailand congratulated the Centre for the quality and innovative nature of this approach. He asked if UNESCO's Regular Programme budget would be able to provide additional human and financial resources to implement this project, especially for the increased activity foreseen from the regional world heritage centres. He stressed that the sites of South-East Asia were under-represented in the present List, especially those of Hindu and Buddhist cultures. He also enquired whether the fund-raising policy would be implemented by a professional in this field on a permanent basis within the World Heritage Centre or by other means, and whether, to improve the living conditions of the people living near the sites and associate them with the safeguard, the States Parties would be involved with the management of the funds in question.

**V.4** Concerning the first point, the Director of the Centre replied that the plan must be realistic and provide the necessary means to implement it. The Director-General of UNESCO has already given substantial support to the World Heritage Centre since the Committee's seventeenth session in Cartagena.

**V.5** With regard to the two other points, the Director of the Centre cited three articles of the Convention (Arts. 17, 18 and 28) which indicate that the States Parties would encourage the creation of fund-raising agencies. This was not yet the case everywhere and should be encouraged, as it would permit the decentralised management of the funds obtained to preserve the monuments, create better living conditions for local populations, and help them become more involved in conservation; at the same time it would give a humanitarian dimension to our action, especially in city centres, where the problems of poverty were an obstacle to conservation. The problem of education and schools in these areas would be especially important. Finally, as a working hypothesis, if a marketing infrastructure closely related to the Centre was to be envisaged, it would be essential to respect the concerns and cultures of the State Party concerned and work together.

**V.6** The Representative of IUCN stressed that, in his opinion, the document seemed to refer especially to the cultural heritage in stating that the world heritage was already largely identified, but this was not at all the case with the natural heritage in many regions of the world. The Director replied that in fact it was especially the European cultural heritage which has been largely identified, and that the select group of experts on global strategy had indicated that much cultural property situated outside of Europe or belonging to certain categories, or dating from certain periods, had not yet been identified.

**V.7** The Representative of ICOMOS also congratulated the Centre for the document's intellectual quality and precision, and endorsed the dynamic approach and intellectual development towards greater anthropological and global understanding of the heritage of humanity and the relationships between nature and humankind.

He made five observations:

1) the "quantitative" aspect of the work should not be under-estimated, because many properties still remained to be identified and inscribed;

2) the rhythm of implementation should be respected, because the improvement of the procedure proposed by the document would increase the complexity of the work and call for greater reflection;

3) that which concerned the World Heritage in danger should be developed in a specific manner;

4) promotion should be the responsibility of the Centre together with the State Party concerned. But care must be taken not to neglect States Parties' "national" heritage not inscribed on the List;

5) if the heritage of the countries of the South was under-represented, it was due also to the lack of human and financial resources to identify this heritage, propose it for inscription, and then protect it. This point, and the development of international solidarity that it called for, must also be highlighted in this document.

**V.8** The Representative of Senegal also congratulated the Centre for the quality of the document and made two remarks:

- the "quantitative" should not be neglected;
- a cost study should be made of the possibilities for partnerships with States Parties which could provide facilities and personnel for "Regional World Heritage Centres". The Centre should also contact different bodies, such as the European Development Bank which could help finance projects.

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

**VI.1** The Secretariat introduced the working documents that were prepared for this Bureau session:

- working document WHC-94/CONF.001/3a on the methodology of systematic monitoring with its Addendum 3a.Add.1 which provided a progress report on the implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee regarding the methodology of systematic monitoring;

- working document WHC-94/CONF.001/3b which included state of conservation reports on specific natural and cultural properties. Four addendums to this document were presented to the Bureau as follows:

- 3b.Add.1: reports on the state of conservation of natural properties prepared by IUCN

- 3b.Add.2: reports on the state of conservation of cultural properties prepared by ICOMOS
- 3b.Add.3: reports on six cultural properties prepared by the Coordinator of the '100 historical sites' Programme for the Mediterranean (MAP/UNEP)
- 3b.Add.4: report on safeguarding the three principal mosques of Timbuktu, Mali.

#### **A. THE METHODOLOGY OF SYSTEMATIC MONITORING**

**VI.2** The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its seventeenth session in December 1993 reviewed the recommendations made by an expert meeting that was held in November 1993 in Cambridge in order to define the concept and framework of systematic monitoring. At that occasion the Committee endorsed the view that three types of monitoring can be distinguished:

- **systematic monitoring:** the continuous process of monitoring the conditions of World Heritage sites with periodic reporting on its state of conservation,

- **ad-hoc or reactive monitoring:** 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, and

- **administrative monitoring:** follow-up actions by the World Heritage Centre to ensure the implementation of recommendations and decisions of the World Heritage Committee and Bureau at the time of inscription or at a later date.

**VI.3** The Committee also endorsed the view that, in the spirit of the Convention, 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 site, but that at the same time, it is essential that external and independent professional advisers are involved in a periodic reporting system.

**VI.4** The Committee at its seventeenth session invited the Secretariat to develop concrete proposals for systematic monitoring, to report on the progress to the Bureau and to present final proposals, including a draft text on monitoring for inclusion in the Operational Guidelines, to the eighteenth session of the Committee.

**VI.5** The Secretariat introduced a detailed outline of systematic monitoring (see Annex III) which had been developed in collaboration with the advisory bodies and independent experts and which incorporates two complementary elements, both of which are thought to be indispensable for a credible and successful monitoring and reporting system.

**VI.6** The first is the **systematic and repeated observation of the conditions of a site and its periodic reporting** - with

external advice - to the World Heritage Committee. These activities are generally being understood to be the prime responsibility of the States Parties and the agency with management authority and require the commitment of the States Parties on all levels.

**VI.7** The second element is the **Committee's strategy towards systematic monitoring** which would be characterized by a regional approach and the involvement of regional agencies and other channels to provide external advice and assistance to the States Parties in setting up appropriate management and monitoring structures and in preparing the periodic state of conservation reports.

**VI.8** In order to create a practical system of monitoring, it was proposed that a new nomination form be established which would provide, at the time of nomination and inscription of a property, a sound baseline information and at the same time would serve as a model for the reporting, on the basis of a five-year cycle, to the Committee.

**VI.9** Such an integral monitoring system would involve the following actions:

- 1) Monitoring, the continuous observation of the conditions of the site, is (to be) incorporated in the day-to-day management of the site, resulting in annual reports to be prepared by the site manager or management authority.
- 2) Parallel to inviting the States Parties to put monitoring and reporting systems in place, the Committee instructs the Secretariat to initiate regional monitoring programmes.
- 3) The Secretariat establishes a workplan for worldwide and regional monitoring programmes and identifies the most appropriate partner(s) for monitoring in each of the regions, who will serve as the regional focal point for monitoring.
- 4) In the context of these regional programmes, the Centre establishes contacts with States Parties, site-managers and other possible participants and defines jointly with them the most appropriate regional monitoring strategy. If necessary, regional seminars will be held to initiate the monitoring process.
- 5) 5-year state of conservation reports will be prepared by the States Parties with the involvement of the site-manager/management authority and an external partner, preferably in the context of the regional monitoring programmes that will be set up by the Secretariat.

- 6) Upon request and in line with the decisions of the World Heritage Committee, the Centre provides assistance and external advice to the States Parties and the site-manager on management practices and collaborates in the preparation of the 5-year state of conservation reports.
- 7) The State Party will present the 5-year reports to the Secretariat.
- 8) The Secretariat will collect the 5-year reports, verify their contents and prepare with the help of its decentralized regional structure Regional State of the World Heritage Reports for presentation to the World Heritage Committee. The first of these reports will be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session: the State of the cultural World Heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean, which will be the result of the UNDP/UNESCO Latin American Monitoring Programme. Regional monitoring programmes will be launched in the coming years for Asia, Africa, Europe and the Arab States. Once the monitoring system is properly launched, the Committee would review every year the report on one specific region.
- 9) On the basis of these reports, the World Heritage Committee will, if appropriate, make specific recommendations to the State Party on actions to be taken. Decision-making regarding regional or national World Heritage policies and activities and regarding requests for technical cooperation will equally be based on those reports.

**VI.10** The Delegates of Spain and Thailand as well as the representatives of the advisory bodies expressed their appreciation of the proposals made by the Centre and stressed the need to put a monitoring system in place. The Delegate of Thailand expressed two concerns: the system should be sufficiently flexible, but at the same time allow for comparison of the results of the monitoring and reporting system in different countries and regions; and the processing of the great number of site, country and regional reports should be secured as well as making them accessible to the States Parties and other World Heritage partners.

**VI.11** The Delegate from China emphasized the important role of the States Parties and national and local experts in the monitoring process. The full involvement of these partners would be a pre-requisite for communication and a better understanding of local and national knowledge, practices and techniques and establish a real dialogue between all World Heritage partners.

**VI.12** The Representative of ICOMOS confirmed that his Organization is prepared to further collaborate with the Secretariat in coordinating monitoring programmes and initiatives and called for further discussion of the proposals with the States Parties, site managers and other partners. He made specific mention of ICOMOS' involvement in national and regional monitoring programmes in the United Kingdom, Sri Lanka and Asia and stressed that these should be seen as a contribution to the development of the global monitoring strategy and that some of the elements of the proposed systematic monitoring methodology would be tested in the field.

**VI.13** He also called for the need for a more global assessment of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the States Parties, e.g. national heritage legislations, institutional structures, training facilities.

**VI.14** The Representative of IUCN, while agreeing with the 5-year reporting system and the revision of the nomination form, emphasized the continued need for reactive monitoring and referred particularly to the Operational Guidelines where a particular role for IUCN is indicated. He also expressed his disappointment that the twenty-year in-depth review, the so-called 'sunset clause', which had been recommended on various occasions, was not included in the proposals. The general feeling of the delegates and the Secretariat was that this is a delicate legal matter which should be looked at in the context of the Convention, but that, in fact the proposed monitoring and reporting system implies every five years an in-depth assessment of the World Heritage values of the inscribed sites.

**VI.15** A discussion developed on the most appropriate terminology for monitoring and reporting. The Secretariat will look again into this matter in the context of the further development of the proposals.

**VI.16** The Director of the Centre confirmed the important role of the advisory bodies in monitoring and reporting and in the overall implementation of the Convention and thanked them for their commitment and involvement in all aspects of World Heritage work. He invited them to further collaborate in the refinement of the proposals for monitoring and to coordinate monitoring activities in the different regions of the world. The Director also recognized that difficulties might arise in setting up the regional monitoring programmes and in handling and processing the continuous flow of information. He was confident, however, that the regional approach would be an adequate response and proposed, now that the pilot programme in Latin America is coming to an end, to develop, for presentation to the eighteenth session of the Committee, a regional monitoring plan for Asia, making full use of the already existing and well-staffed UNESCO structure and the specific capacities of the advisory bodies in that region.

**VI.17** The Bureau requested the Centre, in collaboration with other World Heritage partners, to consider the observations made by the Bureau, to revise the proposals accordingly, to enter into

consultation with States Parties and site-managers at the occasion of regional and national World Heritage activities and seminars, and to prepare final proposals, including a text for inclusion in the Operational Guidelines for presentation to the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee.

## **B. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC PROPERTIES**

**VI.18** The Bureau noted that the recommendations and observations made by the Committee at its seventeenth session, in Cartagena, Colombia, in December 1993, had been transmitted, when appropriate, to the States Parties concerned and expressed its satisfaction that, in many cases, a positive response was received from the States Parties.

**VI.19** The Bureau noted also with satisfaction that an increased number of States Parties had taken the initiative to present state of conservation reports on the World Heritage properties on their territories. Reference was made particularly to reports that had been presented or announced by Bulgaria, Mexico, Norway and the Nordic Countries, Portugal and the United Kingdom. The Bureau took note of these reports and commended the States Parties' commitment to the preservation of the sites and the reporting thereon to the Bureau and the Committee.

**VI.20** As to (sub)regional monitoring programmes, the Bureau noted that the Latin American pilot monitoring programme will be concluded by the end of this year and that a Regional State of the Cultural World Heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean will be presented to the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The Bureau also took note of the UNEP Action Plan for the Mediterranean which provides technical advice to a hundred historical sites in the Mediterranean basin. The Coordinator of this Action Plan provided the Bureau with detailed information on six of these sites.

**VI.21** The Bureau examined the working documents for this agenda item, as well as additional information received from the Secretariat, the advisory bodies and representatives of States Parties to the Convention. The Bureau reviewed the state of conservation of a great number of natural and cultural properties on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **Natural Properties**

#### **Natural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

##### **Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)**

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed in 1983 and placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992. Furthermore, it noted that considerable discussion had taken place both at the Committee and its Bureau sessions regarding the possible delisting of the site, and that IUCN reports on the

status of the site indicating the degradation of its natural values have been reviewed continuously since December 1991. Furthermore, a report by wetland experts from the United States National Park Service indicate that major effort is required to restore the site. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Bulgarian Ministry for the Environment presented a report on restoration efforts by the Bulgarian authorities from 1992 to 1994, including an extension from 600 to 902 ha, the elaboration of an hydraulic system for Srebarna Lake and to review the re-establishment of the links between the Lake and the Danube.

The Bureau took note of the report and commended the authorities for their efforts. It decided, however, that the site should be continuously monitored and that a detailed report on the site should be given to the nineteenth session of the Bureau in 1995.

It was recommended that on behalf of the Bureau, the World Heritage Centre should write to the appropriate authorities stressing the need for maintaining a research/monitoring station at Srebarna.

#### **Sangay National Park (Ecuador)**

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed in 1983 and added to the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 due to threats from poaching and a road construction. A field mission was carried out in 1993 and a report was submitted to the seventeenth session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1993. A short up-date report has been provided by the IUCN Office in Ecuador, indicating major restructuring of the park administration and a reduction of personnel. Furthermore, the Macas-Guamote road construction is progressing with no attention being paid to the conditions of the inter-institutional agreement. The Bureau decided to request the Centre to prepare two letters, one to be signed by the Director-General of UNESCO and the other by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, addressed to the Government of Ecuador, expressing the Bureau's above concerns.

#### **Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The Bureau took note that the Government of India finally responded to the concerns of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau by letter dated 24 January 1994. However, the Bureau showed continued concern with regard to the management of the site, the increase in poaching and the continuous decline of this World Heritage site in Danger. It therefore, endorsed international assistance, if officially requested by the Indian Government, and requested the Centre and IUCN to work closely together with two non-governmental organizations, WWF-India and the Swaminathan Foundation, to obtain a detailed monitoring report on the state of conservation of the threatened site.

**Natural Properties on the World Heritage List****Shark Bay (Australia)**

The Bureau was informed of a recent IUCN mission to the site giving an account on (a) the implementation of the Commonwealth and State Management Agreement which has been signed, but no further action has been taken so far and (b) on the efforts to achieve more effective conservation of the site, for which improvements have been made.

The Bureau requested the Centre to write to the Australian authorities informing them of its concerns and requesting that an up-date on progress in implementing the Agreement be presented to the next session of the Committee.

**Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)**

The Bureau took note that several reports have been sent to the Centre and Bureau members by the Wilderness Society concerning Tasmania World Heritage site and the impact of logging operations in areas adjacent to the current World Heritage area. By letter of 22 March 1994, the Centre informed the Permanent Delegate of Australia and requested a response from the Australian authorities regarding this matter. The Observer from Australia indicated that discussions between the Government and the State of Tasmania are taking place at the moment. The Bureau requested the Centre to follow-up and report back at its next session.

**Willandra Lakes Region (Australia)**

The Bureau was informed by IUCN of the first World Heritage mission to this mixed site. The report indicated problems at the site with landowner residents, aboriginal concerns as well as the fact that no management plan has yet been prepared. However, the Commonwealth is taking up these issues and furthermore, a socio-economic impact study is underway. IUCN suggested that all authorities consider renominating the area under cultural criteria and with a reduced boundary. The Observer of Australia informed the Bureau that through the agreed management arrangements for the site, a review of the boundaries is being conducted by a Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee. The results of this review will be conveyed to the World Heritage Centre.

The Bureau took note of IUCN's suggestions that the Willandra Lakes site be considered for a revised nomination based on cultural criteria and that redefinition of the boundaries of the site be considered. The World Heritage Centre was requested to consult the Australian Government, ICOMOS, the International Union of Geological Sciences and IUCN and to report back on the findings to the Committee.

**Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)**

The Bureau was informed that a fire broke out at Isabela Island on 12 April 1994 and was discovered by a patrol boat of the Galapagos National Park authorities. The fire combat was very difficult, involving park personnel and both the army and the navy. After one month the fire was under control, but 4,500 ha were burnt. The giant tortoises are not at risk, but the extinction danger remains. The authorities have received emergency aid from the World Heritage Fund (US\$ 50,000), UNESCO (US\$ 20,000) and several governments, NGOs and individual donors. The Bureau took note of the report and recalled that the extension of the marine reserve of the Galapagos Islands will be discussed under the nomination section of this report.

**Mount Athos (Greece)**

The Bureau recalled that at its sixteenth session it noted concern over increasing forestry activities at the site, however, no mission was carried out. A recent report by WWF and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (EPC) on the ecological state of the site indicates serious threats, including overgrazing, chemical pollution as well as a proposed hydrodam construction. IUCN stressed the need for impact studies, a forest management plan and a system of reserves. The Bureau took note of the report and requested the Centre to write to the appropriate authorities transmitting its concerns with regard to the content of the afore-mentioned report. A report should be requested from Greece for presentation to the eighteenth session of the Committee.

**Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania)**

The Bureau took note of the Centre's report on the Paris-Dakar rally crossing the site, which had very little impact on the ecological situation of the Park. IUCN reported on the plan to capture six monk seals from the seal population of the park (100-130) and move them to Antibes (Southern France) for captive breeding. After some discussion on captive breeding experiences, the Bureau requested that the propensity of the planned capture operation be reported to the World Heritage Committee.

**Te Wahipounamu (New Zealand)**

The Bureau took note of the report by IUCN on the following issues: (a) legal matters, in particular land claims and sacred sites of the Maori people; (b) continued cattle grazing which has an impact on the natural World Heritage values and should be phased out, and (c) that the 1986 IUCN recommendation to include the site of the coastal forest (Waitutu forest) in the World Heritage area, was not taken up. Plans have been made by the Maori owners to sell the land for logging operations.

The Bureau requested the Centre to send a letter to the New Zealand authorities transmitting the above concerns.

#### **Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania)**

The Bureau was again informed about the continuing illegal and random cultivation at the site, and noted that no official response had been received from the Tanzanian authorities, although the Cultural Commissioner of Tanzania indicated that a response would be sent to the Centre. The Bureau again expressed its concern and asked the Centre to send a letter to the authorities concerning the ongoing cultivation at site, and requesting them to cooperate with the IUCN mission scheduled for October 1994.

