

Limited distribution

WHC-95/CONF.201/12  
31 July 1995  
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Nineteenth session  
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

3-8 JULY 1995

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Opening session	1-2
Adoption of the Agenda	2
Report of the Secretariat on the activities undertaken since the eighteenth session of the Committee	2-4
Draft Report of the World Heritage Committee to be presented to UNESCO's General Conference at its twenty-eighth session	5
Examination of UNESCO's Biennial Plan (1996-1997) and World Heritage Conservation	6-8
State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List	8-37
Information on Tentative Lists and the examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the World Heritage List and List of World Heritage in Danger	37-50
Examination of the World Heritage Fund: Statement of accounts for 1994 and budgetary information for 1995	50-51
Requests for International assistance	51-52
Proposals for improving the working methods of the World Heritage Secretariat	52-55
Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention	55-60
Draft agenda for the extraordinary session of the Bureau (1-2 December 1995)	60
Preparation of the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, including the draft agenda (4-9 December 1995)	60-62
Other business	62
Adoption of the Report of the Bureau and closure of the session	62

## ANNEXES

Annex I	List of participants
Annex II	Nomination of properties for inclusion on the World Heritage List
Annex II	Periodic World Heritage State of Conservation Report

## I. OPENING SESSION

I.1 The nineteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 3 to 8 July 1995. The following members of the Bureau attended: Dr Adul Wichiencharoen (Thailand) , Chairperson, representatives of Colombia, Germany, Italy, Oman and Senegal as Vice-Presidents and Mr Zhang Chongli (China) as Rapporteur.

I.2 Representatives of the following States Parties to the Convention attended the meeting as observers: Argentina, Australia, Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Canada, Cap Vert, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ecuador, France, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Iran, Japan, Korea (Republic of) , Lebanon, Lithuania, Malta, Morocco, Myanmar, Malawi, Nicaragua, Niger, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Syrian Arab Republic, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America, Uganda, Uruguay and Zimbabwe. Representatives of the following non-State Parties also attended the meeting as observers: Belgium, Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

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) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The Organization of World Heritage Cities (OWHC) was represented as well. The full list of participants is given in Annex I.

I.4 The Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mr Bernd von Droste, speaking on behalf of the Director-General, welcomed the members of the Bureau, the representatives of the advisory bodies and the observers. Having thanked the Chairman, Dr Wichiencharoen for his excellent work in the first six months of his mandate, he informed briefly the Bureau of the conclusions of the 146th session of UNESCO'S Executive Board, held in May 1995, insofar as they concern the World Heritage Centre.

I.5 The two documents presented to the Executive Board, notably UNESCO'S Draft Medium-Term Strategy 1996-2001 and its Draft Programme and Budget for 1996-1997, as proposed by the Director-General, underline the importance of encouraging the States Parties to the Convention "to set up systematic monitoring and, to the extent possible, prevention mechanisms for sites on the World Heritage List". Furthermore, they state the Director-General's wish to provide a financial allocation to the World Heritage Centre in order to strengthen its operational capacity and potential impact, while ensuring that it is suitably flexible and versatile, and to mobilize it to a greater extent and more directly in the service of the Organization's work. The Director of the Centre, speaking on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO, underlined that such a financial allocation does not mean detachment from the Organization, but quite the contrary.

I.6 Consequently to the debate, the Executive Board adopted Decision 146 EX/Decision 4.2, which states:

(The Executive Board)  
para. 54: "Considers that the proposal to give 'functional autonomy' to the World Heritage Centre requires a clarification of the reasons behind this proposal, of its political, legal, administrative and financial feasibility, of its content, methods of implementation and limits, together with the ways in which the necessary monitoring would be carried out within UNESCO and by the World Heritage Committee;

para. 55: 'Considers therefore that it cannot formulate a recommendation to the General Conference on this issue before an in-depth discussion of the report on this matter, that the Director-General will submit to it at its 147th session;

para. 56: "Considers that the proposals concerning the new monitoring activities related to the World Heritage sites should be the object of a consultation process among States Parties to the World Heritage Convention and submitted for approval to the General Assembly of the States Parties which will be held in 1995; in the meanwhile, the activities should be held in abeyance."

I.7 Referring to working document WHC-95/CONF.201/6a (interim financial statement), Mr von Droste reminded the Bureau of the Committee's request, expressed at its eighteenth session, that the Secretariat provide a clear, detailed financial statement on the World Heritage Fund and to prepare a more transparent budget. The Director-General therefore addressed in May 1995 a letter to the States Parties members of the World Heritage Committee stating his readiness to submit such a document for the previous calendar year, reiterating his commitment to financial transparency, and inviting the Bureau to provide more detailed guidance on this matter.

I.8 In conclusion, Mr von Droste informed the Bureau of the preparations of an expert meeting on World Heritage Information Management, as mandated by the Committee at its eighteenth session, to be held in September 1995. Its purpose is to explore the possibility of creating jointly with the advisory bodies an integrated World Heritage Information Network which could use effectively new communication developments such as INTERNET and others.

## II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

II.1 The Bureau adopted the agenda as proposed in Document WHC-95/CONF.201/1 without any modifications.

## III. REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

III.1 The Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mr Bernd von Droste, reported on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the last session of the Committee, held in Phuket, Thailand, in December 1994. His presentation outlined key points,

as detailed information was provided in working documents prepared for the session.

III.2 Two new States Parties have signed the Convention during the last six months, Dominica and Latvia, thus bringing the total number of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to 142.

III.3 As part of the efforts to develop the Global Strategy for a more representative World Heritage List, the following meetings took place or are in the process of being organized in 1995: a meeting on Asian Rice Culture and its Terraced Landscapes, a meeting on Identifying and Assessing World Heritage Cultural Landscapes (associative landscapes), a meeting on African Cultural Heritage (first regional meeting for central and southern Africa, Zimbabwe) and a meeting on Geological and Fossil Sites.

III.4 The Committee, at its eighteenth session in Phuket, approved principles for systematic monitoring and reporting of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites. This was done after the successful completion of a pilot project for Latin America and the Caribbean and many other efforts in the same direction. A clear distinction is now made in the Operational Guidelines between monitoring, being the assessment of the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites by the States Parties themselves, and reporting, which is to bring forward the results of this assessment to the World Heritage Committee. It should be emphasized that the Committee in its decisions explicitly underlined the sovereignty of the States Parties and that external advice would only be made available by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre with the agreement of the States Parties.

III.5 Reminding the Bureau that the Committee established a special Emergency Reserve of one million dollars at its seventeenth session (Cartagena, 1993), the Director of the Centre stated that fifteen requests for emergency assistance have so far been approved, i.e., about 60 % of the reserve has been used. He recommended that an appeal be addressed to States Parties to make voluntary contributions for replenishing the Emergency Reserve.

III.6 Having given some examples of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in different regions of the world, the Director stressed the successful outcome of UNESCO'S first World Heritage Youth Forum, which took place in Bergen, Norway, from 25 to 28 June 1995. This included the opening of a new exhibit on 103 cities which have World Heritage properties, and the launching of a CD-ROM presenting these cities. Both were prepared by the World Heritage Centre in cooperation with external partners.

III.7 Furthermore, the Government of Norway signed with UNESCO, after consultations with other Nordic countries, an agreement to establish, on a pilot basis, a World Heritage Office with funding from Norway and staffing from the Nordic countries. Apart from encouraging the implementation of the Convention in

the Nordic countries, the office will also provide international assistance to States Parties outside the region.

III.8 Giving a rapid overview of some of the major accomplishments in the Centre's promotional and educational activities, which are stated in more detail in the information documents INF.3 and INF.5, Mr von Droste underlined the progress made in linking the Centre's work to INTERNET and the World Wide Web, the reorganization and upgrading of its documentation unit, current work on developing a specialized data-base and linking it with the data-bases of other international organizations, etc. More effective networks and promotion of the Convention were mentioned also as the results of the meeting of Directors of Cultural Heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean, which was held in Cartagena, Colombia, in May.

III.9 Mr von Droste expressed UNESCO's gratefulness to the Governments of Japan, the Netherlands and Sweden for providing Associate Experts to the Centre. The secondment of a specialist for natural heritage has been foreseen by Austria, and should become effective before the end of the year. He appealed to other States Parties to do likewise, as this strengthened considerably the Centre's work capacities.

III.10 In the debate that followed, the Delegate of Germany expressed satisfaction with the Centre's work, and underlined that the Director-General made a wise decision when he established the Centre. The Observer of India commented on whether reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites are to be voluntary or mandatory for the States Parties. The Chairman informed the Observer that he has received a letter from India on this matter. The Observer of Benin asked if the regional meeting in Zimbabwe will be followed up, and was informed that next year, depending on the result of the meeting in Zimbabwe, there will be a meeting for. Sub-Sahara and West Africa.

III.11 The Representative of ICOMOS asked for clarification concerning the emergency request for Mostar and Sarajevo, as they are not on the World Heritage List. The Director of the Centre pointed out that the Operational Guidelines (paragraph 93) allows the provision of emergency assistance to properties, not yet inscribed, but likely to qualify for the World Heritage List. The Representative of ICOMOS furthermore informed the Bureau of their meetings on a subregional level in Africa. The Representative of IUCN complemented the Director of the World Heritage Centre by commenting on monitoring. In his view the roles of the Centre, the Committee and the Bureau were clearly defined, but the role of the advisory bodies, in ad hoc monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites, should not be forgotten. He also wished to point out the grass root bodies' key role in the area of monitoring.

IV. DRAFT REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE TO BE PRESENTED TO UNESCO'S GENERAL CONFERENCE AT ITS TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION

IV.1 The Director of the World Heritage Centre introduced Item 4 of the Agenda, and recalled that in accordance with Article 29.3 of the Convention, the Committee shall submit a report on its activities at each of the ordinary sessions of the UNESCO General Conference. Therefore, the draft of Document 28 C/98, "Report of the world Heritage Committee to the General Conference (28th session)", covering the period 1994-1995, was submitted to the Bureau members for approval. He furthermore recalled that, in accordance with Strategic Orientation 15 adopted at Santa Fé, this report will also be submitted by the Chairperson of the Committee to the tenth session of the General Assembly of States Parties, which will be held during the General Conference.

He then outlined the structure of the document which provides information on the following items:

- i) composition and functions of the World Heritage Committee;
- ii) the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists;
- iii) global strategy;
- iv) state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and the general policy on monitoring;
- v) the World Heritage Fund; its voluntary and obligatory contributions;
- vi) expenditures obligated under the World Heritage Fund from 1/1/94 to 1/5/95; since the detailed account of incurred expenses will be submitted to the General Assembly of States Parties in the fall of 1995 during the UNESCO General Conference.

IV.2 The Delegate of Colombia requested an amendment in paragraph 23 'Development Plan of a Wider Archaeological Area for the site of Joya de Ceren (El Salvador)' instead of Cuba. She also requested that the decision taken by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in Phuket, Thailand in December 1994, to finance a meeting in Cartagena, Colombia, in 1995, be reflected in the document.

IV.3 The Delegate of Italy requested that the last sentence of paragraph 5 be a-mended. It should now read : "The secretariat of the World Heritage Committee is appointed by the Director-General of UNESCO.

V. EXAMINATION OF UNESCO'S BIENNIAL PLAN (1996-1997) AND WORLD HERITAGE CONSERVATION

V.1 In introducing this agenda item on UNESCO's Biennial Plan (1996-1997) and World Heritage Conservation, Mr von Droste drew the attention of the Bureau to Document WHC-95/CONF.201/3, which reproduced the text of Document 28 C/5 'Draft Programme and Budget for 1996-97' which the UNESCO General Conference will examine at its twenty-eighth session.

V.2 Mr von Droste explained that the World Heritage Centre, while serving as the Secretariat to the World Heritage Committee, is an entity of the UNESCO Secretariat and thereby would receive a budgetary allocation from UNESCO, as approved by the General Conference, mainly to meet the staff salary costs and other administrative costs as well as for some basic activities.

V.3 Informing the Bureau of Recommendations 54 and 55 of the UNESCO Executive Board at its 146th session in May 1995, which called for clarifications on "functional autonomy", Mr von Droste said that, the World Heritage Centre is presently preparing a comprehensive document which will be submitted to the Director-General to assist in the formulation of his report to the 147th session of the Executive Board.

V.4 A first draft of this document will be presented to the Bureau during this session when the Bureau will examine budgetary matters. He pointed out that the proposal of the Director-General will have no political or legal implications and therefore these issues should not arise.

V.5 The Centre would continue to operate as an integral part of the Secretariat under the authority of the Director-General of UNESCO and within the framework of the Programme and Budget approved by the General Conference.

V.6 It is not proposed to empower the Centre with any form of legal or institutional personality distinct from UNESCO or to separate it from the Organization in any manner whatsoever.

V.7 The proposal is aimed at providing the Centre with a financial allocation which will be used and accounted for under UNESCO regulations, thus granting the Centre a larger degree of financial autonomy. Therefore, the main point to be examined by the 147th session of the Executive Board is the question of a financial allocation to the World Heritage Centre. In this respect it is important to keep in mind that the financial resources managed by the World Heritage Centre come from two main sources, the World Heritage Fund and the UNESCO Regular Programme (in addition there are some limited extrabudgetary sources) .

V.8 As far as administrative aspects are concerned, what is involved is a delegation of authority by the Director-General to the Director of the Centre with regard to a number of administrative decisions. Such delegation of authority is within

the authority of the Director-General. It is common usage within UNESCO and is considered to be sound administrative practice.

V.9 The expenditures under the World Heritage Fund are incurred under the provision of the Convention on the basis of the budget adopted by the World Heritage Committee, in accordance with the Financial Regulations of the Fund, and which are accounted for under UNESCO'S accounting procedures. The Regular Programme resources earmarked for the operation of the Centre, will continue to be accounted for under UNESCO's procedures as a distinct element of the World Heritage Fund. The Director-General of UNESCO as chief executive of UNESCO, which serves as the Secretariat of the Convention, remains fully accountable for all funds related to the implementation of the Convention.

V.10 With regard to the reference in the Document 28 C/5 of the Centre's activities in assisting the Member States of UNESCO in the monitoring of World Heritage sites, Mr von Droste informed the Bureau of Recommendation 56 to the General Conference of the 146th session of the Executive Board, which calls for this issue to be discussed at the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention, scheduled to take place during the next General Conference.

V.11 He explained that, in conformity-with the text of the World Heritage Convention, the General Assembly of States Parties is asked to decide primarily the level of compulsory contributions to the World Heritage Fund and to elect the members of the World Heritage Committee. To date, the General Assembly of States Parties, which will be convened this year on 2 and 3 November, has only dealt with these matters and not raised other substantive issues.

V.12 As recommended by the Executive Board, the item "*New proposals for inviting monitoring reports from States Parties to the World Heritage Committee*" may be included on the provisional agenda of the General Assembly of States Parties.

V.13 He indicated that the World Heritage Centre will make a document on this matter available to the Général Assembly and will be grateful for the Bureau's advice on this important matter.

V.14 The Director of the Centre recalled that the Committee's decision followed a long process of consultations with the States Parties and discussions at the Committee since 1987. Of the important decisions taken by the Committee, and reported to the States Parties and the General Conference of UNESCO, he mentioned two:

In 1987, and based upon the recommendations of a working group of States Parties, the Committee adopted certain principles of monitoring and reporting which were very similar to the ones included in the Operational Guidelines in December 1994.