#### **Thungyai Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries (Thailand)**

The Bureau was informed that a fire broke out at the site on 22 February 1994 in the buffer zone area and rapidly swept through the site. A report by the Forest Fire Control and Rescue Division of the Royal Forest Department in Bangkok indicated that fire fighting was difficult, particularly in the mountain area of the Sanctuary. It furthermore stated that the fire was completely extinguished by 15 March 1994 and damage assessment revealed that 10,924 ha were burnt. The report noted that fire is a normal and frequent occurrence at the site but generally it is not damaging. The Bureau took note of the report and commended the Thai authorities for submitting a detailed report which was distributed at the Bureau session.

#### **Yellowstone (United States of America)**

The Delegate of the United States informed the Bureau about a report concerning Yellowstone National Park, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978. The Park is faced with a proposed mining project of a gold mine two miles north of the northeast boundary of the site. The area concerned is both public and private with 20% under the administration of the US Forest Service. The mine would remove 56 acres of wetlands to build an artificial lake and would call for construction of access roads and housing for the workers. The economic value of the project is estimated at US\$ 1 billion in recoverable gold, silver and copper. The mine sits at the head of three drainages, one of which, Soda Butte Creek, flows into the National Park. Thus, potential threats would be the degradation of surface and ground water, the changes in water quantity, as well as the displacement of wildlife and other disturbances. The Delegate underlined that the United States will keep the Committee and its Bureau informed about further developments. The Observer from Canada stressed that the Canadian Government will check about direct or indirect Government-support for the parent company of the proposed mine.

**Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas  
(Zimbabwe)**

The Bureau was informed that the property was one of the most important black rhino refuges at the date of inscription with a population of 500. The ten remaining rhinos are being captured and translocated for intensive protection. The site has never received assistance from the World Heritage Fund to control poaching.

The Bureau raised concern about this loss of one of the World Heritage values of the site, and asked the Centre to work closely together with CITES and IUCN to determine the lessons learned from this unfortunate experience. This specific case could be used to coordinate efforts by the World Heritage Convention and the CITES Convention Secretariats.

**Cultural Properties**

**Cultural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

**Angkor (Cambodia)**

Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki, Director of the Division of Physical Heritage, recalled the recommendations made by the Committee at the time of the inscription of the Angkor site on the World Heritage List in December 1992, and informed the Bureau of the latest action taken by the Director-General of UNESCO for the safeguard of Angkor. The Director-General decided to give additional support to the UNESCO Office in Cambodia, by assigning Mr. Khamliène Nhouyvanisvong, former Acting Assistant Director-General for External Relations, to the post of Director of this Office, and also naming him Personal Representative of the Director-General. Mr. Richard Engelhardt was called upon to undertake new functions at UNESCO's Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok, as Regional Advisor for Culture. Mr. Bouchenaki also informed the Bureau of the nomination of Mr. Azedine Beschouch to the post of Special Advisor to the Assistant Director-General for Culture. However, Mr. Beschouch will continue to monitor the technical work for the safeguard of Angkor in his capacity of Special Representative of the Director-General.

Mrs. Minja Yang, who is responsible for the intersectoral programmes for Cambodia and Chief of the Angkor Unit, was invited to present the latest developments of the Zoning and Environmental Management Plan (ZEMP). Mrs. Yang defined the categories for the protection of the cultural sites which serve as a basis for establishing the different zones at Angkor: i) monumental sites; ii) protected archaeological reserves; iii) protected cultural landscapes; iv) archaeological, anthropological and historical points of interest. She stressed the importance of taking into consideration the sociological, touristic and economic aspects, with a view to integrated sustainable development in the region of Angkor.

As complementary information on the zoning of the Angkor site, Mr. Beschaouch presented the conclusions of his recent mission to Cambodia. He stressed the fact that the International Coordinating Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of Angkor, which had been created during the Intergovernmental Conference of Tokyo, and is co-chaired by France and Japan with UNESCO ensuring the secretariat, had strictly observed the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. In this regard, on the basis of proposals made by the "ZEMP", the Royal Government of Cambodia, by a decree dated 4 June 1944 relating especially to the zoning and management of the Angkor site, defined a zone of safeguard, the total area of which (including Angkor, Banteay Srei and Roluos) covers an area of 401 square kilometers. Mr. Beschaouch added that, during the next parliamentary session of the Kingdom of Cambodia, two legislative texts relating to the protection of cultural property and the administration of the Angkor site should be submitted for examination to the National Assembly. He stressed the exemplary effort of the Kingdom of Cambodia to set up a legal, legislative, technical and administrative structure for the integrated safeguarding of the site of Angkor.

Following this report, the Representative of ICOMOS expressed satisfaction with the action undertaken during the last eighteen months for the safeguarding of the site of Angkor and congratulated the UNESCO Secretariat for its work. The Delegate of Thailand proposed that a letter of congratulations be sent to the Royal Government of Cambodia. The Delegate of Senegal, after congratulating Mr. Beschaouch for his nomination at UNESCO, endorsed that initiative.

The Bureau approved this proposal.

As complementary information, Mr. Beschaouch stressed the volume and quality of the work undertaken by the French and Japanese teams at Angkor. He indicated that the "WMF" had proposed, in agreement with the Royal Government of Cambodia, to develop and diversify its action. Finally, as concerns the database produced with the "Integraph" software in the framework of the "GIS" programme, he drew attention to the interest in converting this data to the "SPANS" base, thanks especially to the collaboration of "Parks Canada".

#### **Timbuktu (Mali)**

The three mosques of Djingareiber, Sankore and Sidi Yahia were placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1990. These properties are threatened by obvious, precise and imminent dangers:

- a) serious alteration of the mud construction materials
- b) serious alteration of the structures
- c) the climatic factor of desertification.

The Bureau was informed of the content of the report, produced in French, concerning the state of conservation of the three mosques, by the UNESCO consultant. In 1990, this consultant elaborated the proposal for the placing of the mosques on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and in his present report he noted that the situation was more or less the same as in 1990 and that the mosques remained threatened by the dangers which were identified at that time. The consultant also highlighted the threats to the mosques during the annual maintenance work. This work, which is coordinated by the religious authorities in consultation with the management committees and the masons attached to each mosque, is organized by means of an appeal for donations of material and voluntary labour. The voluntary system in force contributes to the rapid degradation of traditional technology. The poor quality of the mud construction materials ("banco") prepared and applied each year by inexperienced hands causes water infiltration and attack by micro-organisms, and this attempt at creating a protective coating for the building also tends to weaken its structure.

The report recommends a method of intervention involving the local population which, since the construction of the mosques, has been responsible for their upkeep, thus perpetuating a living religious culture. This method foresees the organization of a pilot work site in a restricted zone of each mosque, to be implemented in three stages:

- 1) preparation of a documented study recording all the stages of the annual maintenance work, so as to clearly determine the organization of the voluntary work sites;
- 2) identification, together with specialists, of the appropriate additives and stabilisers for the "banco" of Timbuktu;
- 3) organization of a pilot work site which should be entrusted to a Mali architect assisted by municipal technicians. The architect would also have the responsibility for defining a long-term conservation programme taking account of the local realities, whilst respecting and improving traditional techniques.

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to ask the Mali authorities to prepare a report to be submitted to the eighteenth session of the Committee, concerning follow-up action with regard to the report of the UNESCO consultant. Considering the grave situation of the city where insecurity abounds, and which is threatened by the advance of the dunes, the World Heritage Centre should define, together with the Mali authorities, appropriate cooperative action to meet this situation.

#### **Wieliczka Salt Mine (Poland)**

During its present session, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that this site, inscribed in 1978, continued to be threatened by frequent floods. However, thanks to financial assistance from

the European Union, the Polish authorities have at their disposal the necessary pumping material to maintain a satisfactory level of salubrity of the historic part of the mine.

Furthermore, Bureau members were informed that in 1991 the Polish authorities prepared a humidity-level study, and that in 1993 the data collected was examined during a seminar held in the United States, which was attended by two Polish experts, thanks to assistance from the World Heritage Fund. The seminar drew up recommendations for the long-term conservation strategy of the mine.

This strategy includes a project for ventilation and dehumidification for which the purchase of equipment amounting to US\$ 156,000 is necessary. In the coming months, the Polish authorities may present a request for technical cooperation from the World Heritage Fund for partial financial support for the purchase of this equipment.

The Bureau took note of this information with satisfaction, and the World Heritage Centre will be kept informed of the different stages of this project.

#### **Cultural properties on the World Heritage List**

##### **Butrinti (Albania)**

The Coordinator of the MAP/UNEP "100 historical sites" programme presented this archaeological site inscribed in 1992, which is immersed below 1.50m of water due to subsidence. However, the maintenance work there is being carried out in a satisfactory manner by the Archaeological Institute of the Department of Antiquities, in spite of the lack of human and financial resources. The Bureau was informed of the wish of the Albanian authorities to create a natural and cultural archaeological park. To accomplish this, the Hydrology Institute of Tirana has prepared a study in order to identify the causes of subsidence. Consequently, the Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to write to the Albanian authorities requesting information on the following:

- specific legislation for the site
- results of the study prepared by the Hydrology Institute
- progress made in the programme for the protection and management of the site;
- the advisability of setting up a committee of international experts to work together with the archaeological missions working at the site.

The World Heritage Centre will transmit this information, if received, to the Committee.

**Great Wall; Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties; Mausoleum of the First Qin Emperor; Mogao Caves; Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian (China)**

The Bureau was informed about the results of a World Heritage Centre monitoring mission to the existing five cultural World Heritage Sites in China, namely the Great Wall, the Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties, the Mausoleum of the First Qin Emperor, the Mogao Caves and the Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian. The mission had been generally impressed with the standard of maintenance of Chinese World Heritage sites and the professionalism of the staff responsible for them. Nevertheless, the mission had been able to raise specific technical issues with the State Bureau of Cultural Relics and other responsible authorities in China, in particular the need for training in techniques for the conservation of ruined stonework, the conservation of earthen structures, the conservation of marble, new jointing techniques for timber conservation, the conservation of wall paintings, computer-assisted recording of standing monuments and geophysical archaeological recording techniques. The mission had pointed out that monitoring was a two-way process and that the representatives of the state party whose sites were being monitored could often provide invaluable technical information which was relevant to World Heritage sites in other countries. With regard to the management of World Heritage sites in China, the report dealt with tourist facilities, visitor pressures and intrusive structures in the World Heritage sites, a number of them erected since inscription.

The Representative of China expressed his thanks for the work of the mission and explained that a number of the technical points raised by the mission had also been matters of concern for Chinese experts, about which the State Bureau of Cultural Relics was already in contact with provincial and other responsible authorities. China was attempting to ensure that conservation work conformed to accepted international standards. He said that cultural heritage was of increasing public interest in China, which made the work of the mission particularly useful. He welcomed the fact that the mission had been able to clear up a number of misunderstandings about plans for the Mogao Caves, for which there had been concern both within and without China. He looked forward to the results of the mission being made available in the form of a written report.

In response to a request made by the Representative of Thailand, the Director of the World Heritage Centre stated that he would liaise with the Chinese authorities and the members of the mission in the hope that its results could be made available in time for the next meeting of the Bureau. He looked forward to a follow up in the form of further liaison between the Centre and the Chinese authorities and reported that he had already received requests for technical assistance in connection with the training needs identified by the mission.

**Roman and Romanesque Monuments of Arles (France)**

The MAP/UNEP Coordinator of the "100 historical sites" Programme emphasized the exemplary character of the conservation measures. He reported on the considerable financial support from the Municipality, and he briefly outlined the "Safeguard Plan for the Enhancement of the Safeguarded Sector of Arles". He also mentioned the plan for preventive action to combat atmospheric pollution to conserve the Primatiale Saint-Trophime. This project, partially financed by the World Monument Fund, has elaborated a 24-hour surveillance system which can detect and forecast atmospheric changes.

The Observer of Germany expressed his satisfaction with the work accomplished, and suggested that the French and German specialists involved in the conservation of the stone could exchange their observations and experiences.

The Bureau noted with satisfaction of the considerable efforts undertaken by the State and the Municipality, and reiterated their exemplary character.

**Hanseatic City of Lubeck (Germany)**

The Bureau was informed of the outcome of an ICOMOS mission which visited Lubeck in May 1994 to discuss problems arising from the development plans for the city centre. The Bureau recommended that the authorities in Lubeck be encouraged to revise its heritage protection legislation so as to allow sufficient time for the proper investigation of the city's rich archaeological heritage and to implement measures to make the important archaeological and artistic discoveries accessible to the general public. It also recommended that the authorities should seek the assistance of an experienced international planning consultancy in the preparation of an integrated development strategy which reconciles the competing objectives of heritage conservation, tourism and economic growth.

**Delos (Greece)**

This archaeological site, inscribed in 1990 and excavated since the 19th century, continues to suffer from violent winds, high humidity and the sea. Conservation work has not been carried out systematically after each excavation campaign, and the site museum is too small. Moreover, the personnel responsible for the surveillance of the site appear to be insufficient. Furthermore, it seems that pastures close to the archaeological site have been rented to the Municipality of Myknos for grazing land.

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to ask the Greek authorities for precise information on the possibility of a concession of grazing land close to the archaeological site, and the action they would be obliged to take to ensure the conservation of Delos.

#### **Pythagoreion and Heraion of Samos (Greece)**

This site, which was inscribed in 1992, is threatened by the expansion of activities linked with tourism. The avenues and surrounding area of the archaeological site are threatened by urbanism and the construction of hotel complexes. Moreover, the archaeological site is subject to vibrations from the nearby airport which now accommodates large carriers, and for which an extension is planned.

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to request the Greek authorities to ensure that the Antiquities Law is strictly observed, so as to limit threats weighing on the site due to tourist development activities and notably the construction of hotels in the zone of Pythagoreion. In view of the danger caused by increased air traffic, the authorities should be requested to halt possible plans to extend the airport and preferably to identify a more appropriate site.

#### **Piazza del Duomo, Pisa (Italy)**

This site was inscribed in 1987. The MAP/UNEP Coordinator of the "100 historical sites" Programme informed the Bureau that the Technical and Scientific Committee created in 1988 and which was responsible for evaluating the security of the Tower of Pisa, did remarkable work. A series of enquiries, measures and studies were undertaken to obtain information on all the physico-mechanical characteristics of the substratum, and to make various hypotheses of structural evolution. The intervention approved by the Technical Committee in the spring of 1992 necessitated the development of a numerical model of finite elements of the substratum and the structure. The Committee retained the solution to reduce the inclination of the tower by 1/2 degree.

The Bureau noted with satisfaction this information.

#### **Pétra (Jordan)**

The Bureau expressed concern following the report presenting the different threats to the integrity of the site of Pétra, especially with regard to:

1) the serious impact of some ten new hotels planned or under construction, both on the visitor capacity of the site, their visibility from the site and the disproportion of several of them in relation to the village habitations, the destruction of archaeological vestiges which they cause, pollution and soil erosion;

2) the negative impact of the pumping station planned for Wadi Musa and its new hotels;

3) the risks caused to the site by projects for the development of residential zones such as those included in the master plan of Wadi Musa, as well as the absence of building specifications and building height restrictions;

4) the necessity of applying existing legislation governing businesses, especially in the proximity of the monuments of the site;

5) the necessity of ensuring proper conservation of the vestiges of the Temple of the Lion and the sculptured blocks scattered throughout the site.

The Bureau agreed to a contribution from the World Heritage Fund to organize, together with the Jordanian authorities, a select meeting of experts at the site to implement the master plan of the site of Pétra as quickly as possible, and to take the necessary measures to ensure by all possible means the preservation of the values of the site.

#### **Quseir Amra (Jordan)**

The Bureau expressed concern with the lack of general maintenance of the site, especially the lack of permanent and effective surveillance. It requested the World Heritage Centre to request the Jordanian authorities to take the necessary measures to ensure the satisfactory maintenance and management of the site.

#### **World Heritage sites in Mexico**

The Observer of Mexico informed the Bureau that the Mexican National Institute for Anthropology and History (INAH) prepared state of conservation reports on the ten cultural and natural sites that were inscribed on the World Heritage List until 1992. He emphasized that Mexico has taken this initiative as it feels that it is an integral element of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the country and that it is one of the obligations of the States Parties to the Convention to report on the state of conservation of the sites and on the actions taken by them to ensure their adequate protection and conservation. The Observer announced that the report is now available in Spanish and that a translation into English and/or French is forthcoming. The Bureau thanked the Mexican authorities for this initiative and requested the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to evaluate the report for presentation to the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee.

**Puebla (Mexico)**

The Bureau recalled that the case of Puebla was briefly discussed at the seventeenth session of the Committee. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that since then, it continued to receive letters and reports from individuals, associations and organizations on the rehabilitation plan for Puebla, particularly the so-called Rio San Francisco area.

A report was received on 28 March 1994 from the Mexican National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH) that a regional development programme called ANGELOPOLIS is in preparation for an area of the State of Puebla including 14 municipalities and 35% of the population of the State of Puebla. It also reported that in the context of this regional development plan an urban rehabilitation project is planned for the Rio San Francisco area in Puebla which would include the development of a pedestrian area and the construction of hotels, a convention centre and commercial areas. The report re-affirmed the statement made by the Delegate of Mexico at the seventeenth session of the Committee, namely that to date no concrete proposals exist for the area concerned. It confirmed, however, that the proposal in Puebla would concern 27 of the 391 building blocks within the World Heritage site. The report stressed that the National Institute would create a special commission to evaluate future projects for this area.

The Bureau was also informed that the Director-General of UNESCO decided, at the request of the Governor of Puebla, to send an expert to Puebla to advise the municipal and state authorities on the rehabilitation plans. This mission was undertaken in early June by an architect/urbanist from the University of Venice.

The draft mission report, which was received only a few days before the Bureau session and which includes an analysis of the urban structure and morphology of the historic centre of Puebla, concludes that the projected intervention would be valid in the sense that it would upgrade an area now partially abandoned and would re-establish the visual and functional links between the eastern and the western parts of the centre, but that the structure and morphology of the area should be maintained and reinforced, and should form the basis for future plans.

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that as a follow-up to the mission a request for technical assistance had been presented by the Government of Mexico to obtain the services of the expert who undertook the mission, for advice and guidance in the further development of the plans.

The Representative of ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it also had tried to examine the situation in Puebla through its national committee, but that it had not succeeded. He offered, however, ICOMOS' services and expertise in the evaluation of the expert mission report and the information received from the Mexican authorities.

The Bureau decided that at this point it could not form a clear opinion on the plans for Puebla and requested the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to evaluate the reports and to report in more detail to the eighteenth session of the Committee.

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

The current state of the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage site had been the cause of apprehension since 1992 and had already appeared on the agenda of a number of meetings of the Bureau and of the World Heritage Committee. The Bureau was informed of the conclusions of the joint UNESCO/ICOMOS Review Mission of 14-30 November 1993, which had recommended that the site be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and returned to the World Heritage List within a period of one to three years, after sixteen specific matters of concern had been met. It was explained that the World Heritage site consists of seven distinct monument zones, three of them urban, centered round the palaces of the cities of Kathmandu, Patan and Bhaktapur, and the remainder, two Buddhist and two Hindu shrines, which had formerly been in rural surroundings. The mission report had recommended the effective delisting of parts of the Kathmandu Darbar Square and Bauddhanath monument zones, following a general failure to control development, but an extension of the monument zones of Swayambunath, Patan and particularly Bhaktapur, which was now the only Newari city to retain its overall traditional character. It was pointed out that the Hindu shrine of Pashupati, although part of the World Heritage site, had never been afforded the protection of being gazetted as a protected monument area in Nepalese law.

The mission report illustrated examples of demolition, encroachment, traffic pressure, the unsympathetic introduction of modern services and conservation practices which did not conform to accepted international standards. UNESCO had undertaken a number of initiatives, including plans for technical training and an advisory mission on amendments to the Nepalese Ancient Monuments Preservation Act. ICOMOS had plans for a professional seminar in October 1994.

The Representative of Thailand stated that it was important to judge the degree to which the site had deteriorated and whether it was now worthy of being included in the World Heritage List. The Nepalese State Party should be made aware of the Bureau's concerns and informed that, if the situation was not remedied, steps to delist the site would be initiated. He suggested that, rather than delisting part of the monument zones, that the State Party should be asked to redefine the areas which constitute the World Heritage site. The Representative of the United States concurred in these sentiments. The German Observer highlighted the importance of concentrating efforts on the core areas, where the best results could be achieved, rather than on peripheral areas which might still be part of the monument zones but in which traditional buildings had since been demolished and replaced with concrete-framed structures.

ICOMOS argued that the matter was an extremely delicate one, which could be approached from a number of standpoints. It would be possible to suggest that in the spirit of the World Heritage Convention, the site should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, but Nepalese opposition to such a move might make it self-defeating. He emphasized that it was important to do what was best for the site, which should be in cooperation with the Nepalese authorities to try and resolve outstanding difficulties. The Representative of Senegal also proposed a new approach which would enable the Nepalese to be more protective towards the World Heritage Site and argued that the State Party should be made fully aware of the Bureau's concerns with regard to violations of the articles of the World Heritage Convention.

The Director of the Centre endorsed the idea of redefinition of the monument zones but proposed that, rather than the site being placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it would be more constructive if a package of assistance to the Nepalese could be developed which would enable them to act as more effective guardians of the World Heritage site in cooperation with UNESCO and other relevant agencies. He would be contacting his colleagues in the Division of Physical Heritage to develop more concrete proposals.

The Chairperson summarized the discussion, to the effect that a letter should be sent to the State Party expressing the Bureau's deep concern about the state of the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage site. The Bureau recommends to the Committee to envisage partial delisting and redefinition of the part still intact and qualifying as World Heritage, which should be placed on the List of World in Danger to bring particular attention to the need to avoid further deterioration. At the same time, UNESCO is asked to work out an international assistance project.

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

The Bureau was informed of the considerable improvements for site conservation and management in the two years since the initial mission. These improvements were achieved with the support of the Canadian Government. The Bureau noted with satisfaction that ICOMOS will provide a detailed report to the Committee session in December, including a long-term assessment of conservation problems at the site for the decade to come.

#### **Island of Gorée (Senegal)**

This property inscribed in 1978 was also the subject of an International Campaign of UNESCO. The Coordinator of the MAP/UNEP "100 historical sites" Programme presented the results of the studies and restoration work carried out since 1965. The evaluation would indicate that a number of buildings have been preserved and conserved, however the island's problems of socio-economic and development have yet to be resolved. Restoration

work is no longer sufficient; the needs of the population struck by unemployment must be considered. Actions to create employment to allow the population to remain on the island need to be promoted and coordinated with the National Committee for the Safeguarding of Gorée. This action especially concerns:

- protection of the shores
- revision of the sanitation system
- improvement of the public lighting system
- development and repair of grounds and streets
- installation of an incinerator
- organization of a handicraft sector
- development of cultural activities, especially the possibility of producing a "son et lumière" show, a spectacle which would be presented during the entire tourist season.

The Bureau took note of this information, and of the numerous supporting agencies (European Union, World Bank, France, Germany, UNESCO, etc.) which finance projects on the island.

#### **Burgos Cathedral (Spain)**

In December 1993, on the occasion of the seventeenth session of the World Heritage Committee in Cartagena, it was reported that information from local and national authorities in Spain confirmed the setting-up of a multidisciplinary advisory council (Building Committee) which had drafted a Master Plan setting out the priorities for restoration and all other work on Burgos Cathedral.

ICOMOS confirmed to the Bureau that the issue of coordinating actions and respective roles with regard to the Cathedral have now been solved. The Ministry of Culture, the Regional Government of Castille and Leon, and the Chapter of the Cathedral have signed an agreement for the implementation of emergency restoration measures. It provides for the restoration of the towers, spires, ridges, part of the altars, and the stained glass windows, as well as the solving of problems caused by humidity.

The Bureau congratulated the various Spanish organizations involved on the actions taken in the conservation of Burgos Cathedral. At the same time, however, it expressed a desire to see those components of the total project which are still under negotiation put into effect with the minimum delay.

For its part, ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it will continue, through its National Committee, to monitor the progress of the project and will report further to later meetings of the World Heritage Committee and Bureau, if needed.

#### **Old City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic)**

The Bureau was informed that, in accordance with the recommendations of UNESCO's expert mission carried out in

December 1993, a working meeting was held at Headquarters on 31 May 1994, with the Delegate of the Syrian Arab Republic to UNESCO and the national authorities in charge of the conservation of the cultural heritage.

A work plan for this site was thus prepared which will be financed through the US\$ 19,500 accorded by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee in 1992. A technological partnership has been set up by UNESCO with the Electricity of France which will provide one or two experts in hydrogeology, and thus make substantial savings. A contract for the use of the balance of the US\$ 19,500 is being prepared with the Syrian Ministry of Culture. The Bureau noted with satisfaction the progress made on this project.

#### **Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)**

The Bureau was informed that, in accordance with the recommendations of UNESCO's expert mission carried out in December 1993, a working meeting was held at Headquarters on 31 May 1994, with the Delegate of the Syrian Arab Republic to UNESCO and the national authorities in charge of the conservation of the cultural heritage.

The World Heritage Centre was thus informed that the Syrian authorities are currently preparing a global project to safeguard and develop the city of Palmyra, for which a contribution to the national financial efforts will be requested from the Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994, inasmuch as all the components of this global plan will have been defined. The Bureau noted with satisfaction the progress made on this project.

#### **Göreme National Park and the rock sites of Cappadocia (Turkey)**

The Bureau was informed that the Proceedings of the International Seminar on the Preservation of the Rock Churches of Göreme, which was held at the site from 5 to 11 September 1993 with the support of the World Heritage Fund, are currently under publication at ICCROM, in close collaboration with the Turkish authorities in charge of conservation. The World Heritage Fund provided US\$ 10,000 to finance this publication. The Bureau took note of this information.

#### **Pueblo de Taos (United States of America)**

The Delegate of the United States of America recalled that the Committee at its seventeenth session expressed its concern about plans for the extension of the Taos Airport, as this would pose a potential threat to this World Heritage site.

The Delegate informed the Bureau that the National Park Service has been in close and continuous consultations with Pueblo's Governing Council, attorneys representing the Pueblo interests

and with the responsible federal agency, (Federal Aviation Administration), and that it is of the opinion that full consultation and assessment procedures to evaluate effects on historic structures, as required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, apply to this case. The National Park Service has requested the status of a cooperating agency in the environmental impact assessment. This request is pending a decision. The National Park Service believes that this airport project may have significant effects of noise and vibrations on the historic, archaeological and architectural features of Pueblo, and that the traditional living culture of the Pueblo may also be impacted by the increased air traffic and associated transportation and community development projects.

The Delegate informed the Bureau that the United States of America will provide a more complete report to the next Committee meeting.

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

This site which was inscribed in 1986 is threatened by the path of the A303 motorway through the southern part of the site. At the request of the Observer of the United Kingdom, a communication prepared by the concerned authorities was brought to the attention of the Bureau. Two proposals for the organization of the site will be discussed on 8 July 1994 at a meeting organized by The English Heritage and the National Trust, in which the representatives of the Ministry of Transportation and international experts will participate. The first foresees the construction of a tunnel which would be dug under the site. The second foresees the creation of an access bridge for visitors at the eastern end of the site which would be linked to an observation station on the top of the hill dominating Stonehenge. The first option is by far the most costly.

The Bureau took note of this information and expressed the wish that a satisfactory project could be undertaken as soon as possible.

**VI.22** Concluding the examination of the proposals for systematic monitoring and the great number of site specific state of conservation reports, several delegates noted the increased number of state of conservation reports, which, if a systematic monitoring programme would be set up, would increase even further and require more time for discussion at the Bureau and Committee sessions. They also noted the different approaches applied by the Secretariat and the advisory bodies and suggested an improved and advanced planning of monitoring missions and reports.

**VI.23** Both IUCN and ICOMOS made the suggestion that the ordinary session of the Bureau in July of each year concentrates on the examination of the nominations for inscription on the World Heritage List, and that the extraordinary session in December would be dedicated to monitoring the state of

conservation of the already inscribed World Heritage sites. The Delegates of the United States of America and Thailand, however, pointed out that the Bureau's recommendations on specific sites may also be required at the July session and that these, in many cases, have a decisive influence in the decision-making process. It was concluded that those cases on which a recommendation from the Bureau is required, would also be brought forward to the July session, but that information and 'success stories' would be presented to the December session of the Bureau and the Committee.

**VI.24** The Director of the World Heritage Centre stressed the value of regular consultative meetings with the advisory bodies for enhanced coordination of World Heritage work.

## **VII. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR TRAINING PROVIDED UNDER THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND: REVIEW, EVALUATION AND STRATEGY**

### **Introduction**

**VII.1** The Bureau recalled that during the seventeenth session of the Committee there was considerable discussion regarding several international assistance requests that had been submitted for financing under the World Heritage Fund. The Committee therefore asked the World Heritage Centre to prepare for the eighteenth session of the Bureau a proposal on the evaluation of international assistance projects which had received contributions from the World Heritage Fund. The preparatory work for such an evaluation, covering in particular the last five years (1988-1992), has already begun.

**VII.2** The Bureau, having recalled that training is a vital and integral part of the World Heritage Convention (Articles 5, 22 and 23) and its Operational Guidelines (paragraphs 87 to 91), welcomed the Centre's initiative to present a preliminary review of the training activities undertaken within the framework of the World Heritage Convention. In this context, the Bureau underlined that training is primarily the obligation of the States Parties. Their lack of commitment in this regard, however, manifests itself through insufficient infrastructural investment, institutional development and international assistance for training in many developing countries.

**VII.3** The Secretariat stressed its intention of undertaking an in-depth evaluation of its training activities before defining, with its partners, a strategic planning process in order to encourage a pro-active attitude. The outline submitted to the Bureau aimed at informing it of the most relevant facts concerning training, which are:

- assessment of the funding disbursed to the Centre's partners in the period from 1988 to 1992;

- identification of the nature and the periodicity of the courses;
- identification, by region, of the beneficiaries of fellowships.

**Review and assessment of natural heritage training activities (1988-1992)**

VII.4 It was underlined that training concepts have undergone major changes in the last twenty years. This is particularly true in the case of training of protected area managers, as the objectives and principles of protected area management, and the definitions of national parks and other reserves, have changed considerably. There has been a shift to an interdisciplinary approach rather than to traditional natural sciences. Moreover, there has been a need to focus training courses more on the conceptual approaches to management, biodiversity status of the protected areas and the monitoring of the state of conservation.

VII.5 Training under the natural part of the Convention can be distinguished thematically into three different groups:

- (1) wildlands, wildlife and game management
- (2) biology, ecology and conservation
- (3) protected area management.

Two types of training courses have been supported under the Fund, group training, which became the major part and individual training as fellowships financed from the World Heritage Fund.

VII.6 The group training courses (61 courses from 1988 to 1992) ranged from in situ training at natural World Heritage sites to regional and sub-regional workshops on natural resources conservation and management, as well as some specialized workshops. The training workshops were held in practically all regions of the world, however, cooperation developed over the years with several specialized training institutes and organizations, such as CATIE (Costa Rica), ENGREF (France), Colorado State University, Smithsonian Institution (USA), Dehra Dun (India). Protected area management courses included the large majority of the short-term training courses over the last five years.

VII.7 The main partners for training under the natural part of the Convention providing long-term training courses (fellowships) for 12 to 24 months for selected students are the School for Training of Wildlife Specialists (Garoua, Cameroon) and the College of African Wildlife Management (Mweka, Tanzania), both of which focus mostly on wildlife and protected area management. The discussion focused on the outcome of the training courses for the protection of World Heritage sites and that for an in-depth analysis the Schools (Garoua and Mweka) should be involved, as well as other course organizers. In total, 37 individual fellowships for short- or long-term training were granted from 1988 to 1992.

**VII.8** The review by the Centre emphasized some shortcomings in the selection of candidates, the outcome of the courses as well as communication between the course organizers and the World Heritage Centre concerning the content of the training activity.

**Action by the Bureau**

**VII.9** The Bureau approved US\$30,000 for a workshop to be held in 1994-1995 with a selected number of experts, specialists and key individuals, including agreement by the schools, to review the curricula of the courses, management objectives as well as the outcome of the courses. The Bureau asked that the Centre submit the evaluation findings as well as recommendations by the experts for a future training strategy for natural heritage to the World Heritage Committee.

**Review and assessment of cultural heritage training activities (1988-1992)**

**VII.10** The outcome of the preliminary analysis for the cultural part is still general but can be summarized as follows:

42 fellowships out of 56 were awarded to trainees who attended ICOMOS and IBPC courses;

10 in-situ courses were organized at the request of States Parties;

the total expenditure for training in the cultural domain for the past five years amounts approximately to US\$ 1 million;

all regional needs were far from being covered.

The Centre's partners are ICCROM and the Brazilian Institute for Cultural Heritage in Bahia, Brazil (IBPC).

It was also stated that the World Heritage Centre not only needs to refine its analysis but to discuss with its partners the content and impact of each course and examine emerging needs in that field. Greater diversity in courses is required and training packages need to be renewed and strengthened. Curricula and training modules will have, in certain instances, to be redefined or adapted to cover specific regional needs. Reference was also made to the more general question of monitoring and to the twin issues of conservation and site management which need to be addressed.

**VII.11** The Representative of ICCROM underlined that the strategic planning process currently being undertaken by ICCROM to understand current training needs at the international, regional and national levels and in order to better redefine its curricula, were in line with the World Heritage Centre's objectives. ICCROM and the Centre have a common purpose and share the same approach. The Bureau was informed of the evaluation exercise being undertaken by ICCROM, which has sent

questionnaires to all the participants of their courses in order to assess their long-term benefits.

**VII.12** The ICCROM Representative then briefly introduced the regular ICCROM courses which take place in their premises, in Rome, (architectural conservation, mural paintings, science and technology of conservation) and referred to the "new" in situ courses which will be organized in the coming months for the Maghreb, the Baltic, and the Central Asian countries and focus on the philosophy and ethic of conservation. He also referred to the summer course on Conservation Management of World Heritage Historic Ensembles which is taking place at Potsdam "Sans Souci" which will cover the training needs of Eastern and Central European site managers and address the issues of site management and conservation. He stressed that these new training packages were being defined after completing inventories of needs and assessments of resources on a regional and sub-regional basis.

**VII.13** The ICCROM Representative underlined the need for different approaches for international courses which put the emphasis on methodology and use of comparative analyses; while regional courses promote the creation of professional networks and the exchange of technical information. On the other hand, national courses are usually meant to address specific administrative questions and more detailed issues of conservation.

**VII.14** The Delegate of Thailand stressed the importance of inviting foreign participants to in-situ courses in order to enhance the learning process and better promote the exchange of information.

#### **Action by the Bureau**

**VII.15** The Bureau approved US\$30,000 for the organization of a workshop to be held in 1994-1995 with a selected number of the Centre's training partners in the field of the conservation and preservation of the cultural heritage, key individuals and colleagues from UNESCO's Secretariat to provide a sound basis for a fresh strategy. The Bureau asked the Centre to submit the overall evaluation findings as well as recommendations for a future training strategy to the World Heritage Committee.

#### **VIII. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**VIII.1** The Bureau examined the nominations of 11 natural properties, of which two were extensions of already inscribed sites). The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe six of them, recommended not to inscribe one site, referred three

nominations back to the States Parties concerned for further information and deferred one nomination.

**VIII.2** The Bureau also examined the nomination of 26 cultural properties, of which two were extensions of already inscribed sites. The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe 14 properties, not to inscribe two properties, referred four nominations back to the States Parties concerned for further information and deferred six nominations.

**VIII.3** The Bureau did not examine the two natural sites submitted by Congo, as an IUCN field inspection of the site had been postponed due to circumstances beyond the control of IUCN.

**VIII.4** Furthermore, the Secretariat provided information received on four natural World Heritage sites, which were deferred by previous sessions of the Bureau.

### Natural Properties

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

<b>Name of Property</b>	<b>Identification No.</b>	<b>State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
<b>Australian Fossil Sites</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>Australia</b>	<b>N(i)(ii)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe a modified version of the site as Riversleigh/Naracoorte Fossil site, excluding the site of Murgon until its significance can be more convincingly demonstrated. The Bureau noted that Riversleigh provides outstanding examples of middle to late Tertiary mammal assemblages and one of the world's richest Oligo-Miocene mammal records in a continent whose mammalian history has been most isolated and distinctive, whereas Naracoorte preserved outstanding terrestrial vertebrates and illustrates faunal change spanning two ice ages.

The Bureau furthermore underlined that the inscription of the fossil sites is a new challenge, as there are only very few sites with fossil values on the list and that this inscription is a major precedent for the Committee.

<b>Tatshenshini- Alsek Provincial Wilderness Park (extension of the Glacier Bay/Wrangell/ St. Elias/Kluane site)</b>	<b>72bis/rev.</b>	<b>Canada/USA</b>	<b>N(ii)(iii) (iv)</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this as an extension to the Glacier Bay/Wrangell/St. Elias/Kluane World Heritage site. The site comprises spectacular river and high mountain scenery and a diversity of wildlife (genetically viable population of grizzly bears) and fish, as well as outstanding examples of geological and geomorphological processes.

The Bureau furthermore commended the Government of British Columbia on the action taken to prevent mining in the area and it complemented the government agencies involved in moving towards the establishment of an International Advisory Council and endorsed, in principle, the 19th IUCN General Assembly Resolution concerning the area. The Bureau underlined that any decision made by the Committee would not prejudice the land claims over the area by the First Nation people (Champagne-Aishihik). The Delegate of the United States emphasized that proposals for a less cumbersome name for the expanded site such as "St. Elias Mountain Parks" are the prerogative of the States Parties. This statement was endorsed by the Observer of Canada and concurred with by IUCN.

<b>Los Katios National Park</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>Colombia</b>	<b>N(ii)(iv)</b>
-------------------------------------	------------	-----------------	------------------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site, which adjoins Darien World Heritage site in Panama, and which represents a rich biota comprising elements of both the North and the South American continent, embodying a centre of endemism for flora and fauna. Los Katios displays exceptional biodiversity and provides the habitat for a number of threatened animal and plant species. The Bureau commended both the Colombian and the Panamanian Governments for the bilateral cooperative management agreement and recommended that the site be inscribed as a transfrontier site with Darien National Park (Panama).