In 1992, the Committee adopted the Strategic Recommendations and Goals for the implementation of the Convention which included explicitly, monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties as one of the main functions of the Committee. He stressed that the Committee very explicitly confirmed the sovereignty of the States Parties in attributing to them the sole responsibility for the monitoring of the conditions of the sites and for the preparation of the periodic state of conservation reports. The goals of monitoring and reporting are stated in the Operational Guidelines as being: improved site management, advanced planning and preventive action, and improved World Heritage cooperation and decision-making. In this sense it should be looked at as a means to strengthen and enhance the World Heritage cooperation and to contribute to the preservation of the World Heritage properties.

V.15 The Chairman of the Committee, Mr Adul Wichiencharoen, suggested that a private session be held during this Bureau session to discuss both the points, on "functional autonomy" and "systematic monitoring and reporting".

V.16 In the discussions that followed, the Observer of India sought clarification on the nature of the Committee's "invitation" for States parties to submit the periodic state of conservation report, as India is under the impression that this has been presented more as a "mandatory" act than a "voluntary" one. The Delegate of Oman said that since the Centre has proposed to prepare a comprehensive paper on the issue of monitoring and reporting, he suggested that discussions on this point be deferred.

V.17 The Delegate of Italy stated that since the issue of "functional autonomy" will be debated by the Executive Board and the General Conference, he felt that discussions on this point by the Bureau should be suspended. The Delegate of Germany stated that he supported the suggestion of a private session to discuss these two points, if only to ensure a complete understanding of the issues.

V.18 The Chairman called for a private session to be organized for the following day.

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

VI.1. The Bureau examined the following documents that were prepared for this Bureau session:

Working Document WHC-95/CONF.201/4 which consisted of a background and progress report and the following four sections:

- A. Revised nomination form
- B. Format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports
- C. Work plan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes and the examination of regional synthesis reports by the World Heritage Committee
- D. Reports on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties;

Working Document WHC-95/CONF. 201/4Rev. which was prepared during the session and which concerned the 'background and progress report' section of the original working document;

a document prepared by IUCN on the state of conservation of Huascarán National Park in Peru;

the preliminary report on the ICOMOS World Heritage site Monitoring Mission to Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa and Sigiriya (Sri Lanka).

#### THE PRINCIPLES OF MONITORING AND REPORTING AS ADOPTED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AT ITS EIGHTEENTH SESSION

VI.2 The Bureau examined in a private session the recommendation made by the Executive Board of UNESCO to the UNESCO General Conference and the concerns expressed by one State Party to the Convention regarding the principles of monitoring and reporting that were adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session.

VI.3 The Bureau recalled that the Committee defined the observation of the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties as one of its main functions already at its sixteenth session in 1992 and that this was reflected in the UNESCO Work Plans for 1994-1995. It also recalled that the Committee adopted the principles of monitoring and reporting only after a long process of discussions, consultations and careful consideration of several practical experiences and with reference to specific articles of the World Heritage Convention:

1. Bearing in mind the provision of Article 4 of the Convention, under which "each State Party recognizes that the duty of ensuring the conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and situated on its territory belongs primarily to that State", the Committee was of the view that the establishment of systematic monitoring, the day-to-day observation of the sites by the States Parties, in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority, constituted a meaningful, active and effective operational method capable of countering the dangers that may threaten the cultural and natural World Heritage.
2. Bearing in mind also the provisions-of Article 6, which provides that "whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of

the states on whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 is situated, and without prejudice to property rights provided by national legislation, the States Parties to this Convention recognize that such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate" and Article 7, which provides that "for the purpose of this Convention, international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve. . . .that heritage", also in consideration of Articles 8, 11, 13,14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26 and paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 29, and in pursuance of the intent of the Convention as reflected in the preambular clause 8 in "establishing an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with scientific methods", the World Heritage Committee invited the States Parties to present every five years a scientific report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites on their territories, and decided that, to this end, the States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat or the advisory bodies and that the Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties.

VI.4 The Bureau furthermore considered various articles in the Convention that call for international cooperation and the undertaking by the Committee of studies and research needed for the drawing up of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. Monitoring and reporting should be considered as a scientific and technical method to undertake the studies and research mentioned in Article 11.7.

VI.5 The Bureau emphasized that the principles of monitoring and reporting as defined in paragraphs 69-76 of the Operational Guidelines fully respect the sovereignty of the States Parties and that these should be implemented by the States Parties themselves on a voluntary basis.

VI.6 The Bureau unanimously decided that the Chairperson and the Secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau members, should jointly prepare a document along the lines of the above considerations as a means to clarify the principles on monitoring and reporting adopted by the Committee and as a basis for future discussions at the Convention's and/or UNESCO's statutory bodies.

VI.7 The Bureau also considered whether it would be desirable to create a consultative body as mentioned in Article 10.3 of the Convention for the examination of technical matters such as state of conservation reports, the establishment of which would allow more States Parties to participate directly in the

implementation of the Convention. As no consensus could be reached, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to look into this matter in more detail so that the Bureau can discuss it again at its next session.

#### PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S DECISIONS

VI.8 The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994 invited the Secretariat to undertake a set of concrete actions to implement the monitoring and reporting. The Secretariat reported on the progress made on the following matters:

A revised nomination format had been prepared in close collaboration with the advisory bodies for examination by the Bureau (see paragraph V1.9 to V1.13 and Annex II of this report) .

A format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports had equally been prepared for examination by the Bureau (see paragraph V1.9 to V.13 and Annex III of this report) .

A preliminary meeting was held with the advisory bodies and other interested partners in February 1995 to prepare a meeting of experts on World Heritage information management. This meeting will be held on 26-28 September of this year. A draft working document was made available to the Bureau as Information Document 5.

The Secretariat informed all States Parties of the principles adopted by the Committee, inviting them to put monitoring structures in place and to report on the state of conservation of the properties on their territories to the Committee on a 5-year basis.

A draft workplan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes and the examination of regional synthesis reports by the Committee had been prepared for the Bureau session. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that on the basis of the work plan that would be established by the Committee, the Secretariat would enter into consultations with the States Parties and the World Heritage partners to establish work plans for each of the regions of the world (see paragraphs V1.14 to V1.17 of this report) .

The Secretariat informed that it was in consultations with the advisory bodies and other professional organizations to identify the potential means to promote and assist the States Parties and the site managers in the implementation of monitoring and reporting procedures including scientific documentation and recording practices.

REVISED NOMINATION FORM AND FORMAT FOR PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS

VI.9 The Bureau recalled that sound baseline information on each of the World Heritage sites is indispensable for any credible monitoring and reporting system, for the maintenance of a credible World Heritage List, as well as for sound site management and coordinated and meaningful World Heritage cooperation. The Bureau recalled also that the World Heritage Committee, at its eighteenth session, decided that the nomination form should be revised in such a way that this baseline information be established at the time of the nomination and the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List and that a format should be developed for the periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports.

VI.10 The Secretariat introduced the draft formats (see Annexes II and III) for both the nomination and the state of conservation reports that had been prepared in very close collaboration with the advisory bodies. The Secretariat emphasized that both formats follow the same structure so as to facilitate future references and comparison of data provided.

VI.11 The Chairperson requested the members of the Bureau, other interested States Parties and the advisory bodies to transmit their comments to the Secretariat so that the Secretariat can prepare a final draft of both formats for consideration by the Committee at its nineteenth session.

VI.12 As to the possible date of introduction of the formats, the Bureau felt that this should be as early as possible but that the Committee should consider this matter at its next session.

VI.13 The Bureau invited the Secretariat to prepare, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session, a draft revised text for paragraph 65 of the Operational Guidelines ('Format and Content of Nominations') so as to reflect the new requirements for nomination dossiers.

WORKPLAN FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REGIONAL MONITORING AND REPORTING programmes AND THE EXAMINATION OF REGIONAL SYNTHESIS REPORTS BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

VI.14 The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its eighteenth session decided that the site specific periodic state of conservation reports should be synthesized by the Secretariat and be examined by the Committee on a regional basis.

VI.15 The Bureau examined the workplan prepared by the Secretariat for the examination of the regional state of conservation reports by the Committee as presented in Section C of the working document. The Bureau expressed some concern on the tight schedule and the great number of state of conservation reports that will have to be examined on a yearly basis. It was stressed however that, in accordance with the principles adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session, it

will be the States Parties who are responsible for the preparation of the reports and that the task of the Secretariat, in collaboration with other partners, will be to synthesize these reports and to draw broad conclusions for future decision-making by the Committee.

VI.16 As to the strategies for the implementation of the regional programmes, the Secretariat explained priorities for monitoring for natural heritage for Africa, Asia and Latin America as well as the baseline information on natural and mixed sites provided by the WCMC database. It was furthermore stressed that monitoring activities will be coordinated for sites which are Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage sites.

VI.17 For cultural heritage the Secretariat recalled that whereas the first monitoring cycle in Latin America was undertaken through the UNDP/UNESCO Regional Project, the second cycle will be implemented through the States Parties themselves. The Secretariat informed that for Asia a close collaboration had been established with the UNESCO Cultural Heritage Division to make the most efficient use of activities already underway in that region.

VI.18 The Delegate of Colombia pointed out that in the first cycle, the reports for the cultural and for the natural properties are not scheduled for examination in the same year and that provisions should be made for a concerted reporting on the mixed properties.

VI.19 The Bureau requested the Secretariat to review the proposed workplan in consultation with the advisory bodies and taking into account the comments made by the Bureau members and to prepare a revised workplan for consideration by the Committee at its nineteenth session.

#### REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC PROPERTIES

VI.20 The Bureau examined reports on the state of conservation of eight natural and eight cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on 15 natural and 14 cultural properties on the World Heritage List.

#### NATURAL HERITAGE

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

##### Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1983 and placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992. A report was presented by the State Party on their restoration efforts at the last session of the Bureau. Two small-scale international assistance projects from the World Heritage Fund are presently under way at the site, as well as

international assistance from other sources. On 29 June 1995 the World Heritage Centre received a report prepared by the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Bulgaria recalling the history of the site and the deterioration of the state of conservation, which led to the listing of the site both on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the Montreux List of the Ramsar Convention in 1993. The main results of the measures taken to restore the ecological integrity of the site were research studies and the construction of a channel and a monitoring programme to oversee the status of the Reserve since 1994. The hydraulic connection between the lake and the Danube River was reestablished and the water level is now raised by 1m. Furthermore, it is indicated that the Dalmatian Pelican is continuing to nest in the site.

The Representative of IUCN underlined that they are awaiting a detailed monitoring report from the Ramsar Convention Secretariat and recalled that the previous Bureau felt that the site may no longer retain the values for which it was inscribed.

The Bureau took note of both the report received from the State Party and the comments made by IUCN and recommended that no decision can be taken until the monitoring report by the Ramsar Convention Secretariat is received. This report should be presented to the session of the outgoing Bureau in December 1995.

#### Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992. Missions to the site were carried out in 1992 and 1993. The situation remains critical due to armed conflict and the political situation in the region which remains unchanged. The Committee at its eighteenth session decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and another fact-finding mission to this area, particularly to the Korckaova Uvala Virgin Forest is to be scheduled for 1995-96. Given the continued armed conflict in the region, the Bureau recommended to the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### Sangay National Park (Ecuador)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed in 1983 and placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 due to threats from poachers, boundary encroachment and unplanned road construction. A technical assistance project from the World Heritage Fund is underway. The equipment component of this project was carried out in 1994. Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre received in March 1995 a preliminary report by INEFAN (Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Areas Naturales y Viola Silvestre) on the environmental impact of the construction of the Guamoto-Macas road in the Park and a final report of the Commission (Ministry of Public Work/INEFAN) was received in May 1995. The Commission had studied the following issues: (1) the environmental impact of the first 7kms of the road, which have

been constructed; (2) the measures to be taken to mitigate the environmental impact of the last 23 kms which still have to be constructed and (3) guidelines for the management of the Park to mitigate the negative impact of the new road.

From the report it is clear that the road has caused irreversible damage to the natural environment, as the construction has caused a number of landslides. The Commission recommended that the following measures should be taken: the "road should be made narrower (6 meters) ; manual labour should be used and not heavy machinery, to take care of the disposal of excavated material; the establishment of supervision by environmental experts; the setting-up of additional control posts at the entrance of the Park to halt spontaneous settlements; intensification of patrols in the Park to allow only government controlled eco-tourism; the creation of a small visitor centre for tourists; an inventory of the legal land owners in the Park should be made, and the new part of the road should be considered as an 'environmental pilot stretch".

The Representative of IUCN underlined that the impact on the site was worse than expected and that the local IUCN office will provide an update on conditions in the site in September 1995.

The Bureau asked the Centre to write to the Government of Ecuador to commend the authorities for the impact report and to transmit the concerns of the Bureau as well as to ask for clarification on the present situation of the threats to the site.

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

The Bureau recalled that the site was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 because of a proposed iron-ore mining project and threats due to the arrival of a large number of refugees from neighboring countries. An expert mission was undertaken in 1993 and proposals to revise the boundaries of the site were endorsed by the seventeenth session of the Committee in 1993. An international assistance project under the World Heritage Fund was recently carried out in 1994, and a report was presented to the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The French Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry for Cooperation, in cooperation with IUCN-France, has carried out a study and review of the site for the Government of Guinea with regard to priority needs and potential future investment.

Two experts from the French IUCN Committee presented a report on a mission to the site which took place end-1994. The mission stated the international donor community has not given support and there are also problems with regard to the absence of commitment by the Government of Guinea, including the fact that the site is legally not sufficiently protected or classified as a protected area on the national level, with responsibilities shared by four ministries. The expert also spoke of negative

impacts of the potential mining project adjacent to the site. The mission, furthermore, reported on scientific issues, including the lack of topographic thematic mapping and monitoring of water quality. The mission recommended enhanced conservation management including resource inventories with international cooperation and bilateral development agencies. Road projects should be reviewed and rural development projects outside the site extended. The enhancement of educational and development projects with the local population are considered as a cornerstone for the future protection of the site.

The Bureau recalled that the boundaries were revised and adopted by the seventeenth session of the World Heritage Committee and requested the Centre, jointly with IUCN, 'to follow-up on the results of the mission, including a letter to the Guinean authorities to ask for clarifications on the legal protection and classification of the site. It recommended to the World Heritage Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

The Bureau recalled that at its eighteenth session, the World Heritage Committee took note of the information provided by the Indian Government through the Permanent Delegate that "if the representatives of the World Heritage Centre and of the World Heritage Committee desire to visit New Delhi, Assam and Manas for discussion, or see the site" then they "would be welcomed by the concerned authorities of the Government of India". In the same letter the Indian authorities also indicated that the Indian Government will involve local level NGOs in monitoring the state of conservation of the site. Cooperation between the management authorities of the Manas Wildlife Sanctuary of India and Manas National Park in Bhutan should be encouraged. To enhance cooperation between India and Bhutan in the conservation of the Manas ecosystem, the Government of Bhutan should be invited to ratify the Convention as soon as possible.

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Government of India, to elaborate the terms of reference for a mission to New Delhi, Assam and Manas in India.

#### Aïr-et-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 as it was affected by civil disturbances and its staff held hostage. The World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session took note that a peace accord was signed on 9 October 1994 and encouraged the authorities to implement it and to undertake all efforts to safeguard the site. The Centre in cooperation with the authorities of Niger sent a mission to Niger to review the protected area system of Niger and to prepare a nomination of a natural site. As one of the outcomes of this mission, a preliminary report on Aïr et T&&6 was prepared. It indicates that under the influence of a number of

different factors, including, historical, socio-economic and political, an armed conflict developed during the last years (minority of Tuareg against the States). A major degradation of the site was noted including poaching. In 1995, however, a dialogue was established between the two parties, which makes the return to a normal situation possible and may allow evaluation of the state of conservation in detail and to elaborate how the World Heritage Fund could contribute to the action programme for the recovery of the site.