<b>Donana National Park</b>	<b>685</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>N(ii)(iii) (iv)</b>
---------------------------------	------------	--------------	----------------------------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the site which contains an exceptional example of a large Mediterranean wetland site with diverse habitats of marshes, forests, pristine beaches, dunes and lagoons which contain a high faunal diversity, particularly for its ornithological values.

The Bureau furthermore complemented the Spanish authorities on the improved protection of the site during the past two years and their efforts to maintain the integrity of the site. It noted,



Islands World Heritage site. Its marine environment has been recognized as a distinct biotic province including 307 species of fish (51 endemic) and large numbers of dolphins, whales, sea lions and fur seals, sharks, rays and turtles.

The Bureau, however, noted that the management plan for the marine part is not being implemented and requested the Centre to prepare a letter to the national authorities under the Chairperson's signature, requesting the confirmation of the following commitments and evidence of progress concerning the management of the marine reserve: (1) augment the management capacity (2) encourage institutional cooperation (3) step up enforcement activities to ensure the integrity of the marine reserve and (4) conduct research on the sustainability levels of fishing.

It took note of severe management problems of the area including illegal sea cucumber fishing and other human-related stresses on the marine resources. Discussion focused also on the possibility by the Committee to nominate the site directly to the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Glacier and Waterton National Parks**                      354rev.                      Canada/USA

The Bureau recalled that it referred the site back to the authorities in 1986 and noted that the revised nomination included, as requested, the Waterton National Park. However, it did not provide any sufficient additional information which distinguished it from other similar World Heritage sites in the Western Cordillera. The Bureau noted that the site has important values for threatened species, significant geological formations, as well as spectacular mountain landscapes.

After considerable discussions and statements by the Delegate of the United States and the Observer of Canada, the Bureau referred the site back to the authorities to allow them to prepare a revised nomination, with comparison to other World Heritage sites in the surrounding regions.

**Canaima National Park**                      701                      Venezuela

The Bureau recognized the outstanding universal value of the site, in particular the unique table mountains (tepui), and requested the Centre to inform the authorities of this. However, it requested that the authorities proceed with the identification of revised boundaries of the site, including the famous tepui formations, but excluding the low elevation grasslands inhabited by indigenous people who have not been involved in the nomination process. Furthermore, a second phase to incorporate other tepuis outside the nominated area was encouraged. The Bureau strongly encouraged the Venezuelan authorities to proceed with the revised boundaries so that the Committee could inscribe the site in 1994.



and that advice will be given on the outcome in due course. The Observer of Australia informed the Bureau that information will be provided in time for the eighteenth session of the Committee in December 1994.

**Jiddat-al-                                654                                Oman**  
**Harasis**

The Bureau recalled that the site was reviewed at its seventeenth session and was referred back to the authorities to complete the nomination with an effective management regime and administrative structure, as well as legislation. The Centre was informed by the Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Oman on 20 January 1994 that His Majesty, the Sultan of Oman, Sultan Qaboos, has issued the Royal Decree to demarcate the site as an area to be known as "The Arabian Oryx Sanctuary". The administration statute will be laid down by the Ministry of Regional Municipalities and Environment. Concerning a management plan, a preparatory assistance request was submitted to the Centre and approved by the Chairperson. The Ambassador of Oman informed the Bureau that information will be provided in time for the eighteenth session of the Committee. The Bureau took note of this information.

**St. Paul's                                652                                Philippines**  
**Subterranean**  
**National Park**

At its seventeenth session, in June 1993, the Bureau reviewed the site and was of the view that an extended nomination may meet criteria (iii) and (iv). The Philippine authorities informed the World Heritage Centre on 12 May 1994 that appropriate legislation expanding the area of the Park from 5,753 ha to 86,000 ha is expected to be officially approved by the Philippine Government. The Observer of the Philippines informed the Bureau that information will be provided in time for the eighteenth session of the Committee.

**Ha-Long Bay                                672                                Vietnam**

The Bureau recalled that at its seventeenth session it recognized that the site would fulfil natural criterion (iii) because of its outstanding scenic values. However, a clear definition of the boundaries and an effective management regime and legislation was requested. On 27 June 1994 the Centre was informed by the Ambassador of Vietnam to UNESCO, that additional documents and maps have been provided which the Centre has transmitted to IUCN.

## Cultural Properties

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

Name of Property	Identification No.	State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention	Criteria
------------------	--------------------	---	----------

The Mountain Resort and its Outlying Temples	703	China	C(ii)(iv)
--	-----	-------	-----------

The Potala Palace, Lhasa	707	China	C(i)(iv)(vi)
--------------------------	-----	-------	--------------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List and requested the Chinese authorities to envisage the possibility in the future of extending the first site to include the historic village of Shol, the Temple of Lukhang and its willow parks, as well as the Chakpori Hill.

Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church	697	Denmark	C(iii)
---	-----	---------	--------

The City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta	708	Georgia	C(iii)(iv)
-------------------------------------	-----	---------	------------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List and suggested to the State Party to change the name to "Historic Churches of Mtskheta".

Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati	710	Georgia	C(i)
------------------------------	-----	---------	------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List and recommended the ICOMOS mission evaluation report to be transmitted to the State Party.

<b>The Collegiate Church, Castle, and old town of Quedlinburg</b>	<b>535rev</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>C(iv)</b>
---	---------------	----------------	--------------

<b>Völklingen Ironworks</b>	<b>687</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>C(ii)(iv)</b>
-----------------------------	------------	----------------	------------------

<b>Vicenza</b>	<b>712</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>C(i)(ii)</b>
----------------	------------	--------------	-----------------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List and that the ICCROM/ICOMOS mission evaluation report be transmitted to the State Party. Moreover, it was suggested to change the name of the property by adding the words "The City of Palladio".

<b>Historic monuments of Ancient Kyoto (Kyoto, Uji and Otsu Cities)</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>Japan</b>	<b>C(ii)(iv)</b>
---	------------	--------------	------------------

<b>The City of Luxemburg: its old quarters and fortifications</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>Luxemburg</b>	<b>C(iv)</b>
---	------------	------------------	--------------

<b>The Church of the Ascension, Kolomenskoye</b>	<b>634rev.</b>	<b>Russian Federation</b>	<b>C(ii)</b>
--	----------------	---------------------------	--------------

<b>The Rock Carvings in Tanum</b>	<b>557rev.</b>	<b>Sweden</b>	<b>C(i)(iii)(iv)</b>
-----------------------------------	----------------	---------------	----------------------

#### **EXTENSIONS**

<b>Surroundings of the Mosque (iii)(iv) of Cordoba (extension of the Mosque of Cordoba)</b>	<b>331bis</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>C(i)(ii)</b>
---	---------------	--------------	-----------------

The Bureau recommended that the nomination of the surroundings of the Mosque-Cathedral of Cordoba be considered as an extension of the existing World Heritage site of the Mosque of Cordoba. The Bureau endorsed the suggestion made by the Delegate of Spain to adopt the name "The Historic Centre of Cordoba".

Historic Centre of Granada (extension of the Alhambra and the Generalife, Granada, to include the Albayzin quarter)	314bis	Spain	C(i)(iii) (iv)
---	--------	-------	-------------------

The Bureau endorsed the suggestion made by the Delegate of Spain to adopt the following name: **Alhambra, Generalife and Albayzin, Grenada.**

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

The Monastery Church of the Ascension of the Virgin Mary at Kladruby	691	Czech Republic	
--	-----	----------------	--

The Cathedral of St. Elizabeth, the Chapel of St. Michael and Urban's Tower, Kosice	681	Slovak Republic	
---	-----	-----------------	--

**C. Properties for which nominations were referred back to the national authorities for further information**

The Temple of Confucius, the Cemetery of Confucius, and the Kong Family Mansion in Qufu	704	China	C(i)(iv) (vi)
---	-----	-------	------------------

The Bureau took note of the ICOMOS evaluation and referred this nomination to the Chinese authorities requesting them to provide precise information on the buffer zone of the site. This information should be communicated before 1 October 1994, to allow ICOMOS to complete its evaluation which will be submitted to the next session of the Bureau in December 1994.

The ancient building complex in the Wudang Mountains	705	China	C(i)(ii) (vi)
---	-----	-------	------------------

The Bureau took note of the ICOMOS evaluation and referred this nomination to the Chinese authorities requesting them to provide precise information on the management plan for the site and give

assurances concerning the implementation of conservation measures for its more distant monuments. This information should be communicated before 1 October 1994 to allow ICOMOS to complete its evaluation which will be submitted to the next session of the Bureau in December 1994.

**The Pilgrimage Church of St. John of Nepomuk at Zelena Hora**                      **690**                      **Czech Republic**

The Bureau took note of the ICOMOS evaluation and referred this nomination to the State Party concerned for additional information concerning the effect of the new legislation on the protection of ecclesiastical monuments and on the on-going restoration project. This information should be communicated before 1 October 1994 to allow ICOMOS to complete its evaluation which will be submitted to the next session of the Bureau in December 1994.

**The Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana**                      **700**                      **Peru**                      **C(i)(iii)  
(iv)**

The Bureau referred this nomination to the State Party to define the boundaries of this cultural property. If this information is communicated before 1 October 1994 and ICOMOS makes a positive evaluation, the property may be inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (iii) and (iv).

#### **D. Deferred nominations**

**The Ruins of Jiaohe City**                      **706**                      **China**

The Bureau deferred the examination of the nomination until precise information is provided by the Chinese authorities on the existence and effective application of a management plan for the site, including the conservation, restoration, control of tourist visitation, and protection against archaeological looting, and which would also apply to the other visible archaeological sites in the area.

**Roskilde Cathedral**                      **695**                      **Denmark**

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination until a comparative study on religious brick Gothic architecture is completed.

**Kronborg Castle            696                    Denmark**

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination until a satisfactory programme has been adopted by the State Party for the removal of the major part of the disused shipyard and the landscaping of the area.

**Upper Svaneti                709                    Georgia**

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination to enable the State Party to give a clearer indication of the area proposed, and provide more information on the conservation and management plan which is under preparation.

**The Old City                689                    Jordan  
of Salt**

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination until the Jordanian authorities have confirmed that the Action Plan ("Salt: A Plan for Action"), 1990, had been finally adopted and that its implementation has become effective.

**The earliest 16th        702                    Mexico  
Century Monasteries  
on the slopes of  
Popocatepetl**

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination and requested the World Heritage Centre to transmit to the State Party a copy of the ICOMOS mission evaluation report. However, if the requested information concerning a conservation and management plan and information about buffer zones is received by 1 October 1994, the nomination could be re-examined at the eighteenth session of the Bureau of the Committee in December 1994.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it would present to the next session of the Bureau in December 1994, a favourable report on the proposed extension of the zone of protection surrounding the ramparts of Dubrovnik (Croatia).

**IX. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

**IX.1**        The Bureau examined the following documents WHC-94/CONF.001/5, WHC-94/CONF.001/5Corr., WHC-94/CONF.001/5Add1, Add2 and Add3 and approved 18 requests for international assistance.

## IX.2 Requests approved

### A. NATURAL HERITAGE

#### A.1 Training

#### Training in the Conservation and Management of Natural Heritage in the Arab Region

The Bureau reviewed a request for US\$ 30,000 for a two-week regional training seminar submitted by the Egyptian authorities to be held in Egypt in April 1995 on conservation and management of natural heritage. The Bureau approved the requested sum of US\$ 30,000 for the course and asked the Centre to proceed with an agreement on the course programme with the national authorities.

### B. CULTURAL HERITAGE

#### B.1 Technical Cooperation

**Historic Centre of the Town of Olinda (Brazil) - US\$ 19,000:** for a tourist study which would form part of the Urban Development Plan.

**Rock-hewn Churches of Ivanovo Monastery and Monastery of Rila (Bulgaria) - US\$ 21,000:** of which US\$ 16,000 will be earmarked for the purchase of equipment and US\$ 5,000 for advisory services on the nature of conservation measure to be undertaken.

**Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia) - US\$ 8,000:** for the restoration of mural paintings in the 18th century Baroque Festival Palace, which was severely damaged in 1991. ICCROM will supervise the project in collaboration with the the Croatian Institute for Restoration. However, Croatia should first pay its outstanding dues to the World Heritage Fund.

**Joya de Ceren (El Salvador) - US\$ 25,000:** to define an integral development for the site of Joya de Ceren in the context of a wider area of archaeological importance (including sites such as San Andres, El Cambio, etc). Participants attending the workshop would be representatives of all national institutions involved, with a limited number of external experts.

**Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala) - US\$ 20,000:** for the purchase of equipment.

**National History Park Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) - US\$ 17,510:** for the purchase of exhibition panels, climate control equipment and other allied costs.

Given the international embargo and the socio-economic situation, the UNDP Resident Representative in Haiti is requested to cooperate in the implementation and supervision of this assistance.

**Authenticity Conference (Japan) - US\$ 30,000:** to cover the travel costs of participants from Africa and Latin America attending the Conference, which will propose a draft text on the "test of authenticity" to the World Heritage Committee for World Heritage nominations, revising and enlarging the definition of the different aspects and criteria of authenticity as contained in the Operational Guidelines.

**Medina of Marrakesh, Morocco (Restoration of the Medersa Ben Youssef) - US\$ 30,000:** to contribute to the restoration of the monument (rehabilitation, water-proofing, floor coverage, decoration and in particular the sculptured plaster and "zellij" tiles as well as the protective mortar).

**Historic Zones of Istanbul (Turkey) (Restoration of the Mosaics of Hagia-Sophia) - US\$ 30,000:** to continue the restoration work of the mosaics of the dome (purchase of materials and equipment and travel, per diem and remuneration of restoration experts).

## **B.2 Training**

**Argentina - US\$ 20,000:** for a series of seminars which will be held at different sites in Argentina and on different subject matters:

- 1) Posadas, 5-8 September 1994: Safeguarding the Jesuit Missions.
- 2) Mar del Plata, 30-31 August 1994: Tourism and cultural heritage.
- 3) Salta, 5-8 September 1994: Preservation of historic centres.
- 4) Cordoba, 5-8 September 1994: Interventions in the archaeological heritage.
- 5) Buenos Aires, 5-8 September 1994: Recycling versus restoration.
- 6) Trelew-Chubut, 5-8 September 1994: Natural heritage, its relevance in the development process.

**Brazil (Historic Town of Ouro Preto) - US\$19,250:** to organize a training seminar for site managers of Historical Cities (eight from Brazil and seven from other Latin American countries).

**China (National training course on "Conservation of Timber Buildings") - US\$30,000:** for a two-week training course, with the objectives to improve trainees' theoretical and technical knowledge in restoration work and to introduce new methodology of intervention and to promote the development of conservation and restoration of ancient building structures to the public at large.

**Germany - Training course "Conservation and management of the World Heritage sites" (Palaces and Parks of Potsdam) - US\$ 20,000:** to cover the travel costs of participants from Central and East Europe.

**Haiti (National History Park - Citadelle, Sans Souci, Ramiers) - US\$4,100:** to organize a one-month on-site training workshop for five architectural students. Technical expertise will be provided by ISPAN for training in inventory and documentation of architectural structures as well as for the preparation of state of conservation reports.

Given the international embargo and the socio-economic situation, the UNDP Resident Representative in Haiti is requested to cooperate in the implementation and supervision of this assistance.

**Italy (International training course on "Information, documentation and use of UNESCO publications regarding Cultural and Natural World Heritage") - US\$ 20,000:** a one-week training course for 20 participants: participants from 15 countries from Eastern Europe and 5 countries from Africa.

### **B.3 Emergency assistance**

**Archaeological Park of Tierradentro (Colombia) - US\$ 69,500:** in accordance with paragraph 85 of the Operational Guidelines which indicate that emergency assistance may be approved "for work in connection with cultural and natural properties included or suitable for inclusion in the World Heritage List and which have suffered severe damage due to sudden, unexpected phenomena" to undertake the following actions as a first phase of an overall conservation plan:

- 1) Field an expert mission (4 Colombians and 2 international experts) to draw up an action plan for the safeguarding of the site.
- 2) Take measures to evacuate the rainwater, particularly in the tombs in the Alto de Segovia area.
- 3) Emergency scaffolding in tombs that are in danger of collapse.
- 4) Consolidation of the mural paintings.

**National History Park Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) - US\$ 73,000:** for emergency measures to be undertaken for the structural consolidation of the entire roof construction of the Royal Battery of the Citadel.

Given the international embargo and the socio-economic situation, the UNDP Resident Representative in Haiti is requested to cooperate in the implementation and supervision of this assistance.

#### **IX.3 Requests were deferred by the Bureau:**

**Establishment of an itinerant conservation laboratory which would service the seven sites inscribed on the World Heritage List (Bulgaria) - US\$ 39,000:** The Bureau recommended that this request be re-examined by the Secretariat and ICCROM before being submitted to its next session in December 1994.

**Historic Centre of Puebla (Mexico) US\$ 18,000 -** to elaborate a rehabilitation plan to secure the safeguarding of the remaining historical buildings in the area, the introduction of new functions and structures compatible with the urban architecture and a maintenance programme to keep the locality in good condition.

The Bureau recommended that this request be re-examined by the Secretariat and ICOMOS before it is re-submitted to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

**Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) -** Taking into account the present situation in the country and the particular menace of rapid degradation which threaten the Historic Town of Zabid, the Bureau requested the Centre to request the Yemeni authorities to reformulate their request in the form of emergency assistance. The request shall be submitted as soon as possible to the World Heritage Centre for approval by the Chairperson.

#### **IX.4 Requests not approved by the Bureau:**

**China (Biodiversity Measuring and Monitoring Course):** The Bureau reviewed a request for US \$ 19,000 for a biodiversity measuring and monitoring course to be held in Guangdong Province in China in November/December 1994. It felt however, that two Chinese participants had already been financed from the World Heritage Fund for a similar course in the United States in 1994 and, moreover, that the course did not involve World Heritage site managers, nor was it being held at a World Heritage site. The Bureau therefore, did not approve the request.

**IX.5** At the end of the debate, the Bureau was informed that the amounts approved for training were slightly superior to the budget allocation available for this activity, and therefore it

authorized the Director of the World Heritage Centre to commit the approved funds by transferring the amount required from the technical assistance budgetary line.

## **X.     MARKETING AND FUND-RAISING STRATEGY**

**X.1** A presentation to the Bureau by Mr Charles de Haës, Special Advisor to the Director-General and former Director-General of the World Wildlife Fund, who was asked by the World Heritage Centre to carry out a preliminary study on marketing, promotion and fund-raising strategies, was rendered under the form of "preliminary recommendations for discussions".

**X.2** The following major points were raised by Mr de Haës in his report, which is to be submitted in written form in the near future.

- a) There exists a potential for raising money for the Fund and promotion of the Convention; in order to achieve this goal, however, a fully integrated approach is necessary (under the authority of the Director of the Centre who will report to the Director-General);
- b) it is necessary to coordinate the various efforts that are currently carried out within UNESCO related to the Convention;
- c) the Director of the Centre should overview all the opportunities for promotion or fund-raising arising either within the Secretariat or at regional or national level;
- d) the World Heritage Centre should turn into a "Centre of managerial excellence" capable of raising the extrabudgetary funds which are increasingly going to be required. Thus, not only the Centre will benefit, but also UNESCO;
- e) conditions for the above (d) are:
  - to create a legal entity capable of owning trademarks and concluding contracts;
  - adoption of a fully integrated working approach;
  - increase the WHC Director's authority with reference to an overall plan and budget;
  - definition of objectives, priorities and responsibilities;
  - maintain the co-operative support of other relevant UNESCO units for the Convention;

- shift the World Heritage Centre from its present site to other office space close to the Culture and Science Sectors;
- contract private sector expertise to develop communications and fund-raising;
- amend the World Heritage Logo to make its relevance more evident.

**X.3** In the debate which followed this presentation, comments were made by the Delegates of Oman, Senegal, Spain, Thailand and the United States of America. Most of these felt that the proposals were essentially positive and that the Director-General deserved high praise for having taken timely and prompt action following the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee at its sixteenth session held in 1992 in Santa Fe. The Bureau therefore decided unanimously to express to the Director-General its satisfaction on this matter. The Delegates of Spain and the Observers from Australia, Italy and France, felt furthermore that these important innovations should first be examined by the Director-General before being presented to the Committee.

#### **XI. ORGANIZATION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES IN 1995 AND ELECTION OF SEVEN MEMBERS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**XI.1** In order to remedy a situation which was judged prejudicial to the smooth running of the election of members to the World Heritage Committee, the Centre presented proposals for the modification of Rule 13 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, paragraphs 8 and 12. According to this proposal, **Rule 13.8** of the Procedure would be modified as follows:

"Members of the World Heritage Committee will be elected in such a manner as to limit the number of ballots by using the rule of simple majority at the third ballot.

States having obtained the absolute majority in the first ballot are declared elected, unless the number of these States is superior to the number of seats to be filled.

In this last case, States having obtained the greatest number of votes, up to the number of seats to be filled, are declared elected.

If the number of States having obtained the absolute majority is inferior to the number of seats to be filled, a second ballot will take place with absolute majority ruling.

The election will be limited to States having obtained the greatest number of votes in the preceding ballot, up to twice the number of seats to be filled.

Finally, if all the seats are not filled at the end of the second ballot, a final ballot will take place with a simple majority."

With regard to item 29 of the report of the Ninth General Assembly and the necessity for equitable rotation of States Parties to the Committee, it would be possible to add the following rule:

**Rule 13.12:** it is forbidden for an outgoing State Party to stand for election for a second mandate immediately.

**XI.2** The Delegate of Thailand also presented a document (see Annex V) which modifies paragraphs 9 and 10, harmonizing them with paragraph 8, as amended in the Secretariat's proposal. The text now reads:

"II. Proposed Amendments (the underlined words):

13.8 Those States obtaining in the first ballot the required majority shall be elected, unless the number of States obtaining that majority is greater than the number of seats to be filled. In that case, the States obtaining the greatest number of votes, up to the number of seats to be filled, shall be declared elected. If the number of States obtaining the majority required is less than the number of seats to be filled, there shall be a second ballot to fill the remaining seats, the voting being restricted to the States obtaining the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot, to a number not more than twice that of the seats remaining to be filled.

13.9 In the second ballot, the candidates obtaining the greatest number of votes, up to the number of seats to be filled, shall be declared elected.

13.10 If, in the second ballot, two or more candidates obtain the same number of votes, the Chairperson shall decide between them by drawing lots."

Paragraphs 11 and 12 remain unchanged.

**XI.3** The Bureau members as well as the observers all concurred in that the procedure for election of new members to the Committee should be simplified. Specifically, the Observer of Italy, endorsed by several other delegates and observers, suggested that there should be four ballots with an absolute majority, after which a simple majority rule would apply.

**XI.4** With regard to paragraph 12 of Rule 13, there was unanimous agreement that the word "forbidden" should be deleted. However, most of the speakers agreed on the necessity of following the spirit of the Convention in finding a solution which would limit the possibility of an outgoing State Party to

present its candidature for a second mandate, in order to allow a better representation of different regions and cultures in the Committee.

## **XII. GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**XII.1** For several years now, the Committee has constantly stressed the importance of completing the identification of world heritage and ensuring a truly representative List, and thus its credibility. Consequently, it has also stressed the necessity to implement the "Global Study" of the List and the associated thematic studies on the different types of cultural properties which could be proposed for inscription, including those which are at present little or not at all represented.

**XII.2** In July 1993 in Colombo (Sri Lanka), ICOMOS organized a meeting of six experts to prepare a framework for this Global Study. However, the absence of a conceptual and methodological consensus on this matter within the scientific community was afterwards confirmed.

**XII.3** During its seventeenth session at Cartagena (Colombia), the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to continue their efforts in this direction.

**XII.4** The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS therefore jointly organized a first expert meeting at UNESCO Headquarters from 20 to 22 June 1994, representing the different regions of the world and the different disciplines concerned (cultural heritage specialists, anthropologists, art and architecture historians, archaeologists, etc.) with the objective of reviewing the issues and considering all the different approaches, and especially all the work and contributions made to date, in an attempt to define a conceptual framework, a methodology and common goals.

**XII.5** The Vice President of ICOMOS presented to the Bureau the report of the expert meeting and a summary of its recommendations to the World Heritage Committee, as they are set out "in extenso" in the working document WHC-94/CONF.001/INF.4, which figures as Annex IV to this report.

A) The principal objectives of the meeting were to:

- 1) examine the present representative structure of the World Heritage List with regard to cultural properties;
- 2) carry out an in-depth study of all the studies and earlier contributions to the "Global Study" and in particular the proposals presented in Mr. H. Cleere's report of 23 November 1993 and in Mr. Léon Pressouyre's publication *La Convention du Patrimoine mondial, vingt ans après*;

- 3) integrate the international scientific community's most recent findings and ideas on the content and concept of cultural heritage over the past twenty years.
- B) The experts were in full agreement on the following points:
- 1) that there is a serious imbalance in cultural heritage on the World Heritage List in its present form with regard to regions of the world, types of properties and the periods represented. Living cultures, especially those of "traditional" societies, are largely under-represented;
  - 2) earlier proposals and the work carried out from 1984 to 1993 on the "Global Study", in particular the three-dimensional space-time-human achievement grid, have been found invaluable to the process of reflection in this complex and difficult domain. Thus, they were indispensable steps towards the new anthropological and multidimensional approach proposed by the experts in the more dynamic, continuous and evolutive form of a "global strategy";
  - 3) the development of knowledge and the process of reflection within the international scientific community over the past twenty years has led to an evolution in the content and the extension of the concept of cultural heritage, and to the abandon of a basically "monumental" vision for a far more anthropological and global conception of material evidence of the different cultures of the world. This material evidence is no longer considered out of context, but in its multiple relationships to its physical and non-physical environment.
- C) The conclusions of the expert meeting are formulated in seven recommendations which will be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994 (see Document WHC-94/CONF.001/INF.4, Annex IV to this report).

**XII.6** The Delegate of Senegal congratulated and thanked the expert group. He noted with satisfaction the evolution of the process of reflection expressed in the document, as well as its new orientations which are in accordance with Senegal's wishes. Their implementation, with the move away from the strongly "monumental" concept which has prevailed thus far, will permit the nomination of many African cultural sites to the World Heritage List. African cultural heritage has its roots in living cultures, and the role of humankind in all its aspects is essential.

**XII.7** The Delegate of Spain also congratulated the group of experts for its work and its conclusions which throw new light on the World Heritage List. He endorsed the idea that "monumentality" should not be the foremost consideration in the

concept of cultural heritage and particularly stressed Recommendation No. 3 of the expert meeting (p.7 of the document WHC-94/CONF.001/INF.4) regarding the necessity to encourage nominations from regions and for types of properties which are under-represented.

**XII.8** The Delegate of the United States congratulated the expert group for the ideas and proposals contained in the working document which he would communicate to specialists upon his return. He underlined the importance and need to take better account of living cultures and stated that further reflection along these lines should be continued for the development of this study.

**XII.9** The Delegate of Thailand expressed satisfaction with this work which achieved far more than previous studies and which highlighted important matters of great concern to Thailand and many other regions. He endorsed the change in the name "Global Study" to "Global Strategy for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention". This change illustrates the need to redirect attention to important aspects of this implementation which must be considered with care. The preparation of a global strategy will help to throw light on the work of the Committee far better than a simple "study". This strategy will also permit the identification of indispensable elements for a more balanced approach to establishing the List.

The Delegate of Thailand then made several comments on the modifications to certain cultural criteria proposed by the experts in Recommendation No. 7. He endorsed the modification proposed for criterion (i) and stressed the importance of the proposed modification to criterion (ii) which, in its present form, only takes into account cultural influences which occurred in one direction only, between the different continents. This re-examination should be carried out in-depth in order to avoid all notion of any cultural domination: efforts must be made to achieve diversity of the manifestations of different cultures in their interaction with their environment.

The experts' suggestion for criterion (iii) is good, however, cultures which have disappeared should not be forgotten. The Delegate of Thailand felt that this remark should also apply to criterion (v). With regard to criterion (vi), it should be studied with care so that the idea of outstanding universal value which is expressed here, is not just a simple tautology of what has previously been affirmed, point also endorsed by the Delegate of the United States. He continued by proposing to reflect upon the concept of "outstanding" in its temporal dimension. Finally, the Delegate of Thailand stressed that these different remarks were not to be interpreted as criticism but that, on the contrary, he hoped that the group of experts would continue their work along the same lines.

**XII.10** The Delegate of China congratulated the group of experts for its remarkable work and underlined the importance of the reflection on the concept of cultural heritage and the need

to continue according attention in the future to the diversity of cultures so as to achieve a fully representative List.

**XII.11** The Observer of Italy requested clarification of the concept of living culture and the types of properties which could be proposed for inscription according to the thematic categories proposed by the experts. The Vice President of ICOMOS gave him the examples of the Route of Santiago de Compostela, inscribed by the Committee in 1993, which is a good illustration, amongst others, of the cultural dimension of humankind's peregrinations through space; the nomads of Australia, who maintain very special cultural relationships with the land and space; and the Island of Gorée where one of the principal dimensions is symbolic, referring to the phenomenon of slavery.

**XII.12** The Observer of Australia also congratulated the experts on their important and very useful report which introduced significant changes in the process of reflection, especially in favour of living cultures. He advocated a more proactive role for the Committee, the Bureau and the States Parties, and more cooperation between the latter to coordinate their proposals for inscription in a more constructive manner than at present. This should lead to improved coherence in the nominations for inscription and consequently in the List itself.

**XII.13** The Observer of Germany fully endorsed the remarks made by the Delegate of Thailand on the need for reflection on the definition and implications of "outstanding" and "universal" within time and space.

**XII.14** The IUCN Representative remarked that the cultural sites were far more numerous on the List than the natural ones, and as concerns the natural criteria, they had already been revised with regard to the definition of "outstanding", reflected in the Bureau Report of 1979, as "Best property of its type". This concept is not defined elsewhere and IUCN has always applied this formulation ever since: the World Heritage List has, of course, to be very selective; one must be rigorous.

**XII.15** The Secretary General of ICOMOS was satisfied with the excellent cooperation between the Centre and ICOMOS for the preparation and organization of this meeting. The study of these issues should be continued, with particular attention to the evolution of the concepts of heritage and conservation. The findings of this study should be widely disseminated to States Parties to encourage a general reflection, and ICOMOS would naturally wish to be associated with any future regional meetings. The reflection of the group surpasses a simple opposition between nature and culture, it seeks to identify the sites which display a relationship between humankind and nature. The increase in the number of mixed sites could resolve the question raised by the IUCN Representative.

**XII.16** The Director of the Centre announced that the final report of the expert meeting would be annexed to the Bureau

Report (Annex IV), and that its wide diffusion would be ensured, that the proposals of the experts on global strategy would be submitted to the eighteenth session of the Committee, and that the Centre will propose, in its Work Plan and Budget for 1995, the adoption of the necessary measures to continue the work of the expert group and especially to organize the proposed regional meetings.

The Chairperson of the Committee requested the Bureau members to make their written comments to the World Heritage Centre in respect of this document.

### **XIII. PREPARATION OF THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, INCLUDING A DRAFT AGENDA**

**XIII.1** The Delegate of Thailand, Dr Adul Wichiencharoen, informed the Bureau that the preparations of the eighteenth session of the Committee (to be preceded by a two-day meeting of the outgoing Bureau) were well underway. The meetings will be held at the Meridien Hotel, on the Island of Phuket, from 9-10 December (outgoing Bureau) and from 12 to 17 December 1994 inclusive (Committee).

**XIII.2** Bureau members endorsed the provisional agenda as presented in document WHC-94/CONF.001/9, with a modification of item 14, proposed by the Observer of Italy. The modified text now reads: "Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the budget for 1995, and the presentation of a provisional budget for 1996".

**XIII.3** The Bureau also endorsed the proposed draft agenda for the next meeting of the outgoing Bureau (which will meet in Phuket, Thailand, on 9 and 10 December 1994, prior to the Committee session) as presented in document WHC-94/CONF.001/8, with the correction in the French text, item 6, pointed out by the Observer of Italy. The modified text should read: "Examination de la situation du Fonds du patrimoine mondial et du budget provisoire pour 1995 et du budget provisoire pour 1996".

### **XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

**XIV.1** The Observer of the Philippines informed the Bureau that his country will host in April 1995 a regional thematic comparative study meeting: "Rice Cultivation and Rice Terraces Landscapes", organised jointly by the National Commission of the Philippines for UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

**XIV.2** Mr Azedine Beschaouch, Representative of the Assistant Director-General, Culture Sector, informed the Bureau of the follow-up to the declaration concerning Bosnia and Herzegovina, which the World Heritage Committee adopted at its seventeenth session, in Cartagena, and addressed to the Director-General of

UNESCO. Since then, UNESCO undertook to prepare, in cooperation with the Council of Europe, an inventory of the cultural monuments in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and a corresponding action plan. A copy of the Director-General's progress report on this action will be submitted to the forthcoming session of the Executive Board, and will then be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session, in Phuket, with an invitation to all States Parties to participate in the action.

**XV. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

**XV.1** On behalf of the Bureau members and the observers, the Chairperson, Ms Olga Pizano, thanked the Rapporteur and the Secretariat of the World Heritage Centre for their efficiency in preparing the report, and for an overall successful meeting.

**XV.2** The Chairperson then declared the session closed.

**ANNEX I/ANNEXE I**

Distribution limited  
Distribution limitée

WHC-94/CONF.001/INF.2  
Paris, 9 July/juillet 1994

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND  
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION/ORGANISATION DES  
NATIONS UNIES POUR L'EDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD  
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE/CONVENTION CONCERNANT  
LA PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL CULTUREL ET NATUREL**

**Bureau of the World Heritage Committee  
Bureau du Comité du Patrimoine mondial**

Eighteenth session/Dix-Huitième session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris/Siège de l'UNESCO, Paris

4-9 July/4-9 juillet 1994

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

**I. STATES MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU/ETATS MEMBRES DU BUREAU**

**CHINA/CHINE**

Mr Fuzeng YU  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of China to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr Zhan GUO  
Director  
Division of Cultural Relics  
State Bureau of Cultural Relics  
BEIJING

Mr Feng JING  
Programme Officer  
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO  
BEIJING 100816

Mr Kemiao CHEN  
Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation of China to UNESCO  
23 Blvd. Pasteur  
75015 PARIS

#### **COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE**

Ms Olga PIZANO  
Deputy Director General of Cultural Heritage  
COLCULTURA  
Colombian Institute for Culture  
Calle 9# 8-31  
BOGOTA

Mr Jose SALAZAR  
Asesor Subdireccion de Patrimonio  
COLCULTURA  
Colombian Institute for Culture  
Calle 9# 8-31  
BOGOTA

Ms Isabel VERNAZA  
First Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

#### **OMAN**

Dr Musa Bin Jaffar Bin HASSAN  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegation of Oman to UNESCO  
UNESCO HOUSE  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr Kamal Hassan MACKI  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Oman to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**SENEGAL**

Mr. El Hadji Mbaye Bassine DIENG  
Director  
Historic and Ethnographic Culture  
B.P. 4001  
DAKAR

**SPAIN/ESPAGNE**

Mr D. José GUIRAO CABRERA  
Director-General  
Bellas Artes y Archivos  
Plaza del Rey No. 1  
MADRID 28071

Ms Maria MARINE ISIDRO  
Deputy Director of Monuments and Archaeology  
c/Greco No.4  
MADRID 28040

**THAILAND/THAILANDE**

Dr. Adul WICHIECHAROEN  
Chairman  
Thai National Committee on the Convention  
for Protection of World Heritage  
BANGKOK

H.E. M.R. Thep DEVAKULA  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate of Thailand to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr. Sunthad SOMCHEVITA  
Secretary-General  
Office of Environmental Policy & Planning  
60/1 Phibulwattana 7  
Rama VI Road  
BANGKOK 10400

Mrs Srinoi POVATONG  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Thailand to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr Chalernsak WANICHSOMBAT  
Deputy Director-General  
Department of Environmental Quality Promotion  
60/1 Pibulwatana 7  
Rama VI Rd. Phayathai  
BANGKOK

Mr Payung NOPSUWAN  
Director of Natural Resources Conservation Office  
Royal Forest Department  
BANGKOK

M.L. Chiranand HASDINTRA  
Director of Economic Projects Division III  
Bureau of Budget  
BANGKOK

Mr Bovornvate RUNGRUJEE  
Director  
Ayutthaya Historic City Project Office  
Ayutthaya Province

Mrs Usa KIATCHAIPAT  
Environmental Officer  
Office of Environmental Policy & Planning  
60/1 Soi Phibulwattawa 7  
Rama VI  
BANGKOK 10400

Mrs Prasertsuk CHAMORNMARN  
Environmental Officer  
Office of the National Environment Board  
BANGKOK

Mr Amornsate SINGHA  
Second Secretary  
Royal Thai Embassy  
8 rue Greuze  
75116 PARIS

Mr Nathapol KHANTAHIRAN  
Second Secretary  
Royal Thai Embassy  
8 rue Greuze  
75116 PARIS

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE**

Mr Robert MILNE  
 Chief, Office of International Affairs  
 National Park Service  
 Department of the Interior  
 P.O. Box 37127  
 WASHINGTON D.C.20013

Mr. Richard COOK  
 Chief, International Affairs  
 National Park Service  
 P.O. Box 37127  
 WASHINGTON D.C. 20013

Ms Dennise MATHIEU  
 United States Observer  
 US Permanent Observer Mission to UNESCO  
 US Embassy  
 2 av. Gabriel  
 PARIS

**II. ORGANIZATIONS ATTENDING IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY/ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT A TITRE CONSULTATIF**

**INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF THE PRESERVATION AND THE RESTORATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY/CENTRE INTERNATIONAL D'ETUDES POUR LA CONSERVATION ET LA RESTAURATION DES BIENS CULTURELS (ICCROM)**

Mr. Jukka JOKILEHTO  
 Chief  
 Architectural Conservation Programme  
 Via di S. Michele 13  
 00153 ROME  
 Italy

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES/CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES (ICOMOS)**

Mr Jean-Louis LUXEN  
 Secretary General  
 Hôtel Saint Aignan  
 75 rue du Temple  
 75003 PARIS

Mr Henry CLEERE  
 World Heritage Co-ordinator  
 Hôtel Saint Aignan  
 75 rue du Temple  
 75003 PARIS

Mr Daniel DROCOURT  
Mediterranean Action Plan/UNDP  
10ter Square Belsunce  
13001 MARSEILLE

Mr Leo van NISPEN  
Director  
Hôtel Saint Aignan  
75 rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

Ms Joan DOMICELJ  
Vice President ICOMOS  
102 Alfred Street  
Milsons Point 2061  
Australia

Mme Carmen ANON FELIU  
President, Advisory Committee  
Puerto Santamaria 49  
28043 MADRID  
Spain

Mr David MICHELMORE  
Advisor  
Horbury Hall Church Street  
Horbury, Wakefield WF4 6LT  
U.K.