The Representative of IUCN informed the Bureau that a 125,000 Swiss Franc project is under way with IUCN to assist in reestablishing the management regime. The Ambassador of Niger underlined that his Government is now taking every step to enhance the management of the site and wishes as soon as all conditions are met, that a mission should be sent to the site with the help of the World Heritage Centre. The Bureau recommended that the site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger, however, indicating on the basis of IUCN's report, that the site could be removed from the Danger List in due course.

#### Everglades National Park (United States of America)

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

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

The Bureau concluded that the site remains seriously threatened and recommended that the site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### Virunga National Park (Zaire)

Virunga National Park, inscribed under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) in 1979, was included in the List of World Heritage in Danger at the last session of the World Heritage Committee in

December 1994, due to the tragic events in Rwanda and the subsequent massive arrival of refugees from that country. Virunga National Park, situated at the border between Rwanda and Uganda, has been destabilized by the uncontrolled arrival of refugees, causing deforestation and poaching at the sites. The Bureau recalled that the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee approved a total of US\$ 50,000 emergency assistance for both Kahuzi-Biega National Park and Virunga National Park. The project is carried out in cooperation with IUCN, WWF and the International Gorilla Conservation Programme. A report on the project was received at the time of the Bureau session indicating the World Heritage Fund project was effective and crucial to help in maintaining the Park's management activities and to support the staff. However, the ecological situation at the Park is not improving, the bamboo forests have been cut and the number of elephants and hippos are much reduced within the site. The buffalo population is also threatened. The report indicates that the Park is a primary source of fuelwood and construction wood for the refugees and that 30 to 40,000 people are entering the Park daily.

The report recommends: (1) a long-term-political solution, including the evacuation of refugee camps within the site and (2) that IZCN should pay the salaries of their staff at the Park.

The Bureau discussed the situation at length and recommended: (1) to prepare a press release jointly with IUCN to raise awareness of the need for repatriation and re-location of the refugee camps; (2) to write a letter to the Government of Zaire for greater operational support including the payment of salaries of the staff of the site; (3) that the Centre arranges a meeting between the Director-General of UNESCO with the Ambassador of Zaire to discuss these issues, and (4) that, at the request of the Delegate of Senegal, all possibilities should be explored within the UN system, in particular with UNHCR and UNDP, to find a solution. The Bureau furthermore, requested the Centre to write a letter commending UNDP/GEF, the European Union and the GTZ for their support for the protection of the site and encourages continuous cooperation between the newly-appointed environmental coordinator and the World Heritage Centre.

### Natural properties on the World Heritage List

#### Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

The Bureau recalled that this mixed site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982 and that the Bureau at its eighteenth session in July 1994, discussed reports received on logging operations in areas adjacent to the World Heritage area. IUCN gave an update on the situation and recalled two concerns which were raised: that there is forested land outside the site which may have World Heritage values, and furthermore that adverse impact on the existing World Heritage site could result from logging and reading activities adjacent to the site. IUCN noted that both the 1990 and 1994 General Assemblies of IUCN had urged

Australia to evaluate the World Heritage values of these areas and that recent concerns about the impacts of forestry operations had been expressed by the Australian and New Zealand Committees for IUCN and the Wilderness Society (Tasmania).

The Director-General of IUCN wrote to the Australian Government in March 1995 seeking advice on this issue. A detailed reply was received from Senator Faulkner, Australian Minister for the Environment, dated 28 June 1995, stating the commitment of the Australian and Tasmanian Governments to protecting World Heritage values and to undertake a comprehensive assessment of Tasmanian forests.

The Bureau noted concerns which have been expressed about logging and reading activities in forest areas which may impinge on World Heritage values in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage area, and resolved to thank the State Party for the encouraging response of the Australian Minister for the Environment. In particular the Bureau noted: (1) the commitment of both the Australian and Tasmanian Governments to negotiate a Regional Forest Agreement which would involve a comprehensive assessment of a wide range of values, including World Heritage values, for forested areas in Tasmania; (2) that, in the meantime, the two governments have agreed to avoid activities that may significantly affect those areas of the old-growth forest or wilderness that are likely to have high conservation value; (3) that pending completion of a Regional Forest Assessment, the two governments have agreed to jointly undertake an assessment of those forest areas where commercial logging will be deferred, to allow among other things, an assessment of World Heritage values. The Bureau asked to be kept informed of developments which should maintain the integrity of the existing site and may lead to the identification by the State Party of further World Heritage values, including possible additions to the boundaries of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage site.

ICOMOS stressed that as this was a mixed site all additional information concerning this site should be referred to ICOMOS as well as to IUCN.

Manovo-Gounda St.Floris World Heritage Site (Central African Republic)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1988 and was the subject of a monitoring report at the sixteenth session of the Committee held in Santa Fe. At that time the management regime had collapsed and the site was under numerous threats. It was recommended that the World Heritage Centre should carry out a mission to the site. Unstable conditions continued to prevail throughout 1993 and into 1994.

In 1994 a new government took office and the French company, "Compagnie Generale d'Aéronautique-CGA" decided to move forward with a significant tourism venture for which they had obtained a 20-year concession in 1985. The 'Company La Gounda-Manova S.A.' has been working with the new government negotiating funding,

staffing and management direction for the site. From the 9 to 14 of May 1995 a monitoring mission was carried out on behalf of the World Heritage Centre by staff member of the Division of Ecological Sciences of UNESCO. This mission produced a positive report on the current situation in the Park. The Bureau took note of the report, acknowledged that finally a report was made on this World Heritage site and asked the Centre and IUCN to jointly follow-up the project.

#### Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)

The Bureau recalled, at the request of the Delegate of Germany, discussions at previous sessions concerning both the state of conservation of the site as well as further action concerning the Galapagos Marine Reserve. By letter of 27 January 95, the Centre requested the Ecuadorian authorities to provide information in time for the Bureau meeting, but no reply was received. The Representative of IUCN informed the Bureau that the situation at the site had not improved, but that time has not allowed the presentation of a report to this Bureau. A report will be prepared for the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee.

#### Simen National Park (Ethiopia)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978 and took note of the results of a report on the workshop on the "Simen Mountains National Park Management" held in Gondar from 15 to 17 February 1995, as well as a report on the Simen Mountains Baseline Study by the University of Berne (Switzerland) .

#### Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

The Centre informed the Bureau that a report was received from the Fundación Rio Platano concerning the site, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982. The report concerns the agricultural intrusion at the western border of the site. Additional information was obtained on 12 April 1995 on the land reform programme and its implementation in north-eastern Honduras. The settlement programme threatens several protected areas. The Centre contacted the authorities concerned to obtain further information. The Centre has received additional reports about inadequate commitment to the conservation by the national government. Planned and unplanned colonization is taking place, unauthorized forest operations, poaching of birds and game is extremely serious. Indigenous cultures are threatened by colonization of outside settlers. The World Heritage Centre advised the Permanent Delegate of Honduras the concerns in April 1995, however, no response has been received so far.

The Bureau asked IUCN to verify the situation and to report back to the World Heritage Committee in December. Furthermore, it

requested the Centre to prepare a letter for the signature of the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee to the President of Honduras, transmitting the concerns of the Bureau.

#### Shirakami-Sanchi (Japan)

The Centre informed the Bureau that it has received several letters concerning the logging of beech forests outside the World Heritage site and has transmitted them for review to IUCN. The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed in 1993, and that the Committee at the time recommended to review the site after three years. The Bureau invited the Centre to organize a mission to review the progress made in the implementation of the management plan with regard to the requirements of the World Heritage Convention.

#### Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi)

The Bureau was informed that the UNESCO Equipment Division, in cooperation with the Centre, sent a mission to this World Heritage site in April 1995 to review the current international assistance projects at the site and to carry out an evaluation and assessment of future needs. The mission carried out a detailed review of technical assistance projects under the World Heritage Fund (including the purchase of boats) and helped in designing appropriate projects. This includes a project for an ecological inventory of the coastal regions of the islands in Lake Malawi National Park, which would allow authorities to better monitor changes of the state of conservation of the site. During the mission an environmental education project was discussed at the site which would involve the local villages within the World Heritage area. Such a programme would be crucial, as the population within the Park is growing and is heavily dependent on fish and wood as principal resources. The Bureau took note of this report.

#### Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno (Mexico)

The Bureau took note of the oral report presented by IUCN on the site indicating that Mitsubishi Corporation in partnership with the Mexican Government has a project to convert a part of the lagoon to salt ponds for industrial salt production. A one-mile long pier is proposed, which would disturb the grey whales within the lagoon. The Bureau recommended that a letter be written to the authorities indicating the concerns raised at the nineteenth session of the Bureau and to request an official response on the situation at the site.

#### Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)

The Bureau recalled that-at the eighteenth session of World Heritage Committee IUCN was requested to present to the Bureau an evaluation of the revised boundaries of this site, based on the report of the consultant working on the plan for the area.

However, the Omani authorities, who have hired a consultant, have requested a re-scheduling of the report for 30 July 1995. Upon receipt of the report, an evaluation will be prepared for presentation to the nineteenth session of the Committee.

IUCN raised concern that the report was still not available, although the World Heritage Committee had specifically requested this information and indicated that this concerns not only the boundary question, but also the management regime, the legal status of the different parts as well as a new map of the site. The Delegate from Oman indicated that the consultant could not start his work earlier due to factors beyond his control and indicated that the results will be presented in due course.

#### Huascarán National Park (Peru)

The Representative of IUCN informed the Bureau that the first mission had been undertaken to this World Heritage site reviewing the condition of the site, parks staff and resources, tourism and other issues such as possible threats to the site by mining, dam and road projects. The Bureau requested the Centre: (1) to write a letter of support to the Park management; (2) to write a letter from the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee to the Peruvian Authorities to reiterate the nature of the World Heritage area and the importance of the protection of World Heritage values and its integrity.

#### Bwindi National Park (Uganda)

The Bureau recalled that Bwindi National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994. Reports from different sources, including WWF, have indicated that four mountain gorillas were killed at the site in March 1995. IUCN informed the Bureau that an investigation in Uganda on the incident is currently underway.

The Bureau requested the Centre to inform the Ugandan authorities of its concerns about the depletion of the population of mountain gorillas and to obtain information about the steps undertaken in this respect to ensure no further reductions in the future.

#### Redwood National Park (United States of America)

The World Heritage Centre received on 15 September 1994 information on a proposed road project within the site, which involves 2 miles of highway relocation which has been subject to an Environmental Impact Study. The United States National Park Service and IUCN were requested by the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee to follow up this matter. The Centre informed the Bureau that in May 1995 a preliminary monitoring report from the National Park Service was received indicating that the California Department of Transportation (CDT) has proposed to realignment of 3,2 Km (2 miles) of Highway 101 near Cushing Creek in Del Norte County to correct safety and

operational problems. A Draft Environmental Impact Statement was prepared by the National Park Service and the California Department of Parks and Recreation and 76 comments were received, mostly opposing the alternative, which would have required the removal of at least 200 old growth redwood trees for highway widening. In response to the public and agency opposition, a Value Engineering Team considered other solutions and developed strategies to alleviate safety and traffic problems, which were presented at a public meeting in March 1995.

The Observer of the United States indicated that the proposed plans for the realignment have been abandoned. A detailed report will be presented to the next session of the Bureau.

#### Yellowstone National Park `(United States of America)

The Centre informed the Bureau that detailed documentation concerning Yellowstone National Park was received from a group of fourteen North American conservation organizations. The documents raise serious questions about potential damage to Yellowstone National Park in particular from a proposed mining operation. A draft environmental impact statement is underway. The Centre contacted the American authorities to advise them of the concerns of the World Heritage Centre. Letters by the National Park Service and by the Assistant Secretary of Fish and Wildlife addressed to the Centre are requesting a joint mission, by the Centre and IUCN, to make an interim assessment of the mining proposal and that the Committee give consideration to placing Yellowstone National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegate of Germany raised concern about the serious threats to the world's first National Park to be established. The Bureau recalled Article 6.3 of the World Heritage Convention. The Canadian Observer underlined that the proposed mining operation was to be carried out by a privately-owned American company. IUCN recalled a range of other threats outlined in a recent IUCN publication, such as deforestation by a religious group, tourism impact and wildlife policies. The Observer from the United States invited the Centre and IUCN to visit the site and to review the situation before the end of August. The Bureau decided that: (1) a letter from the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee be written to the States Party, underlining the serious concerns of the Bureau; (2) that a joint mission should take place to the site, subject to extrabudgetary funding, and (3) that a report on the impact of the proposed mine as well as an outline of other threats facing Yellowstone, should be made available for the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee.

#### Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Zaire)

The Bureau recalled that with the relocation of a refugee camp in 1994, the Kahuzi-Biega World Heritage site seemed to be less threatened in comparison with the situation at Virunga National

Park, but still remains critical. The Centre informed the Bureau that a new visitor centre was built with funding from the German authorities and the GTZ. Furthermore, Kahuzi-Biega obtained funds from the European Cooperation. A progress report on the emergency assistance from the World Heritage Fund was also received. The site will celebrate its 25th anniversary in 1995.

The Bureau requested the Centre to commend the German and European authorities for their support to the site.

Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe)

The Bureau recalled that the impact of tourism and the proposed dam at the site was discussed at several meetings of the Committee and the Bureau. IUCN informed the Bureau that CND \$ 350,000 from the Canadian Development Agency (CIDA) were received by the IUCN office in Zimbabwe to carry out management planning and environmental impact studies for proper protection of the site. The Bureau asked the Centre to write a letter to CIDA commending them for their efforts to protect this World Heritage site.

#### CULTURAL HERITAGE

##### Cultural properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

VI.21 The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Committee's observations had been transmitted to the States Parties concerned and provided updated information on the following properties.

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin)

At its eighteenth session, the Committee-requested the World Heritage Centre to send a 'monitoring' mission to the World Heritage site (44 ha) to evaluate its state of conservation. A mission comprising two experts, Professor Spini (architect) and Ms Antongini (anthropologist) left Paris at the beginning of July for Abomey. These two experts, who have worked at the site, were designated by the Directorate of Heritage of Benin, which requested them to:

- i) review the nomination dossier for the site and complete it in accordance with the new nomination format which will be presented at the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1995:
- ii) establish a conservation plan which,  
provides the history of conservation works carried out on each of the palaces,

defines a preventive conservation policy based on priorities -to be established in function of the fragility of the structures and the dangers threatening the site, and

- iii) propose the creation of an organism which will be responsible for the protection and the management of the site, placed under the authority of the Directorate of Heritage, and with which associations and other governmental partners concerned with preservation and enhancement of the site may participate.

The Bureau congratulated the Benin authorities and encouraged them to continue their efforts for the protection of the site. The Secretariat will present to the World Heritage Committee, at its nineteenth session, a report on the results of this mission undertaken in July 1995.

Angkor (Cambodia)

The Secretariat reported that within the framework of assistance provided by the UNESCO Secretariat to the Cambodian authorities for the implementation of obligations following the inscription of Angkor on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in 1992, a legal expert was sent by UNESCO in March 1995, to finalize for adoption and application, the legislation with regard to the protection of cultural heritage.

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

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

The Bureau recalled the Declaration adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session and commended the Cambodian authorities on the progress made in the implementation of the requests formulated by the Committee at the time of inscription of Angkor on the World Heritage List. The Bureau recommended that the Secretariat provide a detailed report to the World Heritage Committee at its forthcoming session.

#### Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat about the progress made in the setting up of a documentation centre and coordination unit for the restoration works in the Old City and the Secretariat's cooperation with the national and local authorities in training the necessary personnel and purchasing equipment for this unit. It requested the Secretariat to monitor the implementation of the assistance and to present a progress report to the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session. The Bureau recommended the Committee to retain this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### Timbuktu (Mali)

The Mali authorities have committed themselves to the launching of a pilot project to which the management committees and the masons responsible for the three mosques of Djingareiber, Sankoré and Sidi Yahia which are inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, will be associated. Last June the authorities signed a contract with the World Heritage Centre for the first phase of the project, that is the gathering of information and preparations for the pilot work to be undertaken in 1996.

During the implementation of the second phase of the project, the Mali authorities will require assistance in the form of international expertise. To this end, a technical cooperation request will be submitted to the Committee.

The Bureau congratulated the Mali authorities on the rate of implementation of the project which was endorsed by the Committee at its eighteenth session at Phuket, and encouraged them to pursue their efforts for the preservation of this heritage.

#### Bahia Fort (Oman)

After having taken note of the Secretariat's report on the two expert missions organized with the cooperation of the national authorities, (December 1994 and May-June 1995), the Bureau thanked the Omani authorities for their active collaboration with UNESCO for the preservation of Bahia Fort. It particularly appreciated their willingness to follow the advice of the specialists in earth constructions, sent to the site. The Bureau was of the opinion that this was the only way by which the authenticity of the site would be respected and that great importance should continue to be given to this. It thanked the national authorities for the financial support granted for the safeguarding of this heritage and hoped that the outer mosque and the ancient Governor's residence would also be the subject of restoration work in conformity with international recommendations for conservation materials and authenticity.

The Delegate of Oman expressed his satisfaction with the results of the expert missions and warmly thanked the Centre for its

efficiency and excellent collaboration with the Delegation and the national authorities.

#### Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat that the course on adobe conservation that was originally scheduled to take place at this site in 1995 had been postponed to 1996. It decided, therefore, to await the results of the assessment of the conservation policies and practices at the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, that will be undertaken in the context of this course. The Bureau recommended the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### Wieliczka Salt Mines (Poland)

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat on the actions taken to implement the technical cooperation project that was approved by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to monitor the implementation of the technical assistance and the impact of the equipment on the conditions of this site and to keep the Committee informed of the results. The Bureau recommended the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the results and a report of the impact of technical assistance on the project are known.

#### Cultural properties on the World Heritage List

VI.22 The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Committee's observations "had been transmitted to the States Parties concerned and provided updated information on the following properties.

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

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that UNESCO's Division for Physical Heritage organized a project monitoring mission in December 1994 to these two cultural sites in Bangladesh inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1985. The mission reported on the progress of the two projects financed under the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust for Cultural Heritage within the International Safeguarding Campaign for Paharpur and Bagerhat. The mission, while noting with satisfaction, the progress made in the archaeological and architectural documentation, recommended *inter alia* that: (i) national norms and standards be developed with regard to archaeological investigations, recording and documentation, and conservation and construction work to be carried out within the World Heritage protected zones; (ii) a national mechanism for planning, execution, monitoring and evaluation of conservation work and research be established by

the Department of Archaeology; (iii) reports on the recently conducted archaeological research and conservation work be completed and published; (iv) the conservation laboratory at the Department of Archaeology, in terms of building facilities, equipment and staff be improved; (v) sign posts and boards indicating the World Heritage protected area be improved; and (vi) training strategy and programme, perhaps within the SAARC regional framework, be developed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Observer of Senegal who was delighted with this great success, congratulated the Egyptian authorities and UNESCO for their determination and efficiency in the safeguarding of this site.

ICOMOS wished to join Senegal in congratulating the parties concerned for the rapidity and efficiency of this intervention. However, he was concerned that other problems of this type might occur in Egypt and thought that particular attention should be paid to the state of conservation of properties in this country.

#### Medieval City of Rhodes (Greece)

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session, the Greek authorities had presented information on the legal protection and the management arrangements for the City. The Bureau requested the Secretariat jointly with ICOMOS to examine the information provided and to report on it to its next session in December 1995.

#### Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia)

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Third International Experts Meeting on Borobudur was held on site in January 1995 and that the Expert Group expressed satisfaction on the state of conservation of Borobudur, which has been the object of a UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign launched in 1972, although the site was only inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991. The Centre reported that the meeting made, *inter alia*, the following recommendations:

- (i) avoid any future actions or activities that would unnecessarily disturb the traditional appearance of the site, e.g. construction of park features that have little relationship with the local landscape, indigenous plant species; functions which would devalue the dignity of the site;
- (ii) develop regulations to protect Zones III, IV and V

- outside the Borobudur Park boundaries against inappropriate new construction, etc;
- (iii) develop mid-term (5 year) and long-term (10 year) strategic planning policies and programmes in consultation with appropriate national, regional and local authorities to identify and prioritize conservation measures; institution-building; quality and quantity of staffing level and their training needs;
- (iv) review of information management system;
- (v) develop tourism management policy to ensure protection of site and distribution of tourism revenue for conservation activities;
- (vi) develop information material including multi-media material; and
- (vii) further research and publication on stone conservation and biological growth concerns.

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

#### Meidan Emam of Isfahan (Iran)

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

(i) concern over the heavy traffic in the old town, particularly on the Meidan Emam place, which along with the surrounding monuments are in the protected zone. The proposed construction of an underground passage to alleviate the traffic congestion had been shelved due to the high water table preventing its construction and the city magistrate, instead, transformed the main part of the Meidan Emam into a pedestrian zone. The UNESCO mission reported that a project to create a new traffic axe, immediately south of the Meidan Emam, by widening an existing street is currently under study. As the creation of this axe entails cutting the old town and destroying a large number of traditional houses and ancient mud-brick city ramparts, UNESCO has requested the authorities to reconsider the feasibility of this project in view of the conservation concerns.

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

The Bureau, having noted the concerns raised over the impact of the various transportation infrastructure proposals, suggested that the Iranian authorities consider the establishment of meaningful buffer zones to protect the World Heritage site and to report to the Committee at its nineteenth session.

#### Tchogha Zanbil (Iran)

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

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

It was reported that the Physical Heritage Division of UNESCO is currently urging the deployment of a second technical team including a structural engineer to define better the scope of the conservation measures required and to finalize the project document for submission to funding sources.

The Centre informed the Bureau that the Iranian cultural authorities have invited international experts to participate in the preparation of their monitoring reports on the occasion of the forthcoming regional conference for West and Central Asian experts being organized jointly by ICCROM and the Iranian Central Research Laboratory for Conservation of Cultural Heritage.

The Bureau noted the invitation by the Iranian authorities for international experts to participate in the preparation of their systematic monitoring report and suggested that the Iranian authorities inform the Committee at its nineteenth session on the state of conservation of this property.

#### Hatra (Iraq)

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

#### Petra (Jordan)

After having taken note of the Secretariat's report, and additional information from ICOMOS, the Bureau thanked the Jordanian authorities for having undertaken the measures outlined

by the Committee without delay and congratulated them on their desire to ensure long-term conservation of the site. In order to have available all the necessary elements for the evaluation of the proposed extension of the site, it requested the authorities to confirm by 1 October that no new hotel construction projects will be authorized at Wadi Musa and along the Taybeh road, that the Petra National Park Management Plan will be fully implemented and that a specific management authority will be created at the site.

It also recommended that a proposal for the extension of the World Heritage site which would provide its long-term protection be also submitted as soon as possible by the Jordanian authorities.

#### Megalithic Temples (Malta)

After having taken note of the Secretariat's report, the Bureau expressed its regrets that the Maltese authorities had not responded to the requests of the Committee, and stressed the importance that the requested information be submitted to the Centre by 1 October 1995, so that the World Heritage Committee may evaluate the situation at its nineteenth session and take the measures it deems necessary.

#### Hal Saflieni Hypogeum (Malta)

After having taken note of the Secretariat's report, the Bureau expressed its regrets that the Maltese authorities had not responded to the requests of the Committee, and stressed the importance that the requested information be submitted to the Centre by 1 October 1995, so that the World Heritage Committee may evaluate the situation at its nineteenth session and take the measures it deems necessary.

Following the presentation of the reports concerning these two sites, the Observer of Malta wished to thank the Centre for the work accomplished in close collaboration with the national authorities and for the excellent report resulting from a mission to the site by a member of the Secretariat at the invitation of the authorities responsible for conservation. She explained to the Bureau that the delay was not due to disinterest, but to a serious lack of personnel and, in the case of Hal Saflieni, the necessity that the measures concerning the drainage system should be undertaken by another ministerial department.

#### Puebla (Mexico)

The Bureau recalled that World Heritage technical assistance was approved in 1994 in order to advise the national and local authorities on the conservation and rehabilitation policies for this city, particularly for the Rio San Francisco area. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that a high-level expert had

undertaken a series of missions and that the final report will be available by the end of July. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to report on the results of this assistance to the its next session.

#### Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

The Centre recalled that the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session expressed its appreciation for the monitoring report prepared by the Department of Archaeology on the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Committee at its seventeenth session. The Committee approved in December 1994, a technical cooperation request under the World Heritage Fund to finance a six-month mission of an international technical adviser to Kathmandu to assist the authorities in the preparation of a package of projects for international funding and to establish a development control unit within the Department of Archaeology to prevent further encroachment of the protected monument zones of this World Heritage site, and to implement the other recommendations made by the UNESCO/ICOMOS mission of November 1993. The international expert has been identified and deployment is scheduled for August 1995.

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

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

Noting with concern, reports on the continued demolition of and alterations to historic buildings within the World Heritage protected zones and in areas pending official inclusion, the Bureau suggested that the Chairman of the Committee write to the Government authorities urging the urgent publication of the Government gazette indicating the new boundaries of the protected areas and the early establishment of the Inter-ministerial Task Force to implement the actions agreed upon by the Government to strengthen the protection of the World Heritage site of Kathmandu Valley. The Bureau recommended that the Inter-ministerial Task Force and the international technical adviser, report on the latest developments through the official Government channels, to the nineteenth session of the Committee.

### Archaeologic Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan)

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

The mission benefitted from the 15th meeting of the International Consultative Committee (ICC) for the Safeguarding Campaign for Moenjodaro, launched in 1974, to gather information for a monitoring report on this site currently under preparation in collaboration with and at the request of the national authorities. Amongst the observations made were: (i) the need to ensure the sustainability of activities presently funded by UNDP and the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust by integrating the national experts trained under these projects as staff of the Department of Archaeology and Museums; (ii) clarification of the division of responsibilities between the various government entities dealing with the protection and conservation of Moenjodaro; (iii) cost-benefit appraisal of the electricity-generated water pumping work to lower the water table intended to protect the sub-surface archaeological remains; (iv) need for an international technical adviser based in Moenjodaro or in Karachi to provide more regular advice to the on-site conservation team.

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

The Bureau, having noted the concerns raised at the 15th meeting of the Moenjodaro ICC, recommended that UNESCO strengthen its support to the Pakistani authorities over the next two years to enable the termination of the International Campaign as requested by the 25th Session of the General Conference of UNESCO. The Bureau suggested that UNESCO and the national authorities concerned, review the eventual need for the nomination of an international expert based in Karachi or in Moenjodaro for the duration of the remaining period of the Campaign and if affirmative, seek funding to finance the consultant post.

### Taxila (Pakistan)

With regard to Taxila, the Centre reported that during its joint mission with the Sub-regional Office of the Department of Archaeology and Museum in March 1995, it was observed that the nomination file, on the basis of which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List, did not clearly indicate the number of sites it contained. The site of Taxila, under the national registry of historic monuments is composed of some 55 sites spread over an area of about 18 kms x 8 kms of the Taxila Valley.

The Centre reported that the state of conservation of the sites visited varied but, on the whole, were in very good condition given the enormous maintenance work the property entails by its size and dispersed components. A scientific study on the

application of non-toxic herbicide was deemed to be urgently needed in view of the vegetation overgrowth which cannot be cleared mechanically. The mission noted concern over the gradual expansion of the industrial estates located within the Taxila Valley which, despite their location outside the very limited buffer zone surrounding the registered archaeological sites, nonetheless risk impacting upon the overall integrity of the Taxila World Heritage site in its ensemble. The limestone blasting and quarrying activities in the Taxila Valley also need to be monitored in view of the alleged impact on the structural stability of the Jaulian site, Dharmajika Temple and the Bhir Stupa.

International and national funding to establish a site conservation laboratory in Taxila, both for the conservation of movable objects of the impressive Taxila Museum collection and for in-situ sculptures must be sought. The Centre reported that specific recommendations on stucco preservation, roofing, drainage and other conservation measures will be contained in a monitoring report currently under preparation with the Sub-regional Office in Taxila of the Department of Archaeology and Museums.

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

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

Pueblo de Taos (United States of America)

The Bureau recalled that the potential impact of the extension of the Taos Airport on the World Heritage site of Taos Pueblo was discussed at various Bureau and Committee meetings and that the Committee's concerns were transmitted to the United States authorities. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it had received preliminary monitoring reports from the Taos Pueblo War Chief and the US National Park Service. Both reports indicated that the major issue was the size of the area determined to be affected by the proposed airport extension. It was reported that this area was defined by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) without consultations with the Taos Pueblo or the United States National Park Service (USNPS) and did include the Taos Pueblo Land Tracts immediately surrounding the proposed flight routes, whereas the Blue Lake Wilderness, a federally protected area for tribal religious activity, was excluded. Most of the Tribe's complaints about expected impacts related to this sensitive area.

The Bureau recommended to the authorities of the United States that an impartial professional review of the area defined by the Federal Aviation Administration for the impact study be carried out with the cooperation of ICOMOS, the Taos Pueblo, the United States National Park Service and the Federal Aviation Administration, and that a report be submitted to the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The Bureau also requested the Secretariat to consult with the State Party regarding the possible extension of the World Heritage site to include the culturally valuable areas related to the Taos Pueblo under the cultural landscape criteria.

VI.23 ICOMOS reported on its cooperation with the Sri Lankan authorities and international experts in the monitoring of three World Heritage cultural sites - Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa and Sigiriya. The ICOMOS Representative indicated that, as the preliminary report made available to the Bureau emphasized, this experience in Sri Lanka should serve as an example for the methodology applied in the monitoring exercise, especially in its interdisciplinary and systematic data collection methods. He also reported on ICOMOS' involvement in the monitoring of World Heritage sites in the United Kingdom. Reports on these activities will be presented to the Committee at its nineteenth session.

VI.24 The Centre informed the Bureau of a recent meeting between the Ambassador of Afghanistan to the United Nations and the Director-General of UNESCO during which the critical situation of the cultural properties of Afghanistan caused by years of neglect and war damage, as well as the illicit excavation and traffic of movable property were discussed. It was recalled that four of the sites on the tentative list of Afghanistan, namely, Herat, Bamiyan, Ai Khanoum and the Minaret of Jam - were officially nominated by the State Party for inscription and that on the basis of ICOMOS' evaluation, the World Heritage value of these sites was recognized by the Bureau in 1982. However, in view of the absence of management plans and up-dated report on the state of conservation, the Bureau at that time, recommended the Committee to defer its decision.

The Bureau was informed of the request from Afghanistan for preparatory assistance to up-date the nomination files and to identify emergency preservation measures, but the inability to consider this request due to the exhaustion of the preparatory assistance allocation for 1995. The Centre, on behalf of Afghanistan, requested for voluntary contributions to enable this urgently required evaluation mission to prevent the loss of these cultural properties of potential universal value.

The Chairman indicated that this matter will be considered under Agenda item 8, on budgetary questions.