Ms Regina DURIGHELLO  
Assistant to World Heritage Coordinator  
Hôtel Saint Aignan  
75 rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

**THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION (IUCN)/UNION MONDIALE POUR LA NATURE  
(UICN)**

Mr. James THORSELL  
Senior Advisor - Natural Heritage  
Rue Mauverney 28  
CH-1196 GLAND  
Switzerland

**WORLD CONSERVATION MONITORING CENTRE**

Mr James PAINE  
Senior Research Officer  
219 Huntingdon Road  
CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DL  
U.K.

**III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS****ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE**

Ms Maria Susana PATARO  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Argentina to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE**

Dr Alison McCUSKER  
Assistant Secretary  
Environment Strategies Directorate  
Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories  
G.P.O. Box 787  
CANBERRA A.C.T. 2601

Mr Jonathan BROWN  
Alternate Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO  
Australian Embassy  
4 rue Jean Rey  
75015 PARIS

**BELGIUM/BELGIQUE**

Ms Francoise DESCAMPS  
ICOMOS-Belgium  
106 rue du Cornet  
B1040 BRUXELLES

**CANADA**

Ms Jane Roszell  
Director-General National Parks  
Parcs Canada  
25 Eddy Street (4th floor)  
HULL, Quebec K1A 0M5

Ms Gisèle CANTIN  
Chief, International Affairs  
Parcs Canada  
25 Eddy Street  
HULL, Quebec K1A 0M5

Mr Marius ARSENAULT  
Director  
Miguasha National Park  
Province of Quebec

**COSTA RICA**

Ms Iris LEIVA-BILLAULT  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Costa Rica to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**CZECH REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE**

Mr Michel BENES  
Secretary for Cultural Affairs with UNESCO  
Ministry of Culture  
Valdstejnska 10  
11000 PRGAUE 1

Mr Josef STULC  
Director  
State Institute for the Preservation of  
the Cultural Monuments  
Americka 2  
2 PRAGUE 12000

Mr Karel KOMAREK  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of the Czech Republic to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**EL SALVADOR**

Ms Carmen Maria GALLARDO HERNANDEZ  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of El Salvador to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Ms Nanette VIAUD-DESROCHES  
Councillor  
Permanent Delegation of El Salvador to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**FRANCE**

Mr Jean-Louis PONS  
Chief, International Mission  
Ministry of Environment

Mme Stéphanie MORY  
Second Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of France to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mme Anne LEWIS-LOUBIGNAC  
Technical Advisor  
French National Commission  
42 Av. Raymond Poincaré  
75116 PARIS

**GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE**

Mr. Hans CASPARY  
Conservator of Historic Monuments  
Landesamt für Denkmalpflege  
Rheinland-Pfalz  
Göttelmannstrasse 17  
D-55130 Mainz  
Germany

Mr. H. PLACHTER  
Professor for Biology & Natural Preservation  
University Marburg  
Lahnberge  
DW-MARBURG

**GREECE/GRECE**

Mme Maria GUICA  
Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation of Greece to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**HUNGARY/HONGRIE**

Mr Zoltan SZILASSY  
Deputy Head of Department  
National Authority for Nature Conservation  
Ministry of Environment and Regional policy  
Kolto u.21  
H-1121 BUDAPEST

Mr Béla KOVACSI  
Advisor to the Minister  
Ministry of Environment and Regional Planning  
P.O. 351  
BUDAPEST H-1394

**INDIA/INDE**

Mrs Nina SIBAL  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mrs Nagma Mohamed MALLICK  
Second Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**ITALY/ITALIE**

Mr G. LEO  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Italy to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mme Marina MISITANO BERAUD  
Permanent Delegation of Italy to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**JAPAN/JAPON**

Mr Takenu SASAGUCHI  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr Kanefusa MASUDA  
Chief Senior Specialist  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki  
Chiyoda-ku, TOKYO 100

Mr Makoto MOTONAKA  
Senior Specialist, Monuments and Sites  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki  
Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100

Ms Tokuko NABESHIMA  
Attaché  
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**LAOS/LAO**

Mr Khamphao PHONEKEO  
Secretary General of the Laos National  
Commission for UNESCO  
Ministry for National Education  
Vientiane

**LEBANON/LIBAN**

Mr Rizk BAHJAT  
Cultural Attaché  
Permanent Delegation of Lebanon to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**LUXEMBURG/LUXEMBOURG**

Mr Jean-Pierre KRAEMER  
President  
UNESCO National Commission  
4 Chemin Zinaca  
7626 LAROCLETTE

Mr Georges CALTEUX  
Director  
UNESCO National Commission  
26 rue Munster  
9160 LUXEMBURG

**MEXICO/MEXIQUE**

Mr Salvador DIAZ-BERRIO  
Deputy Director for Technical Support and Training  
INAH  
CORDOBA 45  
06700 MEXICO D.F.

**NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS**

Ms Sabine M. GRIMBRERE  
Ministry for Cultural Affairs  
Legal Advisor for International Cultural Affairs  
P.O. Box 3009  
2280 ML RYSWYK  
The Netherlands

**NIGER**

Mr Lambert MESSAN  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Niger to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**NORWAY/NORVEGE**

Ms Ingunn KVISTEROY  
Deputy Secretary General  
Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO  
P.O. Box 1507 VIK  
N-0117 OSLO

Mr Amund SINDING-LARSEN  
Vice-President ICOMOS-Norway  
Stasjonsveien 35  
1300 SANDVIKA

**PERU/PEROU**

Ms Ana Marine ALVARADO de DIAZ  
Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation of Peru to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**PHILIPPINES**

Mr Augusto F. VILLALON  
Commissioner for Philippine Cultural Heritage  
Philippine National Commission for UNESCO  
MANILA

Mrs Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO  
Office of European Affairs  
Department of Foreign Affairs

Ms Evangeline ONG-JIMENEZ  
Philippine Permanent Delegation to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**SLOVAK REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE**

Mme. Viera POLAKOVICOVA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Slovakia to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr Jozef KLINDA  
Director, Department of Environmental Policy  
Ministry of the Environment  
Hlboka 2  
81235 BRATISLAVA

Ms Viera DVORAKOVA  
Advisor  
Institute for Protection of Monuments  
Hnezdoslavovo Nam. E.5  
BRATISLAVA

**SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE ARABE SYTIENNE**

Mr Abd El Karim SAOUD  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Syria to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**TURKEY/TURQUIE**

Mr Taner KARAKAS  
Councillor  
Permanent Delegation of Turkey to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI**

Mr Francis GOLDING  
Secretary, ICOMOS U.K.  
10 Barley Mow Passage  
LONDON W4 4PH

**SECRETARIAT**

Mr Henri LOPES  
Assistant Director-General  
Bureau of Relations with Member States

Mr Mounir BOUCHENAKI  
Director  
Representative of the Assistant Director-General  
Sector for Culture

Mr Azedine BESCHAOUCH  
Representative of the Assistant Director-General  
Sector for Culture

Mr Bernd von DROSTE  
Director  
World Heritage Centre

Mr Pierre LASSERRE  
Director  
Division of Ecological Sciences

Mr Giancarlo RICCIO  
Deputy Director  
World Heritage Centre

World Heritage Centre Staff

**UNESCO/UNDP**

Mr Sylvio MUTAL  
Chief, UNDP/UNESCO Project  
Casilla 4480  
LIMA, Peru

Mr Francisco CARRILLO  
UNESCO Representative  
TUNIS, Tunisia

Limited distribution

WHC-94/CONF.1/2  
7 June 1994  
Original: French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION  
OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Eighteenth session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

4-9 July 1994

**Item 4 of the Provisional Agenda: UNESCO's Medium-Term Plan for  
1996 - 2001 and World Heritage Conservation**

Over the past twenty years, the World Heritage Convention has given a new perspective to the eternal integration of nature and culture, and, in the years to come, this will remain a major thread of continuity in actions undertaken by the World Heritage Centre.

Although different international conventions concerning either culture or nature (such as The Hague Convention or the Biodiversity Convention) have been strengthened or have recently come into force, the 1972 Convention remains the only one to consider as inseparable these two essential elements of life and the evolution of man on earth.

Therefore, over and above the perspectives of daily or medium-term action of the World Heritage Centre, the strengthening and broadening of intellectual reflection which it must help to incite will become increasingly essential: to encourage new insights into nature and its enduring links with the diverse cultural history of mankind; not only has nature consistently served as support, but the balanced use of its resources has permitted the survival of the human race. Therefore, the Centre should also contribute to a better understanding of cultural identities and their specific characteristics. Each culture is not only a group of monuments, beliefs, traditions and knowledge, but it also has specific relationships with animals, plants and all the natural elements. These are amongst the aspects that the 1972 Convention and the World Heritage Centre should help to explore.

However, the value and significance of the cultural heritage goes beyond the rich and multifaceted interactions between nature and culture: the majority of cultural monuments and sites inscribed on the World Heritage List were not all chosen for their "beauty", but also for their significance, their symbolic importance in the main religious beliefs and major events of the history of humankind.

Thus, they are also messengers of the cultures which have erected them, or the events which have seen them emerge and to which they bear witness. Each one of them can and should also play a primordial role as a channel or support for dialogue between cultures and reflection on humankind, and thus respect for others and their identity, and the fight against exclusion. In this way, they would contribute directly to one of the major goals of UNESCO, the construction of a culture for peace.

World Heritage, which is the crystallization of understanding of the relationship between nature and culture on the one hand, and between human beings on the other, also appears as one of the most central and mobilizing themes for environmental education projects, the understanding and respect of cultural diversity, and tolerance and peace.

Consequently, what assessment can be made of the functioning of the Centre and what directions are to be retained for the future?

After twenty years of existence of the Convention and two years of existence of the Centre, their institutional mechanisms have proven their effectiveness:

- \* The List comprises 411 properties inscribed as of 1 January 1994, and it can be said that, except for the properties situated on territories of States which have only recently (or not yet) ratified the Convention, the essential components of the world heritage as we know it today have at least been identified. The List of course is not closed, but it is more through the recognition of new types of properties that one can expect the most significant future developments.
- \* The mechanisms for reception, analysis, treatment and implementation of international assistance requests are at present well-orchestrated at the Centre, and all requests are studied and treated without delay. Within the Sectors, the cooperation and coordination of activities, seen in a "cultural and natural heritage" perspective rather than one of "World Heritage properties", is continually being strengthened and improved. The States Parties are satisfied with the actions implemented by the Centre, and UNESCO in general, in this field.
- \* The bases for a promotional policy have been established and several activities in this field have been implemented over recent years, in particular at the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Convention. Here again, although much remains to be done, we are on solid ground.

These different points should provide the basis for reflection on the perspectives, both conceivable and desirable, for the World Heritage Centre for the period 1996-2001.

It would appear that the conclusions to be drawn are that we must evolve from the quantitative to the qualitative, and in several directions:

1. For the **future development of the List**, and to **complete World Heritage identification**, qualitative rather than quantitative reflection is called for. Most of the monuments and sites of universal importance, considered from the viewpoint of traditional categories of "classical" art history, have already been identified, and for the most part, inscribed.

Reflection should now focus on more fundamental and somewhat "philosophical" problems: What concept of human heritage is selected by the List as it exists today? What is human heritage today, does it only comprise the types of properties representing the majority on the List today, or does it also comprise other categories of properties, little or not represented, or even those to which no thought has yet been given? The recent revisions to the Convention's criteria, which introduce the idea of cultural landscapes, now allows the international recognition of new forms of non-monumental cultural heritage of different cultures, and correlatively of associated beliefs and traditions.

This widening of the Convention's concept of cultural heritage to non-constructed aspects should obviously be pursued and elaborated without going beyond the framework established in 1972.

On the practical side, it will allow the States which are not yet Party to the Convention and whose national cultures have produced few or no "monuments", to join the Convention and find their place. This requires a serious qualitative reflection on the List, the notion of human heritage, and consequently on the global study and the necessary associated thematic studies.

2. **Monitoring the state of conservation of sites:**

Ninety-six reports on the state of conservation of the 378 sites inscribed at that time were presented in 1993 to the Committee or its Bureau. If this number should further increase in the future, it is more towards an improvement of the monitoring **methods** of the sites already inscribed (or to be inscribed) that efforts should be made, in close liaison with the States Parties themselves:

- a) for basic reasons of principle : it serves no purpose to inscribe a site of universal value on the List if its preservation is not assured;
- b) for reasons related to the history of the Convention: because the heritage of the highly developed countries

was largely inscribed in the first years of the Convention, and amongst those that have been inscribed recently, or will be in the future, the proportion of properties situated in countries which have a more pressing need for assistance in this field, will probably increase;

- c) for reasons owing to the general evolution of the world: because over the years, the number of threats which weigh upon the heritage appear, unfortunately, to increase.

For all these reasons, not only must extensive monitoring action be developed, but also, and especially, its quality must be improved. This entails the development of monitoring mechanisms which are systematic, decentralized and particularly, as far as possible, preventive. This monitoring should be carried out using to the greatest extent possible, the centralized services of the Organization, its regional offices and its field representatives, but also with our "traditional" partners, which are the international and "local" NGOs (e.g. ICOMOS, IUCN, WCMC, WWF and others) and especially in close cooperation with the States Parties themselves, which of course assume the major responsibility for the conservation of the sites. Recognition of the need to safeguard the sites and prevent any political, economic or administrative action occurring which would endanger the values and characteristics for which the site was inscribed on the List must be encouraged. Site managers and local authorities as well as local populations should be made aware of the immense value of the sites, so they may fully recognize that they belong to world heritage and thus are of exceptional value. The general public should be informed and educated so that they may contribute to the protection of the sites. These are some of the actions for which cooperation with the States Parties is indispensable in order to safeguard this heritage.

Links should be established or strengthened with the NGOs, in particular all those that work at the regional, national and local levels and which testify, in their associative forms, to the citizens' interest in their heritage, so that state of conservation reports can be compiled regularly from the "field".

3. At present, all requests for **international assistance** received by the Centre are treated and implemented satisfactorily, but in the coming years the change in the scale of our action must be taken into account. Indeed, due consideration being given to the increasing threats to the conservation of sites, which, alas, are amplified owing to political unrest, civil wars, natural or man-made catastrophes and increasing poverty in many rural zones of developing countries where numerous World Heritage sites are situated, our actions should be carried out on quite another scale than that which is presently provided for by the Convention. The funds currently available play an important catalytic role in preparing conservation measures and consequently giving momentum to the implementation of projects, especially as concerns preparatory assistance. But, even if this allocation is greatly appreciated by the States

Parties, the three types of assistance available (technical cooperation, training and promotion) will become increasingly insufficient: our action should be carried out on a much greater scale, and this is why we are attempting to establish a fund-raising policy based on the project policy (cf. point 4). As the ultimate goal of our action is to respond not only to isolated requests but to encourage significant transfers, financial, human and technical, not only in order to fulfil these needs, particularly in their multiple aspects, but especially to ensure that the populations and site managers are given the opportunity to learn that their true interest lies in being our partners in the long-term conservation of the sites, and not in committing destructive actions for immediate but temporary benefits.

In increasing the three budget lines of the World Heritage Fund for technical cooperation, monitoring and the global study (for the latter, very modestly), during its seventeenth session in 1993, the Committee made way for future development. But in the coming years, other means should be found to increase technical cooperation and more particularly, our efforts should concentrate on the quality of our action, (here again it is with regard to the qualitative aspect that efforts should be made):

- by foreseeing the needs of States Parties, through continual close cooperation with them and the site managers (cf. monitoring), so as to develop a liaison and a preventive and advisory role, and through this to envisage, even to instigate, with them well before damage occurs, well-targeted and formulated requests for international assistance, and to ensure close monitoring of the implementation and evaluation of the results, and possible necessary future action.
  - In further developing cooperation with the Sectors, not only **Culture** (CLT/CH) and **Science** (SC/ECO), but also with the other divisions or sectors, and in closely associating conservation and the sustainable development of populations. For example, with the **Education** Sector for all that concerns heritage education and creating people's awareness of their traditional cultures, non-physical heritage, science for sustainable development, cultural tourism, etc. In this way, world heritage should hold a central place in UNESCO with a mobilizing and "catalytic" role.
4. A veritable **project policy** should be elaborated rather than waiting for isolated requests from States Parties. This policy could cover the training component, for which professional competence already exists at the Centre, and also fund-raising for specific conservation projects. On this basis, a fund-raising policy and even a marketing approach should be conceived and refined in a global and strategic perspective avoiding isolated and uncoordinated

actions. The elaboration of a clear and coherent concept of our engagement and the links which could be established between heritage conservation and the interests of potential important donors should permit not only to secure financial or in-kind assistance, but also to establish true technological partnerships for the safeguarding of the sites with technically-advanced major international companies. It could also encourage local populations to become increasingly involved in in-situ conservation of their cultural heritage, by preserving its aspect of a support for social life which is a source of continual regeneration of community life and is also propitious in conserving the traditions, techniques and knowledge of cultures of which this heritage is born.

The great majority of local populations could and should be closely associated with the management and safeguarding of the sites, regardless of whether, for example, specific techniques concerning the conservation of material of vegetal origin are concerned or a profound knowledge of nature and its ecological balance. In any event, it is clear that the long-term conservation of properties inscribed on the List will never be guaranteed unless human heritage is first and foremost the concern of those who live alongside it.