VI.25 During the examination of the state of conservation reports, some delegates raised the question whether the Bureau is authorized to make specific requests or recommendations to States Parties regarding the preservation of their World Heritage

properties. The Chairperson clarified that the Bureau had done so in the past and with the consent of the Committee and that, in many cases, this was indispensable for a timely intervention under the World Heritage Convention. It was decided that this matter would be taken up under the agenda item 'Proposals for improving the working methods of the World Heritage Committee' .

## VII. INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE LISTS AND THE EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

VII.1 At its seventeenth session the World Heritage Committee expressed its preoccupation concerning the small number of Tentative Lists for cultural properties that met the requirements of paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Guidelines, emphasized the importance of these lists and confirmed their obligatory character. Therefore, it was decided that the Secretariat would regularly provide the Bureau and the Committee with the list of Tentative Lists for cultural properties. This list was provided as an annex to Working Document WHC-95/CONF.201/5a.

VII.2 The Bureau examined ten natural nominations, including one extension and one previously deferred site. The Bureau recommended to the Committee to inscribe four properties, to refer back to the States Parties four properties and not to inscribe two properties.

### Natural Heritage

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

Name of Property	Ident. number	State Party having submitted the nomination (in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention)	Criteria
Messel Pit Fossil site	720	Germany	N (i)

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criterion (i) , considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as the single best site which contributes to the understanding of the middle Eocene, when mammals became firmly established in all principal land ecosystems. The Bureau noted that a geological theme study is underway as part of the framework of a global strategy for natural heritage, which is to be completed in 1996. The Bureau, however, is of the opinion that the significance of Messel is clear and need not wait for the results of this study. Furthermore, the Bureau commended the German Government for their support of the high standards of paleontological research undertaken.

Caves of the Aggtelek Slovak Karst	725	Hungary/ Slovak Republic	N(i)
--	-----	-----------------------------	------

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criterion (i) , considering that the site is an outstanding example of on-going geological processes and a significant geomorphic feature. The karst formations and caves contain the geologic history of the last several millions of years with an unusual combination of climatic effects and paleokarst features.

The Bureau noted: (1) that cultural values of prehistoric cultures in the caves have not been assessed, and (2) that strict control of the area is needed from surface activities such as agricultural pollution, deforestation and soil erosion. The Observer of the Slovak Republic stated that the nomination is considered as a natural one, not indicating cultural values, and that the management plan is in place. The Observer of Hungary underlined that the Hungarian part of the nomination is legally well protected as a national park and has a long history of scientific research at the site.

The Virgin Komi Forests	719	Russian Federation	N (ii) (iii)
----------------------------	-----	-----------------------	--------------

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii), considering the site among the most important natural sites in the boreal forest region. The site has pristine boreal forests and is an important site for scientific research including climate change.

The Bureau however noted, that the Committee should only inscribe 3 million ha of the site which are fully protected as a National Park, Zapovednik and buffer zone. It recommended that the national authorities be strongly encouraged to upgrade the legal status of the remaining 1 million ha and that this area be incorporated in a future nomination. The Bureau raised concerns over the possibility of releasing parts of the area to industrial forestry. It commended the national authorities for their conservation efforts as well as Greenpeace, WWF and the Swiss Government for their assistance in strengthening the management of this area.

Carlsbad Caverns National Park	721	United States of America	N(i) (iii)
--------------------------------------	-----	-----------------------------	------------

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i) and (iii), considering that the site is of outstanding universal value with exceptional geological features with unique reef and rock

formations, and containing the world's largest cave deposits, such as accumulations of gypsum chandelier speleothems, aragonite 'christmas trees' and hydromagnesite balloons.

The Bureau noted however, that oil and gas exploration near the borders of the site may be a potential threat. It therefore requested the Centre to write to the national authorities and to encourage the State Party in its proposal for the creation of a cave protection zone to the north of the Park.

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

Odzala National Park (and annexes) 692 Congo

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee not inscribe the nominated property, as the site is of national importance and does not possess distinguishing features of outstanding universal value.

The Bureau recommends that the World Heritage Committee encourage the State Party to consider nomination of a larger area to the north of the Park, the Ndoki National Park, which forms a part of a proposed tri-national park.

Wildlife Reserve of Conkouati 693 Congo

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee not inscribe the nominated property, as the site is of national importance and does not possess distinguishing features of universal value. It noted furthermore, that the site has been degraded over the past ten years.

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

Juan Fernandez Archipelago National Park 716 Chile

The Bureau recognized that the site fulfils natural criterion (iv) for its high biodiversity and significant natural habitats for threatened species, including the high degree of endemic flora. The Bureau, however, raised concern about the integrity of the site, as the site is under threat from introduced animals, and alien flora. The Bureau, therefore, decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party: (1) to allow the Chilean authorities to outline their action to fulfil the requirements of integrity, and (2) that the State Party indicates how resources will be mobilized to prepare an up-dated management plan of the site, as the present version was formulated 25 years ago. The Bureau requested the Centre to write a letter indicating

the above to the national authorities and to request their reply by 1 October 1995 in order to provide the information to the outgoing Bureau in December 1995.

Gough Island                      740                      United Kingdom

The Bureau recommended that World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv), considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as one of the least disturbed major cool-temperate island ecosystems in the South Atlantic Ocean, with one of the most important seabird colonies of the world, high scenic qualities and spectacular sea-cliffs and coastline.

The Bureau requested the Centre to contact the national authorities: (1) to ask them for confirmation whether the marine area is included as part of the nomination and, if so (2) that the name of the site should then read "Gough Island wildlife Reserve". It was further noted that if this was the case, the Government should ensure that any fishery is managed on a sustainable basis. The information should be made available by 1 October 1995 to be presented to the outgoing Bureau in December 1995.

Okapi Wildlife                      718                      Zaïre  
Reserve

The Bureau recognized that the site fulfils natural criteria (iv) for its high biodiversity and significant natural habitats including the Okapi. The site has the highest diversity of primates with 13 species of all African forests and is an exceptional site for threatened birds.

The Bureau noted however, that the cultural values of the site and the living culture of the Pygmies population living in harmony with the forest within the site has not been assessed. The Bureau furthermore noted that the management plan has not been formally approved and raised concern about the integrity of the site. The Bureau therefore, requested the Centre to contact the Ambassador of Zaire and to ask him for the following information for 1 October "1995, to be provided for the outgoing Bureau: (1) when the management plan will be approved; (2) to inform the Bureau about activities underway to halt human intrusion into the site, and (3) to -give assurance for operational and financial support of the staff at the site (salaries) .

D.      Extension to a World Heritage site

Galapagos National      ibis                      Ecuador  
Park Marine  
Extension

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its eighteenth session recognized that the Galapagos Marine Reserve met natural

criteria. It deferred, however the inclusion of the Galapagos Marine Reserve as an extension of Galapagos Islands to be included on the World Heritage List due to recognition of serious threats to the site and in accordance with the IUCN recommendation and the wish of the Observer of Ecuador. The Committee, requested the Centre and IUCN to report back to the nineteenth session of the Bureau. The Centre provided the Ecuadorian Authorities by letter of 1 February 1995 with details of the Committee's decision. No reply was received so far.

The Bureau therefore, requested the Centre and IUCN to report back to the outgoing Bureau in December 1995. The Observer from Ecuador stated that his Government will provide information in time before the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee.

E. Deferred or referred natural nomination for which additional information has been received

Glacier and Waterton Waterton Lakes International Peace Park	354Rev	Canada/United States of America
---	--------	------------------------------------

The Bureau recalled that at its eighteenth session it had decided to defer the examination of this nomination and to request that IUCN undertake a thorough evaluation of the nomination and provide to the Bureau at its nineteenth session a more comprehensive evaluation on which the Committee could base its decision.

The Bureau at its eighteenth session further endorsed a suggestion that the States Parties, in cooperation with IUCN, organize a working group to examine the possibility of an "association of management units" or a series nomination.

The Centre and IUCN informed the Bureau that the working group met in Calgary, Alberta on 28 March 1995 and that copies of the full report of the meeting had been provided to Bureau members. The report supplements the "criteria" of the amended 1994 nomination and further responds to the conditions of integrity.

IUCN informed the Bureau that the IUCN panel held on 10 May 1995, suggested three options but favoured the options of referral or deferral with consideration being given to a "cultural landscape approach". The Bureau however, did not feel comfortable with this option and had considerable discussion on this matter. Additionally, the Observer of Canada indicated that Canada had no intention of proceeding with a cultural landscape nomination. After consultation between the Chair and the delegates, the Bureau agreed that IUCN be requested to complete its evaluation of the nomination, based on the background material at hand, and the report of the meeting of States Parties held in Calgary. The Bureau also stated that the Operational Guidelines should be adhered to and the question of whether the nomination must be of

"outstanding universal value" or the "most outstanding" should be addressed. Finally, it was agreed that the nomination would not be referred back to the States Parties for further information.

The conclusion of the Bureau was that a full evaluation was required before a decision is made. IUCN was therefore requested to prepare the evaluation for the next meeting of the outgoing Bureau in December.

### Cultural properties

VII.3 The Bureau examined twenty-eight cultural properties and one mixed property nomination of which seventeen were recommended for inscription, four were referred and six were deferred. The Bureau could not reach a consensus on one of the nominations.

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

Rapa Nui National Park	715	Chile	C(i) (iii) (v)
------------------------	-----	-------	-------------------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, since preparing the written evaluation of this nomination, it had received the exact delineation of and the regulations for the nominated area, and that it now recommended the inscription of the Rapa Nui National Park based on a joint evaluation by ICOMOS and IUCN.

The Delegate of Germany pointed out that this should also be considered as a relict cultural landscape and that preservation and management should explicitly address these values. ICOMOS agreed with this observation and stressed that an excellent management plan is in place for the whole of the nominated area which is designated as a national park.

The Bureau concluded that Rapa Nui National Park contains one of the most remarkable cultural phenomena in the world. An artistic and architectural tradition of great power and imagination was developed by a society that was completely isolated from external cultural influences of any kind for over a millennium. The substantial remains of this culture blend with their natural surroundings to create an unparalleled cultural landscape.

The Bureau decided to recommend the Committee to inscribe the Rapa Nui National Park on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (i), (iii) and (v).

The Historic Centre of Santa Cruz de Mompox	742	Colombia	C(iv) (v)
---	-----	----------	-----------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, since preparing the written evaluation of this nomination, it had received a new plan with

revised boundaries of the nominated area in accordance with the ICOMOS recommendation, and that it now recommended the inscription of the Historic Centre of Santa Cruz de Mompox.

The Bureau concluded that the Historic Centre of Santa Cruz de Mompox is an outstanding example of a Spanish colonial settlement established on the banks of a major river and serving an important strategic and commercial role which has survived to a remarkable level of intactness to the present day.

The Bureau decided to recommend the Committee to inscribe the Historic Centre of Santa Cruz de Mompox on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (v).

The Bureau requested the Secretariat to make the ICOMOS evaluation available to the Colombian national and local authorities for consideration of the detailed set of technical recommendations made for the city's preservation. The Delegate of Colombia informed that the ICOMOS recommendations had been considered already by the national and local authorities and that several of them were already being implemented. The Bureau congratulated the Colombian authorities for this positive response.

National Archaeological Park of Tierradentro	743	Colombia	C(iii)
---	-----	----------	--------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, since preparing the written evaluation of this nomination, it had received additional information including a map with the exact boundaries and that it now recommended the inscription of the National Archaeological Park of Tierradentro. As to the preservation measures, the Delegate of Colombia informed the Bureau that, under the World Heritage emergency assistance approved in 1994, a workshop was held on the site in May 1995 to define a conservation strategy and to define the most urgent measures to be undertaken. She informed that the same will be done for the San Agustin Archaeological Park in the future.

The Bureau concluded that the hypogea of the National Archaeological Park of Tierradentro are unique testimony to the everyday life, ritual, and burial customs of a developed and stable prehispanic society in the northern Andean region of South America.

The Bureau decided to recommend the Committee to inscribe the National Archaeological Park of Tierradentro on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii).

San Agustin Archaeological Park	744	Colombia	C(iii)
------------------------------------	-----	----------	--------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, since preparing the written evaluation of this nomination, it had received additional

information including a map with the exact boundaries and that it now recommended the inscription of the San Agustin Archaeological Park.

The Bureau concluded that the wealth of megalithic statuary from the archaeological sites in San Agustin Archaeological Park bears vivid witness to the artistic creativity and imagination of a prehispanic culture that flowered in the hostile tropical environment of the Northern Andes.

The Bureau decided to recommend the Committee to inscribe the San Agustin Archaeological Park on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii).

Kutná Hera: The Historical Town Centre with the Church of St Barbara and the Cathedral of Our Lady at Sedlec	732	Czech Republic	C(ii) (iv)
--	-----	-------------------	------------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the site under criteria (ii) and (iv) as an outstanding example of the mediaeval town whose wealth and prosperity was based on its silver mines. The Church of Saint Barbara and other buildings were underlined as having particular architectural and artistic quality and as having had a profound influence on subsequent developments in the architecture of Central Europe.

Ferrara: City of the Renaissance	733	Italy	C(ii) (iv) (vi)
-------------------------------------	-----	-------	-----------------

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value, being a Renaissance city, remarkably planned, which has retained its urban fabric virtually intact. The developments in town planning expressed in Ferrara were to have a profound influence on the development of urban design throughout the succeeding centuries. The brilliant court of the Este family attracted a constellation of outstanding artists, poets, and philosophers, particularly the new humanists of Renaissance Italy, during the two seminal centuries of the Renaissance.

The Historic Centre of Naples	726	Italy	C(ii) (iv)
----------------------------------	-----	-------	------------

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv), considering that the site is of outstanding universal value being one of the most ancient cities in Europe, whose contemporary urban fabric preserves the elements of its long and eventful history. Its street pattern, its wealth of historic buildings from many periods, and its setting on the Bay of Naples give it an







the Bureau, the Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv).

Jerash

324

Jordan

The Bureau decided to refer this nomination to the State Party until such times as assurances can be given on the following points:

- a) the establishment of a buffer zone of at least 50m, but preferably 100m to the north, west and south of the site within which no construction of any kind would be permitted;
- b) effective cooperation should be established between the Department of Antiquities and the Ministry of Tourism, with the participation of the Municipality of Jerash and the Jerash Festival Committee for the future management of the site;
- c) that all permanent structures associated with the Festival should be removed from the archaeological site and restricted periods agreed for their subsequent erection and dismantling during the Festival.

If the State Party can provide the necessary assurances on these different points by 1 October 1995, the Bureau would recommend that the site be inscribed under cultural criteria (i), (ii) and (iii) on the World Heritage List.

Schokland and its surroundings

739

Netherlands

The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party in order to allow the State Party to resolve the situation regarding the potential recreation area. In the event of a satisfactory solution being proposed by 1 October 1995, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (v).

Savannah City Plan

746

United States of America

The Bureau adopted the recommendation made by ICOMOS to refer this nomination back to the State Party, indicating that it is only likely to be inscribed on the World Heritage List if it is extended to the entire urban fabric of the historic plan area and not confined to the streets and open spaces.

c. Properties for which nominations were deferred

The Historic Centre  
of Rouen 727 France

The Bureau decided to defer the examination of the nomination in order to allow the responsible authorities to redefine the boundaries of both the nominated area and the buffer zone. Regarding ICOMOS' request for a more comprehensive management plan, the Bureau accepted the information provided by the State Party, i.e. that the National protection and safeguard laws of 1913 and 1962 provide for ample management. The Bureau did not endorse ICOMOS' recommendation that a comparative study should be undertaken for this type of property.

The Bauhaus and its  
sites in Weimar and  
Dessau 729 Germany

The Bureau decided to defer the examination of this nomination to allow the State Party to provide more detailed conservation and management plans for the group of properties proposed, and to reconsider the buffer zones.

Old City of Salt 689 Jordan

The Bureau decided to defer this proposed nomination until such times as the State Party is in a position to confirm that appropriate protective measures, based on the Plan of Action of 1990, have been adopted and are being effectively implemented.

Crespi d'Adda 730 Italy

The Bureau decided to defer the examination of this nomination to await the soonest possible outcome of a comparative study of "company towns" in Europe and North America, prepared by TICCIH on behalf of ICOMOS.

Town of Luang Prabang 479Rev. Laos

The Bureau decided to defer the nomination to await a further expert evaluation to assess the impact of the Heritage protection Zone and the consequent conservation programmes.

The Ruins of León 613Rev. Nicaragua  
Viejo (Nicaragua)

The German Delegate questioned whether this nomination met the principal criteria of-outstanding universal value, and asked that this matter be clarified before discussing the issue of protection and management. The Representative of ICOMOS indicated that they considered that the site met the criteria.

The Bureau therefore adopted the recommendation made by ICOMOS to defer the examination of the nomination of the Ruins of León Viejo to enable the State Party to provide clearer information about the delineation of the proposed site and its buffer zone, the management plan and its implementation, and measures for protection against flood threats to the integrity of the archaeological remains.

VII.3 The Bureau examined the nomination of Lunenburg Old Town, Canada (741) and considered the following recommendation made by ICOMOS: "ICOMOS recommends that consideration of this nomination be deferred for two years to await the outcome of a comparative study of European colonial planned settlements. In the event of the British component of this study not being completed by that time, ICOMOS recommends that consideration be given to inscription of Lunenburg on the List without further delay, on the basis of criteria (iv) and (v)." During the Bureau session, the Representative of ICOMOS indicated that ICOMOS was prepared to recommend the inscription of Lunenburg Old Town without the preparation of comparative study.

As no consensus could be reached on the necessity of a comparative study as recommended by ICOMOS, the Bureau decided to adjourn the debate to the outgoing session of the Bureau in December 1995.

VII.4 The debate on this nomination led to an extensive discussion on the general principle and scope of comparative studies. In response to the Italian Delegate's indication of doubt on the whole notion of comparative studies, the Representative of Germany recalled that the Committee had long considered such studies, whether of a universal or a regional framework, to be essential in determining the outstanding universal value of properties to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. ICOMOS maintained that comparative studies are necessary for certain types of property to avoid the over-representation of the same type of property. The Director of the Centre cited Article 11.2 of the Convention which refers to universal value and to paragraph 12 of the Operational Guidelines which specifically refers to the need for comparative evaluations. The Chairman stated that the Committee and Bureau, on numerous occasions had requested such studies as *modus operandi*.

#### VIII. EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND: STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS FOR 1994 AND BUDGETARY INFORMATION FOR 1995

VIII.1 The Director of the World Heritage Centre presented the three documents: WHC-95/CONF.201.6a; WHC-95/CONF.201.6b and the Corrigendum to 6b.

VIII.2 While thanking China, Korea and Thailand for their voluntary contributions in addition to their obligatory contributions to the World Heritage Fund, the Director of the Centre stressed the importance of receiving additional voluntary

contributions in order to respond to the growing needs of international assistance for the protection of World Heritage sites.

VIII.3 Several members of the Bureau took part in the debate, notably the Delegate of China who expressed his thanks to the Secretariat for the well presented budget document.

VIII.4 The Delegate of Italy asked the reason why the funding of the project "Preparation of a Study on promotion and Fund-raising" appeared under the promotional activities budget line. The Director recalled that at the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee held in Phuket, it was stated that only the expenses incurred for the preparation of the logo had been covered by the Director-General, as this activity was not requested nor approved by the Committee nor the Bureau. The Delegate of Italy requested clarification on the procedures governing the expenses incurred for promotional activities. The Director of the Centre explained that a financial allocation was granted in block for promotional activities by the Committee after examination of the Workplan. He also indicated that requests from States Parties for promotional activities were indeed approved in accordance with paragraph 109 of the Operational Guidelines.

VIII.5 The Bureau recommended that all the backlog and outstanding payments of World Heritage contributions should be paid in time to the World Heritage Fund.

VIII.6 In response to a proposal by the Secretariat, the Bureau decided not to discuss at present the draft text of the proposed new Financial Regulations of the World Heritage Fund, which would include the UNESCO financial allocation to the Centre, as the matter will be discussed in the coming 147th session of the UNESCO Executive Board.

VIII.7 Finally, the Bureau took note of the World Heritage Fund and budget documents presented and suggested to up-date the documents in order to present them to the nineteenth session of the Committee which will be held in Berlin next December.

## IX. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

IX.1 The Bureau examined documents WHC-95/CONF.201/7 and WHC-95/CONF.201/7Add and noted that, in accordance with the decisions at the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, one third of the funds should be for natural heritage. Therefore, only requests for technical cooperation for natural heritage were brought forward to the Bureau. The Bureau, taking note of the amount of the remaining funds for international assistance, took the following decisions:

Requests approved:

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

Technical assistance for this site inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger for refurbishing, maintenance of the Headquarters buildings and for the reinforcement of the administrative structure-for an amount of US\$ 18,000 was approved.

Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda)

The technical assistance request for radio equipment, ranger field equipment and rescue gear for Rwenzori Mountains National Park for an amount of US\$ 20,000 was approved.

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Zaire)

The technical cooperation request for a 4-WD Toyota Land Cruiser Station Wagon for better surveillance and control of the National Park was approved (an amount of US\$ 30,000), subject to the payment of outstanding dues to the World Heritage Fund.

X. PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVING THE WORKING METHODS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

X.1 Introducing this item on the basis of the Working Document WHC-95/CONF.201/8, the Representative of the Secretariat clarified that the World Heritage Committee, at its eighteenth session in Phuket had not in fact proposed this item. It was felt, however, both by the Secretariat and the advisory bodies, that it was necessary to explore a more rational and efficient way of work which could be proposed to the Committee. The working document in question was therefore only a first attempt, the purpose of which was to initiate a discussion on this subject.

X.2 In the ensuing debate it was agreed, as suggested by the Chair, that paragraph 1 of the Working Document was to be deleted as there had been no such "request" from the Committee. Specific comments made by the members of the Bureau, the advisory bodies and some of the observers, can be summarized as follows:

x.3 The Delegate of Colombia expressed her concern regarding point 2(a) of the working document stating that this would prolong the process of nomination of new sites for a whole year.

X.4 The Delegate of Germany shared this concern but underlined, on the other hand, the need to introduce some changes in order to avoid the increasingly lengthy debates on new nominations. He therefore considered the working document as a useful tool to initiate possible improvements, provided that it is put forward to the Committee with the modifications which the Secretariat could receive in the meantime.

X.5 The Delegate of Italy was against the proposal, stating that it had no business being proposed in the first place as this had not been requested by the Committee. He commented that the proposed revision of the Operational Guidelines hence did not merit consideration. Regarding point 2(a), he recalled that the Bureau's role was to prepare the ground for the Committee, and that the proposal in question was in fact reversing the roles of the Committee and the Bureau. Regarding point 2(b), he said that such a new approach would deprive the Committee of its right to discuss the reports on the state of conservation of the properties which is, he emphasized, one of its primary tasks. To discuss the reports of each region every five years would be insufficient. Further on, speaking for the second time, the Delegate of Italy pointed out that the proposed working document presents serious problems both in terms of substance and method. In terms of substance, it raises the question of the relationship between the Bureau and the Committee: He therefore reiterated that point 2(a) is totally unacceptable. Consequently, he considered that the time schedule proposed which excludes the role of the Bureau in the initial examination of proposed nominations for inscription, was also unacceptable. As regards point 2(b), he reminded the Bureau that the question of monitoring reports, especially those concerning the properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, are extremely delicate and therefore cannot be the sole responsibility of the Bureau. His final comment was that, should the proposal be presented to the Committee, it must be accompanied by a detailed account of the comments and reservations made by the members of the Bureau and some observers.

X.6 The Observer of France likewise expressed her astonishment at the error made in paragraph 1. of the Working Document, and regretted the time she lost in looking for it in the report of the eighteenth session. While she agreed with the concerns expressed by the Delegate of Italy concerning point 2(a), notably the reversal of the roles of the Bureau and the Committee, and the need for the Bureau to discuss the new nominations (as is presently the case), she nonetheless admitted that the working methods regarding the nomination discussions could be improved. Regarding point 2(b), she shared the comments made by the Delegate of Italy.

X.7 The Delegate of Senegal accepted the Secretariat's explanation regarding the error in paragraph 1 and endorsed the Chairman's proposal that the paragraph be simply deleted from any future written proposal. As for the proposal itself, he felt that it was necessary to submit it to the Committee together with a statement of all of the reservations expressed by the Bureau. The working methods do need to be improved, and he would welcome it if the Secretariat could propose how best to manage the time which is at the Bureau's and the Committee's disposal. This statement was endorsed by the Delegate of Germany during his second intervention.

X.8 The Delegate of China first stated his awareness of the fact that, as regards point 2(a), the position of the States

Parties is necessarily different from that of the advisory bodies. He, however, associated himself with the position of the advisory bodies, i.e. that they need more time in order to accomplish accurate evaluations of new nominations and good monitoring reports. The initiative undertaken by the Secretariat seemed to him therefore justified.

X.9 The Delegate of Oman expressed his concern regarding the new proposal relating to working methods of the World Heritage Committee. He found it difficult for the Bureau to express an opinion or take a decision at such short notice. He felt that such proposals should first be discussed by the General Assembly of States Parties. However, at a later juncture, he proposed that the whole issue be withdrawn if a consensus was not reached.

X.10 The Observer of Australia agreed with the concerns expressed by Colombia regarding the extension of time of the nominations process. Should the new proposal be adopted this will prolong the process from nine to eighteen months.

X.11 The Observer of Malta endorsed the statements made by the Delegates of Italy, France, Colombia and Australia, particularly those regarding monitoring, i.e. points 2(b) and (c). She found it difficult to accept that each region would be discussed only every five years.

X.12 The Observer of Lebanon regretted that the Permanent Delegations had not been invited to the consultation which the Secretariat had had with the advisory bodies on 6 February 1995 concerning this matter. Furthermore, he indicated that the new proposal would take away from the Committee the possibility to discuss such important matters as, for instance, the budget. Taking the floor again later in the discussion, the Observer of Lebanon drew the Bureau's attention to the fact that the Committee had adopted at its session in Phuket a new timetable and that coming up with yet another new timetable would certainly create a great confusion among the States Parties.

X.13 The Representative of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) stated that something clearly had to be done: either have the Committee meetings running into a second week or trim down the agenda. In any case, it was necessary to be proactive, hence the proposal of the February meeting. He furthermore said that for their Organization it was becoming increasingly difficult to present at each Bureau and each Committee both the evaluations of the new nominations and the monitoring reports. Finally, he drew the Bureau's attention to the fact that the evaluations of the nominations coming in October from the Arctic or similar regions need to be done, by the present method, in the midst of winter. The Bureau, he hoped, could appreciate what it means doing such evaluations in dark and at -40 degrees Celsius. He therefore proposed that the time be extended from the present 15 months to 18 months, i.e. that the 1 July deadline be maintained or possibly changed to 1 August.

X.14 The Representative of ICOMOS likewise stated that the present methods need to be improved, and it" is for the Bureau to propose. On their part, he wished to state that more time (one-two months) is needed for evaluation missions and for obtaining mission information.

X.15 Having heard all the comments, the Chair proposed that the matter be submitted to the Committee at its nineteenth session together with a detailed account of the comments and reservations expressed by the Bureau and some observers. The Bureau agreed with this proposal.

XI. REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

XI.1 It was recalled that the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session decided that the following items should be included on the agenda of this Bureau session.

A. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

XI.2 The Bureau examined Working Document WHC-95/CONF.201/9 and Information Document WHC-95/CONF.201/INF.4 and noted that following the decisions of the World Heritage Committee in 1992 and 1993 to include cultural landscapes in the World Heritage List and in the context of the global strategy for a representative World Heritage List, two thematic study meetings were held in 1994:

'Heritage Canals' (Canada, 15-19 September 1994),

'Routes as a Part of our Cultural Heritage' (Spain, 24-25 November 1994) .

In 1995, two regional thematic study meetings were held in the Asia-Pacific region:

'Regional Thematic Study Meeting on Asian Rice Culture and its Terraced Landscapes' (Philippines, 28 March to 4 April 1995)

'Identifying and Assessing World Heritage Cultural Landscapes (Associative Landscapes)' (Australia, 26 to 28 April 1995).

XI.3 The Bureau commended the States Parties for their efforts and recommended to the Committee to consider the results as future reference in the evaluation and examination of nominations of properties falling in the categories of canals, heritage routes, rice culture and its terraced landscapes and associative landscapes.

XI.4 The Delegate of Germany stressed that the cultural landscape category reflects the interaction between nature and

culture and that, therefore, the Committee should consider to add this category to the two existing ones, i.e. cultural and natural heritage, and that a special set of criteria for the Operational Guidelines should be considered. He also proposed that in the World Heritage List a clear indication be given of the properties falling in this category.

XI.5 The Bureau considered the following recommendations made by the expert meetings for the revision of the Operational Guidelines:

A.1. The role of the local people in the nomination process

The Bureau recognized the important role of the local people in the nomination process and the management of the properties. It recommended, therefore, the Committee to revise paragraph 14 of the Operational Guidelines as follows:

*14. Participation of local people in the nomination process is essential to make them feel a shared responsibility with the State Party in the maintenance of the site.*

A.2. Criteria for the inclusion of cultural properties in the World Heritage List

The Bureau endorsed the recommendations 'made by the Expert Meeting on Canals and recommended that the Committee revise paragraph 24.(a) as follows:

24. (a) (i) (unchanged)

(ii) add "or technology" after "landscape design", the paragraph to read as follows:

*exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, monumental arts or town-planning, landscape design or technology; or*

(iii) (unchanged)

(iv) add " or technological ..." i.e. "architectural or technological ensemble", the paragraph to read as follows:

*be an outstanding example of a type of building, or architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history; or*

(v) (unchanged)

(vi) (unchanged) .