5. **Promotion** of the Convention should of course continue to be developed and, as is already reflected in the present biennium, should no longer solely promote the Convention, but should also disseminate information on the heritage and values of members of every culture of the world. In order to achieve this, and fully carry out its role at World Heritage sites, as well as with the entire civil community, promotion must be in step with the 21st century by mobilizing the most advanced technologies: its field of intervention is worldwide, and information dissemination between the sites scattered throughout our Planet should be continual and thorough. The progressive establishment of a number of small "World Heritage centres" in a few selected countries according to the geographical size of the region or the sub-region, the number of sites inscribed, the number and specificity of the cultural areas which are represented and the countries' ability to mobilize human and financial resources, also requires live multimedia communication such as will be provided by the "information highways" which are already under construction. As a first objective, two or three "centres" could be envisaged for the Europe/United States/Canada region, one or two for Latin America, one for the Arab States, one or two for Africa, and two or three for Asia and the Pacific.

Here again, all means must be mobilized in order to anticipate technological progress, rather than, as is often the case, attempt to catch up with it : information channels for promotion will also be used by the constellation of partners in need of advice, assistance, training and education -- sites, but also relays of the civil society -- which will increasingly

express themselves in terms of values represented by world heritage. Several events of worldwide importance should also be the occasion for a very broad diffusion of world heritage messages. At the occasion of the 50th anniversaries of the UN in 1995, then UNESCO in 1996, carefully prepared large exhibitions on World Heritage sites should be presented, to show how, by their symbolic impact and the messages they carry on beliefs, hopes and events of the history of humankind, they illustrate and embody -- sometimes positively, sometimes also negatively -- the great ideals that we defend: peace, justice, tolerance, education, recognition and respect of others. Other important world events, such as the World Exhibitions of 1996 and 2000, amongst others, should provide the opportunity to disseminate throughout the world the messages of our Organization based on heritage values.

To complement these important events, and to ensure the continuity and permanence of diffusion of our message, we will continue to develop our publication The World Heritage Newsletter, which is extremely well-received by States Parties and our partners, to reinforce cooperation with our partners in the field (State Party officials, site managers, international and local NGOs...) and our colleagues in the Organization (CLT, SC, ED, OPI...) to diffuse our experiences of concrete problems and actions undertaken, in a clear and precise manner. Links could also be established through worldwide reviews and journals specializing in our field of competence.

All these considerations indicate two major lines of action for the years to come:

- a) an in-depth **intellectual reflection** on our concepts and practices. Not only on the continual study of the concept of humankind's heritage, but also on the best ways of ensuring the safeguarding of the cultural and natural heritage, sustainable human development and the preservation of the diversity of cultural identities which mutually sustain one another.
- b) a more **decentralized** approach to problems.

All this holds true, as we have seen, with respect to the completion of the identification of world heritage and the completion of the List, monitoring, the implementation of international assistance and promotion/education.

Our future direction should now focus on a threefold action, with more flexible and autonomous administrative and organizational structures which can only be clearly defined through the Organization's thorough reflection and careful self-examination. This threefold action will be:

- **centrifugal** in order to expand and disseminate our message throughout the world, probably at a sub-regional level, to get closer to the sites and

populations, without losing our role of decision-making and central guidance: this is **decentralization**, or perhaps rather **deconcentration**;

- **centripetal**, not only to be immediately informed of the problems, preoccupations and achievements of those in the field, but also to centrally converge the knowledge, reflections and intellectual collaboration which must be expressed in accordance with the specificities of world cultures to which belong, first and foremost, the sites and monuments which it is our duty to protect.
  
- **transversal**, to unite in a project and a global action the different components of UNESCO, and foresee a **transectoral** working situation of the Centre, whereby World Heritage is a federative and mobilizing concept and one of the focal points for the implementation of the Organization's action.

Only under these conditions can the 1972 Convention attain its ultimate philosophical goals which, beyond the safeguarding of the great achievements of humankind and Nature, clearly concern their reciprocal interactions, the memory of their past and the guarantee of their perpetuity.

Limited distribution

WHC-94/CONF.001/3a.Add.1

17 June 1994

Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION  
OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Eighteenth session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

4-9 July 1994

Item 5.1. of the Provisional agenda: State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:

addendum 1: Progress report on the implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee regarding the methodology of systematic monitoring.

1. SUMMARY INTRODUCTION

Following the recommendations of the expert meeting on the methodology of systematic monitoring (Cambridge, 1-4 November 1993) and the decisions of the World Heritage Committee at its seventeenth session in December 1993, the Secretariat proceeded, in consultation with the advisory bodies and individual experts, with the further development of the framework and methodology of systematic monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites.

This progress report presents a proposal which integrates two complementary elements, both of which are indispensable for a credible and successful monitoring and reporting system.

The first is the systematic and repeated observation of the conditions of a site and its periodic reporting -with external advice- to the World Heritage Committee. These activities are generally being understood to be the prime responsibility of the States Parties and the agency with management authority.

The second element is the Committee's strategy towards systematic monitoring which would be characterized by a regional approach and the provision of external advice and assistance to the States Parties in putting management and monitoring structures in place and in preparing the periodic state of conservation reports.

Such an integral monitoring and reporting system would have an immediate and long-term impact on actions and decisions taken on all levels:

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

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

**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.

The proposed monitoring structure implies a cooperative effort between the site-manager, the States Parties and the World Heritage Committee, with two objectives in mind: improved site-management and conservation, and a more effective regional, national and site specific World Heritage cooperation.

## 2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The immediate background to these proposals is the World Heritage Committee session in Cartagena and the expert meeting in Cambridge. To set the proposals in context, however, it is useful to go all the way back to the World Heritage Convention and the Operational Guidelines themselves.

2.2 Article 4 of the Convention states:

"Each State Party to this Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage referred to in Articles 1 and 2 and situated on its territory, belong, primarily to that State. It will do all it can to this end, to the utmost of its own resources and, where appropriate, with any international assistance and co-operation, in particular, financial, artistic, scientific and technical, which it may be able to obtain."

Article 27.2 states:

"They [the States Parties] shall undertake to keep the public broadly informed of the dangers threatening this heritage and of activities carried on in pursuance of this Convention."

2.3 Article 29 of the Convention states:

"1. The States Parties to this Convention shall, in the reports which they submit to the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on dates and in a manner to be determined by it, give information on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have adopted and other action which they have taken for the application of this Convention, together with details of the experience acquired in this field.

2. These reports shall be brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee."

It is also worth noting that the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention require the State Party to inform the Committee "of their intention to undertake or authorize in an area protected under the Convention major restorations or new constructions which may affect the World Heritage value of the property" (par. 58) and a state of conservation report to accompany all requests for technical assistance (par. 94.e).

2.4 By adhering to the Convention the States Parties have thus accepted the obligation to report to the Committee on the implementation of the Convention in general and on the conditions of and threats to the sites in particular.

2.5 Following the sixteenth session of the Committee where "The Committee noted that the monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites will receive greater emphasis than the identification and designation of sites in the future work of the Convention", the Operational Guidelines also define the role of the Committee in monitoring. Paragraph 3 states that the Committee "has four essential functions." The second of these is to "monitor the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List" (ibid).

Other references to monitoring in the Operational Guidelines relate to the List of World Heritage in

Danger. Paragraph 81 reads: "The Committee shall review at regular intervals the state of property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This review shall include such monitoring procedures and expert missions as might be determined necessary by the Committee."

- 2.6 Taken together with the calls for assessments of nominated sites before inscription and before inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Operational Guidelines thus indicate what might be termed reactive quasi-judicial monitoring, the assessment of sites by external experts against objective criteria with a view to procedural action as a consequence.
- 2.7 In practice, as shown widely in the papers of the World Heritage Bureau and of the Committee, there has been much monitoring and reporting of sites on the World Heritage List. Since the mid 1980's there has also been a continuing feeling that a more systematic and less reactive system should be introduced. The expert meeting in Cambridge in November 1993 was conceived in order to carry this work forward.

### 3. DISCUSSION

- 3.1 The Cambridge meeting focused on the difference between monitoring, the systematic repeated observation of a site at regular intervals, and reporting, the compilation of summary reports of those observations together with proposals for remedying problems identified. See WHC-93/CONF.002/INF5 for fuller definitions of the terms used. It considered the importance of involving different agencies at different levels in the monitoring process and stressed the need to obtain and up-date information on a systematic basis. Underlying this discussion there was a commonly held view amongst the participants that monitoring should lead to better management of the sites and should enable the achievement or non-achievement of management aims to be recorded.
- 3.2 Before bringing forward proposals for advancing this work, it may be worth briefly considering the underlying assumption about systematic observation. This implies that in respect of each World Heritage Site it will be possible to establish indicators in the form of statistical data which can be measured at regular intervals in order to observe the health of a site and the quality of its management. These

indicators will need to be specific to a site or type of site, but the expectation seems to be general that they can be found.

- 3.3 Consideration of the evidence and practical experience in monitoring sites suggest that this is a false hope. Factual data about the name, ownership, location and extent of sites need to be recorded, but say nothing about their state of conservation. In the case of natural sites the number of species is highly important. An important decline in number would be significant, but would come at the end of a process of poor management, increasing pollution, natural disaster or other threat. Other data held by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) is selective and descriptive and is not in the form of statistical indicators.
- 3.4 In the case of cultural sites the problem is greater in that many of the objective indicators which might be chosen -the rate of erosion of a stone surface, for example- present problems of measurement as well as of selection. It would be wrong, however, to over-stress the differences between the types of sites; in both cases objectivity is not easily achievable by statistical means.
- 3.5 This apparently negative point has been stressed for several related reasons. It explains the aspiration for a methodology which is consistent and objective, and at the same time it explains why previous attempts to devise questionnaires and centralized approaches have been opposed by experts and have not been fruitful. It also points to the difficulties faced by any external observer who wishes to measure change over time. It underlines the need for any account of a site to be both descriptive and to be based on an informed judgement, preferably on the part of someone closely familiar with the site.
- 3.6 In the light of these considerations it is possible to set out some criteria for a system of monitoring and reporting.

#### 4. REQUIREMENTS FOR MONITORING PROCEDURES

- 4.1 Documentation should be prepared on a consistent basis, not because sites are the same or can use the same indicators, but simply for ease in compiling, storing, accessing and handling information.

- 4.2 Within the operation of the World Heritage Convention, the process of describing a site should take the same form from its nomination for inscription onwards.
- 4.3 Information about a site and an expert view of its condition and changes over time should be reported regularly through the World Heritage Centre to the World Heritage Committee and stored with the papers relating to each site in a way which makes it readily accessible to the Committee and to other interested parties. It is essential that the site managers be involved in the process of monitoring, and that there be a participation by professionals or an agency independent of the national organization with direct management responsibility in order to ensure the credibility and objectivity of the reporting.
- 4.4 At the level of the individual site, however, monitoring should be a normal part of the management process, keeping track of expenditure, works of maintenance and repair, staffing changes, external threats and so on. It should be carried out by those with the greatest relevant knowledge, those with direct management responsibility for the site. In larger sites, notably but not exclusively historic towns, this management approach will need to be incorporated into the work of a number of agencies.
- 4.5 At the level of the State Party, information which results from monitoring should be used to generate a report on the way in which it is meeting its obligations under the World Heritage Convention and an indication of the strength of its heritage management systems. The systems devised to establish and oversee monitoring should also provide a way of ensuring co-ordination and co-operation between the various agencies responsible for World Heritage sites.
- 4.6 At the level of the Committee and the Centre, a properly functioning monitoring and reporting system should provide the evidence that the Convention is fully respected by States Parties. It should provide the basis on which the resources of the Fund and other kinds of assistance can be directed. In time, it should reduce the need for exercise in reactive monitoring in response to specific problems and reports (but see paragraph 6.16 below). It is therefore important to produce a system which leads to a gradual improvement in the management and state of conservation of the sites.

- 4.7 At the level of the Centre, the system should improve information and communication with the sites and the State Parties. It should enable the Centre and other World Heritage partners to make the best use of their ability to assess, advise and train, as well as to enhance their information base.
- 4.8 In order to optimize the impact and efficiency of monitoring and the results thereof, a national or regional approach to monitoring should be applied by the Centre. For each programme of monitoring, appropriate partners should be identified for involvement. Such programmes could be initiated with workshops for the partners and other participants in the monitoring activity with the objectives of establishing the framework, defining needs for training in the methods of management and monitoring, and identifying professional resources in the region.

5. **THE BASIS OF THE PROPOSALS**

- 5.1 Under the Convention it is the States Parties which accept obligations towards the World Heritage sites and obligations to prepare reports for the Committee. The State Party, therefore, is crucial to, and should be at the centre of, the world-wide monitoring and reporting system which it is intended to introduce.
- 5.2 This is not to say that the State Party at the level of central government or national institution should carry out the task in isolation. On the contrary, it should already be clear that involvement at the site level is imperative if monitoring worth the name is to take place. To provide authority and credibility, another necessary element for reporting is an independent element, working alongside the site authorities and the state parties. This might come from an individual or organization with relevant experience from within or outside the country. Regional cooperation can also provide a useful mechanism for establishing systems and providing an independent element: these proposals draw heavily on the experiment in Latin America co-ordinated by the UNDP/UNESCO Regional Project. What is vital, however, is that there should be a reporting relationship between the State Party and the Committee underlying any other relationship or form or organization involved in the monitoring. These proposals will only be made to work effectively if States Parties accept the obligation to produce regular reports and introduce arrangements for doing so.

- 5.3 A pro-active strategy from the World Heritage Committee towards the States Parties and the sites is equally indispensable. The experience of the Latin American monitoring programme has shown that an external involvement in monitoring is fully acceptable to most of the States Parties if this is based upon a continuous cooperation between an external partner -in this case a UNESCO project- and the States Parties and the site managers. Essential elements of a monitoring strategy should be: regional cooperation, the provision of information, advice and assistance in setting up adequate management and monitoring structures, and involvement in the preparation of credible state of conservation reports.

A regional approach will optimize the impact and efficiency of monitoring and will enable the Committee to define regional strategies for World Heritage activities.

- 5.4 The basis of these proposals can be described as follows:

#### The States Parties' Responsibility

- a) Monitoring, the continuous observation of the conditions of the site, is (to be) incorporated in the day-to-day management of the site, resulting in annual reports to be prepared by the site manager or management authority.
- b) 5-yearly state of conservation reports will be prepared by the States Parties with the involvement of the site-manager/management authority and an external partner, preferably in the context of the regional monitoring programmes that will be set up by the Secretariat.
- c) The State Party will present the 5-year reports to the Secretariat.
- d) The Secretariat will collect the 5-year reports, verify their contents and prepare with the help of its decentralized regional structure Regional State of the World Heritage Reports for presentation to the World Heritage Committee. The first of these reports will be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session: the State of the cultural World Heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean, which will be the result of the UNDP/UNESCO Latin American Monitoring Programme. Regional monitoring programmes will be launched in the coming years for Asia, Africa, Europe and the Arab States.

Once the monitoring system is properly launched, the Committee would review every year the report on one specific region.

- e) On the basis of these reports, the World Heritage Committee will, if appropriate, make specific recommendations to the State Party on actions to be taken. Decision-making regarding regional or national World Heritage policies and activities and regarding requests for technical cooperation will equally be based on those reports.

#### The Pro-active Monitoring Strategy

- f) Parallel to inviting the States Parties to put monitoring and reporting systems in place, the Committee instructs the Secretariat to initiate regional monitoring programmes.
- g) The Secretariat establishes a workplan for worldwide and regional monitoring programmes and identifies the most appropriate partner(s) for monitoring in each of the regions, who will serve as the regional focal point for monitoring.
- h) In the context of these regional programmes, the Centre establishes contacts with States Parties, site-managers and other possible participants and defines jointly with them the most appropriate regional monitoring strategy. If necessary, regional seminars will be held to initiate the monitoring process.
- i) Upon request and in line with the decisions of the World Heritage Committee, the Centre provides assistance and external advice to the States Parties and the site-manager on management practices and collaborates in the preparation of the 5-year state of conservation reports.

## **6. DETAILED PROPOSALS**

### Nomination Form

- 6.1 Since the beginning of the process for a potential World Heritage site is the compilation of a nomination form, it seems appropriate to begin detailed proposals with that form. Annex I lists the headings under which it is proposed to group the questions on the form and the questions themselves. The aim is to produce a logical series of groupings for the questions, to seek for more precision in replies than the current form, and to give much more weight to management

considerations. The notes to the form should emphasize the need to provide specific information and to annex important documents such as management plans. In this way the question of World Heritage site nomination should from the beginning be brought close to the management process. Site managers should always help to complete it.

- 6.2 Approval is sought for the Nomination form outlined in Annex I with the understanding that explanatory notes will be prepared to accompany the nomination forms.

#### "Baseline" Information

- 6.3 Once completed, the nomination form should also 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 Centre or the advisory bodies have significant questions to raise about a nomination, it is recommended that they are answered by way of a specific amendment or revision of the nomination form. No site should be recommended by the advisory bodies for inscription until they are satisfied with the contents of the form.
- 6.4 The Secretariat will make the necessary arrangements for the adequate storage and management of the nomination file, state of conservation reports and other relevant material, forwarding copies to the appropriate advisory bodies and making full use of the information/documentation services of WCMC/IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM, and others. Particularly where cultural sites are concerned, there is a need for considerable further work to develop systems for storing, handling and networking information.
- 6.5 Approval is sought for these proposals for using and storing the baseline informations.

#### Monitoring

- 6.6 Once a site has been inscribed, monitoring should be the responsibility of those in day-to-day charge of the site. This should be built in to the planning and budgeting process. Each year, at the start of the planning round, the information in the nomination form should be reviewed. Much of the information will not change from year to year and only significant changes need to be noted.

- 6.7 On certain matters, however, a brief written statement should be prepared each year for the use of site managers and information of the State Party.

These are:

- 6.7.1 Present state of conservation (Ref. 3d in the form)
- 6.7.2 Agreed plans relating to the property (Ref. 4f in the form)
- 6.7.3 External Factors Affecting the Site (Ref. 5a-f in the form).

- 6.8 In the light of the report described in the previous paragraph, annual budgets and plans for maintenance, conservation and management should be prepared or rolled forward.

- 6.9 Approval is sought for this formula for regular monitoring, and of the proposal that State Parties should be invited to ensure that such arrangements are in place.

#### Monitoring and Reporting Strategy

- 6.10 The Secretariat develops proposals for regional monitoring programmes for approval by the Committee for each of which the most appropriate partner(s) should be identified. These regional programmes should aim at establishing a communication and collaboration between the States Parties, the sites and the Secretariat, promoting regional cooperation, providing information, advice and assistance in setting up adequate management and monitoring structures, assisting in the preparation of credible five-year reports (as described in the following section) and preparing regional state of conservation reports for presentation to the World Heritage Committee.

- 6.11 Approval is sought for this regional monitoring and reporting strategy.

#### Regular Reporting

- 6.12 It is proposed that every five years the information in the nomination form should be carefully reviewed, and a written report should be sent by the State Party

to the World Heritage Centre. The State Party should be responsible for ensuring the reports are prepared. Site managers should also be involved in the preparation, but there should always also be an independent element, i.e. the involvement of a qualified agency or individual from outside the organization responsible for managing the site, e.g: in the context of the regional programmes that will be set up by the Secretariat (see paragraph 6.10).

- 6.13 In addition to providing up-to-date information, each report should include a schedule of recommended action to deal with problems or threats identified, together with an identified agency for taking the action and an indication as to whether the agency concerned has accepted responsibility for, and the practicality of, the action concerned. These recommendations may involve the State Party, the Bureau and the Committee, as well as agencies more directly involved. In forwarding the reports, the State Party should comment on each recommendation.
- 6.14 In cases where a request for technical assistance is made to the Centre, such a report should always be prepared and annexed to the request (Operational Guidelines, paragraph 94.(b)). In the case of sites which are already inscribed on the list, it is proposed that within five years reports based on the revised nomination form be prepared and submitted.
- 6.15 Approval is sought for these proposals for the compilation, submission and handling of regular monitoring reports.

#### Reactive Monitoring

- 6.16 In the case of sites which are threatened or damaged by natural disasters or unforeseen dangers, or where for whatever reason there is perceived to be a major problem or concern, it will remain necessary to undertake special missions of investigative analysis and recommendations. Such cases will continue to be handled as they arise. It is, however, to be hoped that as a system of systematic monitoring and reporting is introduced, the need for such missions will gradually decline.
- 6.17 Properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger will, in accordance with the Operational Guidelines paragraphs 75-82, be systematically monitored on a regular basis so as to assess whether additional

measures are required to conserve the property, whether the property should be deleted from the List of World Heritage in Danger if the property is no longer under threat, or whether to consider deletion of the property from the World Heritage List.

### Training

- 6.18 It will be clear from what has been said above that it would be wrong to conceive of monitoring as a subject for separate training. A site which is well-managed will be well-monitored and it would be contrary to the spirit and intention of these proposals to specify training based simply around the proposals set out in this paper.
- 6.19 Two training approaches to these proposals seem to be appropriate:
- 6.19.1 Discussion of the proposals once adopted as an item on the agenda of existing meetings, seminars and training activities, both national and regional.
  - 6.19.2 Regional workshops on the management and monitoring of World Heritage sites for site managers directly involved.

### Resource Requirement

- 6.20 Systematic monitoring by management staff will not impose an additional requirement on managers. Experience suggests that an independent contribution to a five-yearly monitoring report should take of the order of 10 person days (in the range 5-15 days depending on the complexity of the site). In exceptional cases and within the limits of the available resources, assistance may be provided to this effect.

## **7. PROPOSED ACTIONS 1994-1995**

**The Bureau is requested to consider the proposals as presented in this document and to formulate recommendations thereon.**

**The Bureau is requested to endorse the following workplan for the remainder of 1994 and for 1995:**

- July-October 1994: initiate discussions of the amended proposals with World Heritage site managers and representatives of States Parties at the occasion of regional/national seminars.
- December 1994: report on the outcome of these consultations and presentation of the proposals for consideration and decision-making to the Committee at its eighteenth session. The Secretariat will attempt to present a draft text on monitoring for inclusion in the Operational Guidelines as well as a revised nomination form.
- Early 1995: inform the States Parties of the decisions of the Committee and invite them to put monitoring structures in place. Implement the decisions of the Committee.
- Bureau Meeting mid-1995: first evaluation of the application of the new monitoring procedures.

**WORLD HERITAGE LIST NOMINATION FORM**

To be completed on A4 paper  
with maps and plans to a maximum of A3

**1. Identification of the Property**

- a. Country
- b. State, Province or Region
- c. Name of Property
- d. Category of Property (e.g. historic town, medieval cathedral, tropical forest)
- e. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates
- f. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area proposed for inscription and of any buffer zone
- g. Area of site proposed for inscription (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.) if any (natural sites only).

**2. Justification for Inscription**

- a. Statement of signification
- b. Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar sites)
- c. 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
- e. Authenticity/integrity

**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**

- 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.

Distribution Limited

WHC-94/CONF.001/INF.4  
Paris, 28 June 1994  
Original : French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Eighteenth session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

4-9 July 1994

**Expert Meeting on the "Global Strategy" and thematic studies for  
a representative World Heritage List  
(UNESCO Headquarters, 20-22 June 1994)**

**I. Background and objectives**

A document (WHC-93/CONF.002/8) on the current situation and the prospects of the "Global Study" and thematic studies was presented by the Secretariat to the Committee at its 17th Meeting in Cartagena (Colombia). After this document had been studied by the Committee, the Delegate of the United States of America urged ICOMOS and the Centre to continue this activity, taking into account the work that had already been carried out.

To this end, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS organized a working group meeting at the UNESCO Headquarters on 20-22 June 1994 to concentrate on the representative nature of the World Heritage List and the methodology for its definition and implementation, to which experts from Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Niger, Sri Lanka, and Tunisia were invited (the list of participants is annexed to this report).

Many high-quality attempts had been made over the past decade to consider the best ways of ensuring the representative nature, and hence the credibility, of the World Heritage List in the future, but they had failed to achieve a consensus among the scientific community, despite the fact that all the component bodies and partners of the Convention were conscious of its weaknesses and imbalances. Since the adoption of the Convention

by the General Conference of UNESCO in 1972, moreover, the concept of cultural heritage had also developed considerably in meaning, depth, and extent. The object of this meeting was therefore to carry out an examination in depth of all the studies made of this question over the last ten years and to arrive at concepts and a common methodological procedure as a result of a detailed analysis of the different approaches adopted.

All the earlier contributions to this debate, which had been brought together and analysed in the ICOMOS document *Framework for a Global Study*, were therefore studied in the initial phase of the meeting:

- 1984 Efforts by the Secretariat to put forward initial thoughts, which were both thematic and centred on architecture.
- 1987-1988 Expert groups convened by the Sri Lankan Ambassador to study the concept of a "Global Study" and its frame of reference, with several thematic studies.
- 1991 Recommendation by the World Heritage Bureau that a combined temporal, cultural, and thematic approach should be adopted for the Global Study.
- 1992 ICOMOS proposal based on the idea of "cultural provinces" and proposal from the USA and Greece to expand the ICOMOS proposal by developing a three-dimensional "time-culture-human achievement" grid and implementing this by means of numerous thematic studies.
- 1992 Proposal by M. Léon Pressouyre, in his publication *La Convention du patrimoine mondial vingt ans après*, that there should be a thematic approach oriented towards categories of property that are little or not at all represented on the World Heritage List.
- 1993 ICOMOS expert meeting in Colombo (Sri Lanka) during which the approach involving the three-dimensional grid and "cultural provinces" was reaffirmed. The results of this meeting gave rise to many discussions in the expert community.

## II. The content of the meeting

The three days of in-depth discussions by the experts led to unanimous agreement being reached on a number of observations.

It was apparent to all the participants that from its inception the World Heritage List had been based on an almost exclusively "monumental" concept of the cultural heritage, ignoring the fact that not only scientific knowledge but also intellectual attitudes towards the extent of the notion of cultural heritage, together with the perception and understanding of the history of human societies, had developed considerably in the past twenty years. Even the way in which different societies looked at themselves - their values, history, and the relations that they maintained or had maintained with other societies - had developed significantly. In 1972 the idea of cultural heritage had been to a very large extent embodied in and confined to architectural monuments. Since that time, however, the history of art and architecture, archaeology, anthropology, and ethnology no longer concentrated on single monuments in isolation but rather on considering cultural groupings that were complex and multidimensional, which demonstrated in spatial terms the social structures, ways of life, beliefs, systems of knowledge, and representations of different past and present cultures in the entire world. Each individual piece of evidence should therefore be considered not in isolation but within its whole context and with an understanding of the multiple reciprocal relationships that it had with its physical and non-physical environment.

Against this background, therefore, it was appropriate to set aside the idea of a rigid and restricted World Heritage List and instead to take into account all the possibilities for extending and enriching it by means of new types of property whose value might become apparent as knowledge and ideas developed. The List should be receptive to the many and varied cultural manifestations of outstanding universal value through which cultures expressed themselves.

This process of reflection should thus be continuous, pragmatic, and evolutionary in nature, based on systematic reference to the international scientific community; it should also be at all times prepared to identify the gaps in the List and to organize studies of those gaps.

A number of gaps and imbalances were already discernible on the World Heritage List:

- Europe was over-represented in relation to the rest of the world;
- historic towns and religious buildings were over-represented in relation to other types of property;
- Christianity was over-represented in relation to other religions and beliefs;

- historical periods were over-represented in relation to prehistory and the 20th century;
- "elitist" architecture was over-represented in relation to vernacular architecture;
- in more general terms, all living cultures - and especially the "traditionnal" ones -, with their depth, their wealth, their complexity, and their diverse relationships with their environment, figured very little on the List. Even traditional settlements were only included on the List in terms of their "architectural" value, taking no account of their many economic, social, symbolic, and philosophical dimensions or of their many continuing interactions with their natural environment in all its diversity. This impoverishment of the cultural expression of human societies was also due to an over-simplified division between cultural and natural properties which took no account of the fact that in most human societies the landscape, which was created or at all events inhabited by human beings, was representative and an expression of the lives of the people who live in it and so was in this sense equally culturally meaningful.

In order to ensure for the future a World Heritage List that was at the same time representative, balanced, and credible, the expert group considered it to be necessary not only to increase the number of types, regions, and periods of cultural property that are under-represented in the coming years, but also to take into account the new concepts of the idea of cultural heritage that had been developed over the past twenty years. To achieve this it was advisable for there to be a process of continuous collaborative study of the development of knowledge, scientific thought, and views of relationships between world cultures. In addition, the expert group preferred the more dynamic, continuous, and evolutionary concept of a "Global Strategy" to the term "Global Study", which conjured up the idea of a study that was rigid, unique, and definitive.

This global strategy should take the form of an action programme covering several phases over at least five years. It should be based on a methodological technique designed to identify the major gaps relating to types of property, regions of the world, cultures, and periods in the List.

It would result in comparative studies that would call upon the skills and ideas of the international scientific community and in a strategy for encouraging nominations of types of property and from regions that were under-represented on the List and would, if necessary, make proposals for changes in the criteria for inscription and in the *Operational Guidelines*.

Two initiatives must therefore be undertaken concurrently: rectification of the imbalances on the List between regions of the world, types of monument, and periods, and at the same time a move away from a purely architectural view of the cultural heritage of humanity towards one which was much more anthropological, multi-functional, and universal.

For example, 20th century architecture should not be considered solely from the point of view of "great" architects and aesthetics, but rather as a striking transformation of multiple meanings in the use of materials, technology, work, organization of space, and, more generally, life in society. This new approach would naturally require something more than a "world prize" for architects in the development of a methodology that would make it possible to identify a battery of objective criteria and operational procedures that would reveal the significant characteristics of this category of cultural property so as to produce selections that were truly relevant.

Themes other than 20th century architecture were also identified by the group in moving from a "monumental" and static view to a more comprehensive and diversified perception of the wealth of human cultures. The world heritage should thus consider the products of culture by means of several new thematic approaches: modes of occupation of land and space, including nomadism and migration, industrial technology, subsistence strategies, water management, routes for people and goods, traditional settlements and their environments, etc.

Only by means of this thematic approach would it be possible to appreciate cultural properties in their full range of functions and meanings. The three-dimensional time-culture-human achievement grid might in this sense be considered as a stage in the process of reflection which had been of great value but which should give way to a process of reflection that was more anthropological and global.

In order to pursue this process of reflection on the new dimensions of the world heritage in greater depth and in this way to ensure that the representative nature and credibility of the List are maintained, it would be necessary to proceed not by subcontracting the work exclusively to a single NGO, which could not guarantee the diversity of approaches and disciplines required, nor by means of large conferences, which would certainly be costly and largely unproductive, but rather through a small number of thematic studies, carefully targeted and forward-looking, and concentrating on new or little known aspects of the heritage, especially that of under-represented regions such as Africa or the Pacific (rather than categories of property that were already extensively covered in the scientific literature), and organized as regional or sub-regional meetings. These meetings should bring together regional experts, experts from the international scientific community in the relevant disciplines, and countries in the region which were States Parties to the Convention and those which had not yet joined. These meetings, each of which would be organized with reference to its specific

objective, would be convened by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, the latter drawing upon its network of experts and preparing a document that explained the meaning and content of the Convention so as to assist those experts who had so far not been involved with it to work within the framework that it provided.

The expert group was convinced that these different approaches and initiatives were such as to make a major contribution to the balance, the representative nature, and therefore the credibility of the World Heritage List, which the World Heritage Committee in 1992 identified as lying at the heart of several of the major goals of its strategic guidelines for the future.

### **III Recommendations**

#### **State of the World Heritage List (cultural)**

The group judged that the current state of the World Heritage List (for cultural and mixed sites) did not meet the original concept of heritage as set forth in the World Heritage Convention (I, article 1). The List in its present form suffers from geographical, temporal, and spiritual imbalances. With its emphasis still on architectural monuments, the World Heritage List projects a narrow view of cultural heritage and fails to reflect living cultures, ethnographic and archaeological landscapes, and many of the broad areas of human activity which are of outstanding universal value.

This assessment of the state of the World Heritage List makes it imperative that steps be taken to achieve a representative, balanced, and credible List. The group therefore recommends for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee the following:

1. Building on previous discussions connected with the global study, the group proposes to pass from a typological approach to one that reflects the complex and dynamic nature of cultural expression. They therefore propose that the project should be renamed "Global Strategy for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention".
2. In order to redress the imbalances in the current List, some areas have been identified as having high potential to complete gaps in representation. Areas such as these should be considered in their broad anthropological context through time:

## HUMAN COEXISTENCE WITH THE LAND

- Movement of peoples (nomadism, migration)
- Settlement
- Modes of subsistence
- Technological evolution

## HUMAN BEINGS IN SOCIETY

- Human interaction
- Cultural coexistence
- Spirituality and creative expression.

3. In order to encourage nominations from under-represented regions, the group strongly preferred a series of regional meetings to the proposal for a large scientific conference. Regional meetings for States Parties and for regional experts should be organized, using as working documents the areas identified in recommendation 2 as well as analyses of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. In addition, in preparation for such regional meeting, States Parties are encouraged to develop tentative lists of properties for inscription as an additional working document.
4. In order to benefit from the wealth of scientific activity under way in all parts of the world, systematic approaches should be made to international scientific organizations to determine their interest in contributing to these reflections.
5. In an effort to achieve a representative List, the World Heritage Centre should actively encourage the participation of States Parties that have never nominated properties to the List, as well as countries that have not yet signed the Convention.
6. In the short term, after considering the list of proposed comparative studies needed to address current nominations to the List, the group noted that work is under way on industrial heritage, cultural landscapes, and 20th century architecture. In its conviction that comparative studies should be targeted to gaps in the List, the group recommends support for studies on protohistoric sites (especially in sub-Saharan Africa) as well as properties in the Caucasian region. The group strongly suggested that comparative studies on areas already well covered in the international scientific literature, such as brick Gothic architecture and fortified towns, should only be undertaken with the participation of the States Parties involved in relevant nominations.
7. In order to encourage inscriptions of properties that would fill gaps in the List, the group recommends the modification of the cultural criteria (*Operational Guidelines*, paragraph 24) as follows:

- Criterion (i)** Remove "unique artistic achievement" from the English version so that it corresponds with the French;
- Criterion (ii)** Re-examine this criterion so as to reflect better the interaction of cultures, instead of the present formulation, which suggests that cultural influences occur in one direction only;
- Criterion (iii)** Removed "which has disappeared", since this excludes living cultures;
- Criterion (v)** Remove the phrase "especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change," since this favours cultures that have disappeared;
- Criterion (vi)** Encourage a less restrictive interpretation of this criterion.

## LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

- Dr. Christina Cameron**  
Présidente de la réunion  
Chairperson  
Director-General of National  
Historic Sites  
Parks Canada  
Department of Canadian Heritage  
Hull, Canada
- Ms. Maria Dolores de Almeida Cunha**  
Division of Intellectual Co-operation  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil  
Brazilia, Brazil
- M. Azedine Beschouch**  
Ancien Président et Rapporteur  
du Comité du patrimoine mondial
- M. Isac Chiva**  
Directeur d'Etudes  
à l'Ecole des Hautes études  
en sciences sociales  
Paris, France
- Ms. Joan Domicelj**  
Vice-President of ICOMOS  
Cultural Heritage Consultant  
Australia
- S. Exc. M. Lambert Messan**  
Ambassadeur,  
Délégué permanent du Niger  
auprès de l'UNESCO
- M. Léon Pressouyre**  
Vice-Président de l'Université  
de Paris I  
Paris, France
- Dr.-Ing. Wolfgang W. Wurster**  
Deutsches Archäologisches Institut  
Kommission für Allgemeine und  
Vergleichende Archäologie  
Bonn, Germany

<b>Dr. Henry Cleere</b>	Coordinateur de l'ICOMOS pour le patrimoine mondial / World Heritage Coordinator
<b>Ms. Regina Durighello</b>	ICOMOS
<b>Dr. Bernd von Droste</b>	Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'UNESCO / Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre
<b>M. Laurent Lévi-Strauss</b>	Centre du patrimoine mondial / World Heritage Centre

Ref. Item 9 of the Agenda and Document WHC-94/CONF. 001/7

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS BY THAILAND TO REMEDY  
THE CUMBERSOME AND TIME-CONSUMING PROCEDURE OF ELECTION  
OF MEMBERS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE ENCOUNTERED  
BY THE NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATE PARTIES TO THE  
CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL  
AND NATURAL HERITAGE.

I. Existing Rules of Procedure:

- 13.8 Those states obtaining in the first ballot the required majority shall be elected, unless the number of states obtaining that majority is greater than the number of seats to be filled. In that case, the States obtaining the greatest number of votes, up to the number of seats to be filled, shall be declared elected. If the number of States obtaining the majority required is less than the number of seats to be filled, there shall be additional ballots to fill the remaining seats, the voting being restricted to the States obtaining the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot, to a number not more than twice that of the seats remaining to be filled.
- 13.9 If necessary, in order to determine the candidates to participate in a restricted ballot, an eliminating ballot may be taken, which shall be confined to the candidates having obtained the same number of votes in the previous ballot.
- 13.10 If, in final ballot or an eliminating ballot, two or more candidates obtain the same number of votes, the Chairman shall decide between them by drawing lots.

II. Proposed Amendments (the underlined words):

- 13.8 Those States obtaining in the first ballot the required majority shall be elected, unless the number of States obtaining that majority is greater than the number of seats to be filled. In that case, the States obtaining the greatest number of votes, up to the number of seats to be filled, shall be declared elected. If the number of States obtaining the majority required is less than the number of seats to be filled, there shall be a second ballot to fill the remaining seats, the voting being restricted to the States obtaining the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot, to a number not more than twice that of the seats remaining to be filled.
- 13.9 In the second ballot, the candidates which obtain the greatest number of votes, up to the number of seats to be filled, shall be declared elected.
- 13.10 If, in the second ballot, two or more candidates obtain the same number of votes, the chairman shall decide between them by drawing lots.