The Bureau recalled that during the eighteenth session of the Committee the Delegate of Lebanon mentioned several problems of syntax in the formulation of criterion b(ii) of paragraph 24 of the Guidelines. Thus, the Bureau recommended that the Committee revise the text as follows:

24. (b) (ii) *have adequate legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural properties or cultural landscapes. The existence of protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level and/or a well-established traditional protection as well as of adequate management mechanisms is therefore essential and, as is clearly indicated in the following paragraph, must be stated clearly on the nomination form. Assurances of the effective implementation of these laws and/or of this traditional protection as well as of these management mechanisms are also expected. Furthermore, in order to preserve the integrity of cultural sites, particularly those open to large numbers of visitors, the State Party concerned should be able to provide evidence of suitable administrative arrangements to cover the management of the property, its conservation and its accessibility to the public.*

#### A.3. Explanatory notes on cultural landscapes

Both thematic expert meetings on canals and heritage routes proposed to include definitions of these types of cultural properties in the Operational Guidelines. After some discussion the Bureau recommended that the Committee adds 'for example canals and heritage routes' and revises paragraph 40 as follows:

40. *The extent of a cultural landscape for inclusion on the World Heritage List is relative to its functionality and intelligibility. In any case, the samples elected must be substantial enough to adequately represent the totality of the cultural landscape that it illustrates. The possibility of designating long linear areas which represent culturally significant transport and communication networks should not be excluded, for example canals and heritage routes.*

As to the definition of these types of cultural properties, the Bureau recommended that the Committee requests the Secretariat, in collaboration with the advisory bodies, to prepare a glossary of terms as an annex to the Operational Guidelines. The following definitions proposed by the expert meetings could then be included in this glossary of terms:

*A canal is a human-engineered waterway. It may be of outstanding universal value from the point of view of*

*history or technology, either intrinsically or as an exceptional example representative of this category of cultural property. The canal may be a monumental work, the defining feature of a linear cultural landscape, or an integral component of a complex cultural landscape.*

*A heritage route is composed of tangible elements of which the cultural significance comes from exchanges and a multi-dimensional dialogue across countries or regions, and that illustrate the interaction of movement, along the route, in space and time.*

#### A.4. ROLE OF THE ADVISORY BODIES IN THE EVALUATION OF NOMINATIONS

In order to better describe the advisory bodies' evaluation process of cultural and natural properties, the Bureau recommended that the Committee deletes paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Operational Guidelines, which only describe the process for natural properties, and to introduce a new paragraph before par. 59 as follows:

##### F. Guidelines for the evaluation and examination of nominations

XX. *The evaluation of whether or not individual sites nominated by States Parties satisfy the criteria and the conditions of authenticity/integrity will be carried out by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) for cultural properties and by the World Conservation Union (IUCN) for natural properties. In the case of nominations of cultural properties in the category of 'cultural landscapes', as appropriate, the evaluation will be carried out in consultation with the World Conservation Union (IUCN). The evaluation will normally include:*

*Data assembly and internal review:  
ICOMOS/IUCN reviews the nomination dossier, identifies which additional information is required and assembles data on the nominated and comparable properties. This may take the form of a standardized data sheet.*

##### **External review:**

*Expert advice is sought on the 'outstanding universal value' of the nominated property, with special reference to the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List (para. 24 (a) and para. 44 (a) respectively) .*

##### **Field inspection:**

*Expert missions are sent to evaluate the site and particularly to study the criteria relating to authenticity/integrity, protection, conservation and management (para 24. (b) and para. 44 (b) respectively).*

*Panel review:*

*Draft evaluations are prepared on the basis of the reports of the expert groups and subjected to a formal review by panels of experts.*

*Reporting:*

*ICOMOS/IUCN Presents an evaluation report, which is an outcome of the four steps mentioned above, to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.*

*ICOMOS/IUCN, taking into account the decisions of the Bureau and additional information that might have been received from the nominating State Party, presents a final evaluation report to the World Heritage Committee.*

*The report of the World Heritage Committee's session will include its decision, the criteria under which the nominated site has been inscribed, the justification of their application as well as any" recommendation the Committee may wish to make on that occasion.*

B. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

B.1. DEADLINES FOR PRESENTATION OF REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BUREAU AND THE COMMITTEE

The Bureau recalled that over the years, it had become practice that a great number of requests which were to be examined by the Bureau and the Committee, were submitted shortly before their sessions.

To facilitate the work of the Secretariat and the advisory bodies and to enable them to prepare the necessary documents well in advance of the sessions of the Bureau and the Committee, the Bureau recommended that the Committee introduces strict deadlines for the submission of all requests for technical assistance, with the exception of requests for emergency assistance, at 1 May and 1 October respectively for examination at the following session of the Bureau. The Bureau recommended to delete paragraph 104, which only sets a deadline for large-scale technical cooperation requests, and to introduce the above deadlines in a new paragraph after paragraph 109, as follows:

*XX All requests for international assistance which are to be examined by the Bureau, with the exception of requests for emergency assistance, should be submitted before 1 May and 1 October respectively for consideration by the following session of the Bureau. Large-scale requests (that is those exceeding US\$ 30,000) will be forwarded, with the Bureau's recommendation, to the following session of the World Heritage Committee for decision-making.*

## B.2. AUTHORITY OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND THE BUREAU TO APPROVE REQUESTS

The Bureau considered the need to amend the amounts that can be approved by the Chairperson and the Bureau for preparatory assistance, technical cooperation and training.

The Delegates of Germany and Italy expressed the view that a revision of the amounts that can be approved by the Chairperson and the Bureau should be seen in relation to an overall World Heritage strategy particularly for technical cooperation. In particular, they stressed that World Heritage technical cooperation should focus on large-scale projects instead of a great number of smaller ones. The afore-mentioned Delegates, as well as the observers from France, Lebanon and Benin, recalled that the total amount available under the World Heritage Fund is not likely to increase and that, therefore, any change in the amounts should be excluded for the moment. The Observer of France recalled that at the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee it was suggested that a budgetary ceiling for promotional activities be established.

The Delegate of Colombia regretted that for-1995 practically all funds had been committed already by the Bureau and the Committee in December 1994 and that, as a consequence, no small-scale requests could be considered in the course of the year. This reflects the need to develop a strategy for the use of the World Heritage Fund.

As to the question whether this issue should be included on the agenda for the next Committee's session, the Bureau decided not to do so and that this matter could be discussed under the deliberations on the 'Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the budget for 1996, and presentation of a provisional budget for 1997'. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to prepare a background paper on this matter that should include an analysis of the type and number of requests over the last years as well as the amounts of these requests.

## XII. DRAFT AGENDA FOR THE EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE BUREAU (1-2 DECEMBER, 1995)

XII.1 The Bureau adopted the Draft Agenda for the extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, to be held in Berlin, Germany on 1 and 2 December 1995. The Bureau also agreed to the Chairman's recommendation that the Secretariat be authorized to add other items to the Agenda should the need arise.

## XIII. PREPARATION OF THE NINETEENTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, INCLUDING THE DRAFT AGENDA (4-9 DECEMBER 1995)

XIII.1 The Provisional Agenda for the nineteenth session of the Committee as outlined in Document WHC-95/CONF.201/11 was

adopted by the Bureau with the following observations and additional agenda items:

*Balanced representation of natural and cultural heritage on  
on the World Heritage List  
Progress report on the implementation of the Global  
Strategy*

XIII.2 The Delegate of Germany recalled that the Committee at its eighteenth session noted the imbalance of the cultural and natural heritage in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and made the following observations: he recalled that a meeting is planned on the notion of integrity to be organized jointly by the Centre and France. He noted that the imbalance between natural and cultural properties is growing and that there is a serious need to take action. More specifically he drew the attention of the Bureau to the following facts: there are three times as many cultural as natural sites on the World Heritage List; that there were 26 new cultural nominations and nine new natural nominations presented; that a global strategy is still lacking for natural heritage; that there is a striking imbalance in the staffing of the World Heritage Centre; that there is a continuing concern about the balance of specialists representing States Parties at the statutory meetings; that the notion of "outstanding universal value" is being applied differently by the two advisory bodies; that there is a need to rationalize the technical evaluation process to ensure that both advisory bodies apply similar judgement values with respect to their recommendations. He underlined that action needs to be taken immediately to ensure that this divergence should be corrected. It was agreed that a background paper be prepared by the Centre in cooperation with the German Delegation, the advisory bodies and other interested parties. The Bureau adopted an agenda item on 'Balanced representation of natural and cultural heritage on the World Heritage List'.

XIII.3 It was furthermore recommended that the issue of *comparative studies* be brought up under item 11 (Examination of the World Heritage Fund) of the Provisional Agenda.

XIII.4 The Observer of Australia noted that an agenda item "*Progress report on the implementation of the Global Strategy*" be included.

XIII.5 The Delegate of Italy urged that major topics be considered in the plenary session of the Committee and not in *working groups*. These should be constituted by the Committee and could discuss minor items of a technical nature to save time and to provide an opportunity for reflection on major issues during the plenary session. The Observer of France expressed her concern about entrusting certain subjects which should be discussed only in plenary to working groups. The Observer of Lebanon noted in addition that no simultaneous meetings should take place and that working groups should have full interpretation facilities. Furthermore, it was suggested that

the Committee, rather than the Secretariat, should decide about the establishment of working groups.

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

No discussions were held under this item.

XV. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE BUREAU AND CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

XV.1 Having examined the draft report presented by the Rapporteur, the Bureau adopted the Report with a number of amendments requested by the the delegates, observers and representatives of the advisory bodies. These have been incorporated when preparing the present final version of the Report.

XV.2 Among the amendments that were adopted, the Bureau decided, upon the request of the Delegate of Italy, and endorsed by some other delegates and observers, that the reference concerning the Natural and Culture-historical Region of Kotor (Yugoslavia), mentioned on page 27 of the draft report (English language) presenting the state of conservation reports of the sites inscribed on the World Heritage in Danger List, be deleted from the report on the grounds that "it had not been discussed by the Bureau".

XV.3 The Delegate of Germany, speaking on behalf of the members of the Bureau, thanked the -Chairman, Dr Adul Wichiencharoen, for his efficient chairing of a difficult meeting. He also expressed his pleasure that the next meeting of the Bureau and the Committee would take place in Germany, in December 1995.

XV.4 The Delegate of Italy and the Observer of France congratulated the Secretariat for producing the draft report in time.

Annex I/Annexe I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

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

CHINA/CHINE

Mr ZHANG Chongli  
Deputy Secretary-General  
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO  
BEIJING 100 816

Mr GUO Zhan  
Director, Division No.1  
State Bureau of Cultural Relics  
BEIJING 100 009

Mr LI Jian Gang  
Délégation permanence de la Chine auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE

Mr Pablo OBREGON  
Ambassadeur auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

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

Ms Isabel VERNAZA  
Premier Secrétaire  
Delegation permanence de la Colombie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE

Dr Hans CASPARY  
Conservator of Historic Monuments  
Landesamt für Denkmalspflege Rheinland - Pfalz  
Göttelmannstrasse 17  
D-55130 MAINZ

Prof.Dr Harald PLACHTER  
University of Marburg  
Fachbereich Biologic  
Karl-von-Frisch-Strasse  
D-35032 MARBURG

Mr Thilo KÖHLER  
Federal Foreign Office (Referat 611-9)  
Postfach 1148  
D-53001 BONN

ITALY/ITALIE

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

Mr Pasquale Bruno MALARA  
Soprintendente  
Beni Ambientali e Architettonici de Turin  
TURIN

Mr Luciano MARCHETTI  
Directeur et Coordinateur  
Ministère des Biens culturels et naturels  
Piazza Pitti 1  
FLORENCE

Mrs Margherita SABATINI  
Attachée au Secteur UNESCO  
Direction général des Affaires culturelles  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
ROME

OMAN

Dr Musa Bin Jaafar Bin HASSAN  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Oman to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

SENEGAL

Mr Mbaye Bassine DIENG  
Directeur  
Patrimoine Historique et Ethnographique  
Ministère de la Culture  
B.P. 4001  
DAKAR

Mr Cheikhma SANKARE  
Conseiller  
Délégation du Sénégal auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

THAILAND/THAILANDE

Professor Dr. Adul WICHIENTHAROEN  
Chairman  
National Committee for Protection of the  
World Cultural and Natural Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy & Planning  
60/1 Phibulwattana, Rama 6 Road  
BANGKOK 10400

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

Mr. Prachot SANGKANUKIJ  
Director, Archaeology Division  
Fine Arts Department  
Ministry of Education  
Si Ayutthaya Road  
BANGKOK 10300

Mr Borvornvej RUNGRUJEE  
Director of Ayutthaya Historical City Project  
Fine Arts Department  
Ministry of Education  
BANGKOK

Mrs Uthaiphun YIMSIRIKUL  
Budget Analist, Budget Bureau  
Office of the Prime Minister  
BANGKOK

Mr Tawee NOOTONG  
Forest Technical Official  
Wildlife Conservation Division  
Royal Forest Department  
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives  
BANGKOK

Mrs Usa KIATCHAIPAT  
Secretariat Officer  
National Committee for Protection of the  
World Cultural and Natural Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment  
BANGKOK

Mrs Srianong KUNGKAYA  
Secretariat Officer  
National Committee for Protection of the  
World Cultural and Natural Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment  
BANGKOK

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

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

Mr Jean-Louis LUXEN  
Secretary General  
ICOMOS  
75, rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

Ms Carole ALEXANDRE  
Director  
ICOMOS  
75, rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

Mr Henry CLEERE  
World Heritage Co-ordinator  
ICOMOS  
75, rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

Ms Carmen ANON FELIU  
Member of the Executive Committee  
Puerto Santamaria 49  
MADRID 28043  
Spain

Mr Joseph PHARES  
Member of the Executive Committee  
B.P 50222  
BEYROUTH (Liban)  
et/ou  
70, rue Saint Didier  
75116 PARIS

Ms Regina DURIGHELLO  
Assistant to the World Heritage Coordinator  
ICOMOS  
75, rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

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  
(ICCRUM)

Mr Jukka JOKILEHTO  
Chief  
Architectural Conservation Programme  
Via di San Michele, 13  
00153 ROME (Italy)

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

Mr Per RYDEN  
Assistant Director-General  
Conservation Policy, IUCN - The World Conservation Union  
Rue Mauverney, 28  
1196 GLAND  
Switzerland

Dr James THORSELL  
Senior Advisor - Natural Heritage, IUCN - The World  
Conservation Union  
Rue Mauverney, 28  
CH-1196 GLAND  
Switzerland

Mr P.H. C. (Bing) LUCAS  
Vice-Chair, World Heritage  
IUCN Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas  
1/268 Main Road  
Tawa  
WELLINGTON  
New Zealand

M. Gérard SOURNIA  
IUCN  
Fax: 47 23 12 82

### III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS

#### ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE

Mrs Maria Susana PATARO  
Délégué permanent  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

#### AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Mr David KAY  
Assistant Secretary  
World Heritage and Biodiversity Branch  
Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories  
CANBERRA

Ms Sarah TITCHEN  
Department of Archaeology & Anthropology  
Australian National University  
CANBERRA ACT 0200

Mr Jonathan BROWN  
Alternative Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

BENIN

Mr Nouréini TIDJANI-SERPOS  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Benin  
to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

M. Isidore MONSI  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente du Benin auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

BOLIVIA/BOLIVIE

Ms Maria Silvia ROCA BRONO  
Attachée civile  
Délégation permanente de la Bolivie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

BURKINA FASO

M. Jean-Baptiste KIETHEGA  
Maître-Assistant d'Archéologie  
Université de Ouagadougou  
Burkina Faso

CANADA

Mme Gisèle CANTIN  
Chef, Affaires Internationales  
Pares Canada  
Ministère du Patrimoine Canadien  
25, rue Eddy  
HULL, Quebec K1A 0M5

CAP VERT

Mr Antonio MORAIS  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Cap Vert to UNESCO  
92, Bd. Malesherbes  
75008 PARIS

CHILE/CHILI

M. Jorge EDWARDS  
Ambassadeur auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

M. Jaime CONTRERAS  
Premier Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente du Chili auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

COTE D'IVOIRE

M. Kouassi BALO  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente de la Côte d'Ivoire auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

CUBA

M. Rolando GOMEZ  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

CZECH REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

Mr Josef STULC  
Director of Heritage Preservation Office  
Americka'2  
PRAGUE 2, 12000  
CZECH REPUBLIC

M. Michal BENES  
Secrétaire pour les Affaires culturelles de l'UNESCO  
au Ministère de la Culture  
VALDSTEJNSKA'10  
11000 PRAHA 1,  
République Tchèque

M. Karel KOMAREK  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

ECUADOR/EQUATEUR

M. Carlos JATIVA  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**FRANCE**

M. Léon PRESSOUYRE  
Vice-Président  
Université de Paris I  
75005 PARIS

Mme Françoise BERCE  
Inspecteur général du Patrimoine  
Ministère de la Culture et de la Francophonie  
PARIS

Mme Anne LEWIS-LOUBIGNAC  
Conseiller technique  
Commission nationale française pour l'UNESCO  
34-36, rue La Pérouse  
75775 PARIS Cedex 16

M. Jean-Louis PONS  
Chargé de mission  
Ministère de l'environnement  
20, avenue de Ségur  
75015 PARIS

**HONDURAS**

Mme Sonia MENDIETA de BADAROUX  
Ambassadeur  
Délégation permanente  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

M. Juan Carlos BENDANA-PINEL  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

HUNGARY/HONGRIE

Mr János TARDY  
Under-Secretary of State  
Ministry of Environment and Territories  
President, Office for Nature Protection

Mr Zoltán SZILASSY  
Deputy Director  
Ministry of Environment and Territories  
Kôltö u. 21  
1121 BUDAPEST

Mr Pal PATAKI  
Délégué permanent de la Hongrie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

INDIA/INDE

Ms Nagma MALLICK  
Second Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

INDONESIA/INDONESIA

Mr Kria Fahmi PASARIBU  
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Indonesia to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
750015 PARIS

IRAK

Mr A. Amir ALANBAR  
Ambassadeur de l'Irak auprès de l'UNESCO  
Délégation permanente  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

IRAN (Islamic Republic of)/IRAN (République islamique d')

Mr Parviz PIRAN  
University Professor  
103A, N°.18, Daneshvar St. Vanak  
19918 TEHERAN

JAPAN/JAPON

Mr Azuza HAYASHI  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr Yutaka MIZUNO  
Director of Monuments and Sites Division  
Cultural Properties Protection Department  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
TOKYO

Mr Akiyoshi WATANABE  
Councilor in Cultural Properties  
Cultural Properties Protection Department  
Agency of Cultural Affairs  
TOKYO

Dr Nobuko INABA  
Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties  
Architecture Division  
Cultural Properties Protection Department  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
TOKYO

Mr Yukuto MURATA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mme Tokuko NAPESHIMA  
Attachée  
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO  
1, rue MIOLLIS  
75015 PARIS

Mr Nobuo ITO  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku  
TOKYO 100

KOREA (Republic of)/COREE (République de)

Mr Hyun-Gon KIM  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegation of Republic of Korea to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Ms Kyung Im KIM  
Counselor  
Permanent Delegation of Republic of Korea to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr Kyung-Jaz PARK  
Permanent Delegation of Republic of Korea to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr Seong-Ryong PARK  
Korean National Commission for UNESCO  
P.O. BOX 64  
SEOUL  
Republic of Korea

LEBANON/LIBAN

M. Noel FATTAL  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente du Liban auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis - 75015 PARIS

LITHUANIA/LITHUANIE

Mr Uone KARVELIS  
Délégation permanente de Lithuanie  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

MALTA/MALTE

Mme Tanya VELLA  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente de Malte  
Ambassade de Malte  
92 av. des Champs Elysées  
75008 PARIS

MOROCCO/MAROC

Mme Naima SEDRATI  
Conseillère délégation du Maroc  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

MYANMAR

Mr Nyunt HAN  
Director  
Department of Archaeology  
32-D, 6 Mile,  
YANGON

MALAWI

Ms Esther KAMLONGERA  
Deuxième Secrétaire  
20, rue Euler  
75008 PARIS

Mr Harry MONONGA  
Chargé d'Affaires  
Malawi Permanent Delegation  
75008 PARIS

NICARAGUA

M. Carlos BARRIOS TORRES  
Ambassadeur  
Délégation permanente auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

NIGER

M. Lambert MESSAN  
Ambassadeur, Délegué permanent du Niger  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

M. Michel Le Berre  
Conseiller technique auprès de la Délégation  
permanente du Niger  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS

Mrs Barbara De Klerk  
Deputy Secretary-General  
Netherlands Commission for UNESCO  
Schenkkade 50  
2595 The Hague

NORWAY/NORVEGE

Mr Oivind LUNDE  
Director General  
Directorate for Cultural Heritage  
Postboks 8196 DEP  
N-0034 OSLO

Mr Around SINDING-LARSEN  
Councillor,  
Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage  
P.O Box 8196 DEP  
N-0034 OSLO

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

PERU/PEROU

Mme Anna Marina ALVARADO  
Conseiller auprès de la Délégation du Pérou  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

PHILIPPINES

Mr Augusto F. VILLALON  
Commissioner for Philippine Cultural Heritage  
Philippine National Commission for UNESCO  
107 Wilson Circle  
SAN JUAN  
1500 M. MANILA

Mr Esteban MAGANNON  
Consultant  
86, rue du Faubourg St Denis  
75010 PARIS

PORTUGAL

Ms Edith ESTRELA  
Mayor of Sintra  
SINTRA

Mr Cardim RIBEIRO  
Municipal Councillor  
SINTRA

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE

Mme Majeda HANA  
Assistante  
Délégation permanente  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

SLOVAK REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE

Mme Viera POLAKOVICOVA  
Déléguée permanente adjointe  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

M. Josef KLINDA  
Head of the Environmental conception Division Ministry of the  
Environment  
HLVOKA'2 81235  
BRATISLAVA - Slovak Republic

M. Pavel TOMA  
Head of the Environment Planning Dept.  
Ministry of the Environment  
Hlboka Str. 2,  
BRATISLAVA

Mr Mikulas ROZLOZNIK  
Head of PR. Landscape Areas Slov. KRAS  
Ministry of Environment  
Brzotin 04951  
Slovak Republic

Mr Jozef HLAVAC  
Director The Management Slovak Show Caves  
Liptovský Mikulas 03101 (Slovak Republic)

Ms Viera DVORAKOVA  
Institute for Monuments  
Cesta Na Cerveny Most 6  
819 04 BRATISLAVA  
Slovak Republic

SLOVENIA (Republic of)/SLOVENIE (République de)

Ms Zofija KLEMEN-KREK  
Secretary-General of the Slovenian National  
Commission for UNESCO  
Slovenska 50  
LJUBLJANA  
Slovenia

SWEDEN/SUEDE

Ms Birgitta HOBERG  
Principal Administrative Officer  
Central Board of National Antiquities  
and the National Historical Museum  
P.O. Box 5405  
11484 STOCKHOLM

Ms Marita JONSSON  
Chief, Regional Antiquarian  
Gotland County Administrative Board  
Lansstyrelsen  
62185 VISBY

TUNISIA/TUNISIE

Mr Abdelbaki HERMASSI  
Ambassadeur  
Délégation permanente de Tunisie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

TURKEY/TURQUIE

Mr Taner KARAKAS  
Counselor  
Turkish Delegation  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Ms Gail Dennise MATHIEU  
US Observer to UNESCO

UGANDA/OUGANDA

Ms Norah Jenla KATABARWA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate to UNESCO  
13, av. Raymond Poincaré  
75116 PARIS

URUGUAY

M. Hector GROS-ESPIELL  
Ambassadeur  
Délégué permanent  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Mr Pedro MO AMARO  
Ministre  
Délégation permanente de l'Uruguay  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Ms Gabriela RICALDONI-GOETHALS  
Deuxième Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente de l'Uruguay  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**ZIMBABWE**

Mr Josiah MHLANCA  
Deputy Chief Delegate  
Zimbabwe Permanent Delegation  
5, rue de Tilsitt  
75008 PARIS

IV. STATES NON PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION/ ETATS NON PARTIES A LA CONVENTION

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE

Mme Françoise DESCAMPS  
Consultant/UNESCO  
106, rue du Cornet  
B-1040 BRUXELLES

KOREA (Democratic People's Republic of)/COREE (République démocratique populaire de)

Mr Thae Gun RI  
Deputy Permanent Delegate of the Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea  
1, rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

V. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS/ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES

ORGANISATION OF WORLD HERITAGE CITIES/ORGANISATION DES VILLES DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Mr Marcel JUNIUS  
Secrétaire général  
56, rue Saint Pierre  
QUEBEC G1H 4A1  
Canada

INALCO-TURKEY PARIS

Mr Muzefffer ADALI  
INALCO TURKEY PARIS  
Kemer Sokak 17/78  
06700 ANKARA

VI. SECRETARIAT

World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

M. Bernd von DROSTE  
Director/Directeur

M. Giancarlo RICCIO  
Deputy Director/Directeur adjoint

Mr Harold EIDSVIK

Mr M. GASSAMA

Mr Laurent LEVI-STRAUSS

Ms Breda PAVLIC

Ms Maria PERERS

Mr RAJ BHANDARI

Ms Mechtild RÖSSLER

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO

Mr Herman van HOOFF

Ms Vesna VUJICIC

Ms Minja YANG

Ms Jane DEGEORGES

Ms Nina DHUMAL

Mr David MARTEL

Ms Elisa ORTIZ

Ms Jocelyne POUTEAU

Ms Marianne RAABE

Mr Michel LINCOURT  
Consultant

Mr Peter STOTT  
Consultant

Ms Annie MERX  
Consultant

Division of Physical Heritage/Division du patrimoine physique

Mr Said ZULFICAR

Ms Chantal RALAIMIHOATRA

Ms Ana DUMITRESCU

Division of Ecological Sciences/Division des sciences  
écologiques

Mr Pierre LASSERRE  
Director/Directeur

Mr Mohamed SKOURI

Mr Malcolm HADLEY

Ms Mireille JARDIN

Mr M. MANKOTO

Mrs Jane ROBERTSON

Mr Thomas SCHAAF

Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs  
Office des Normes internationales et des Affaires juridiques

Mr Daniel De SAN

Bureau of the Comptroller - Accounts Division  
Bureau du Contrôleur financier - Division de la Comptabilité

Mr Marc WARREN

Services attached to Directorate/Services rattaché à la  
Direction générale

Ms Paola ANTOLINI  
Analysis and Forecasting Unit/Unité d'analyse et de prévision

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION ON  
THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Table of Contents

1. Identification of the Property

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

Justification for Inscription

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

3. Description

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

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)

#### Factors Affecting the Site

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

#### 6. Monitoring/Inspection

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

#### Documentation

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

#### 8. Signature of behalf of the State Party

## WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

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

#### Explanatory Notes

#### INTRODUCTION

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

(ii) The nomination dossier is intended to serve two main purposes.

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

Secondly it is to provide basic data about the property, which can be revised and brought up to date in order to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the site.

(iii) In spite of the wide differences between sites, information should be given under each of the categories set out at the head of sections 1 - 7 of these notes.

#### General Requirements

(iv) Information should be as precise and specific as possible. It should be quantified where that can be done and fully referenced.

(v) Documents should be concise. In particular long historical accounts of sites and events which have taken place there should be avoided, especially when they can be found in readily available published sources.

(vi) Expressions of opinion should be supported by reference to the authority on which they are made and the verifiable facts which support them.

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

1. Identification of the Property

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

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

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

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

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

2

Justification for Inscription

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

2.1

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

2.2

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

2.3

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

- 4 -

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

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

2.5 Section 2 (d) is therefore the culmination of the section, relating the specific site to one or more individual criteria and saying unambiguously why it meets the specific criterion or criteria.

### 3. Description

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

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

- 5 -

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

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

- 6 -

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

#### Management

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

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

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

- 7 -

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

- 4.3 Sections 4 (d) and (e) are intended to identify both the authority or authorities with legal responsibility for managing the property and the individual who is actually responsible for day-to-day control of the site and for the budget relating to its upkeep.
- 4.4 The agreed plans which should be listed at 4 (f) are all those plans which have been adopted by governmental or other agencies and which will have a direct influence on the way in which the site is developed, conserved, used or visited. Either relevant provisions should be summarized in the dossier or extracts or complete plans should be annexed to it.
- 4.5 Sections 4 (g) and (h) should show the funds, skills and training which are available to the site. Information about finance and expertise and training should be related to the earlier information about the state of conservation of the site. In all three cases an estimate should also be given of the adequacy or otherwise of what is available, in particular identifying any gaps or deficiencies or any areas where help may be required.
- 4.6 As well as providing any available statistics or estimates of visitor numbers or patterns over several years, section 4 (i) should describe the facilities available for visitors, for example:
- (i) car parking;
  - (ii) lavatories;
  - (iii) interpretation/explanation, whether by trails, guides, notices or publications;
  - (iv) shops;
  - (v) restaurant or refreshment facilities;
  - (vi) site museum, visitor or interpretation centre;
  - (vii) overnight accommodation;
  - (viii) search and rescue.

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

Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture)
  - b. Environmental Pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change)
  - c. Natural disasters and preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)
  - d. Visitor/tourism pressures
  - e. Number of inhabitants within site, buffer zone
  - f. Other
- 5.1 This section of the dossier should provide information on all the factors which are likely to affect or threaten a site. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them, whether by application of the protection described at Section 4 (c) or otherwise.
- 5.2 Section 5 (a) deals with development pressures. Information should be given about pressure for demolitions or rebuilding; the adaptation of existing buildings for new uses which would harm their authenticity or integrity; habitat modification or destruction following encroaching agriculture, forestry or grazing, or through poorly managed tourism or other uses; inappropriate or unsustainable natural resource exploitation; the introduction of exotic species likely to disrupt natural ecological processes, creating new centres of population on or near sites so as to harm them or their settings.
- 5.3 Environmental pressures [5 (b)] can affect all types of site. Air pollution can have a serious effect on stone buildings and monuments as well as on fauna and flora. Desertification can lead to erosion by sand and wind. What is needed in this section of the dossier is an indication of those pressures which are presenting a current threat to the site, or may do so in the future, rather than an historical account of such pressures in the past.

- 9 -

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

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

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

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

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

## 6. Monitoring/Inspection

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

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

-10-

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

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

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

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

## 7 Documentation

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

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

-11-

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

8. Signature of behalf of the State Party

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

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

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

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

#### Factors Affecting the Site

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

#### 6. Monitoring\ Inspection

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

#### Documentation

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

#### 8. Conclusions and recommended actions

#### 9. Signature on behalf of the State Party,

## WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

### PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORT

#### explanatory notes

#### INTRODUCTION

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

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

#### **A. Systematic monitoring and reporting**

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

*The objectives of systematic monitoring and reporting are:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **B. Reactive monitoring**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## General Requirements

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

## 0. Executive Summary

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

## 1. Identification of the Property

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

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

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

2 Justification for Inscription

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

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

3. Description

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

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

4. Management

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

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

4.1 In the case of headings 4(a) - 4(e) it is only necessary to record information which has changed since nomination or the previous report.

4.2 State of conservation reports should review the information about management provided in nomination dossiers or previous reports and draw attention to any significant changes which have taken place. Information should always be provided under headings 4(f) - 4(k) so that trends in levels of finance and staffing and training can be established and up-to-date copies of plans relating to the site will always be provided.

4.3 In the case of all statistics which are available on an annual basis (e.g. income, visitor numbers, staff numbers) information should be provided for each year since nomination or the previous report, so that complete runs of figures can be maintained.

## 5. Factors Affecting the Site

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

5.1 Each state of conservation report should provide up-to-date information under each of the headings 5(a) - 5(f), as indicated in the nomination document. This section of the dossier should provide information on all the factors which are likely to affect or threaten a site. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them, whether by application of the protection described at Section 4(c) or otherwise. Once again, where it is possible to do so figures should be provided over a number of years so that trends can be established as accurately as possible.

5.2 Section 5(a) deals with development pressures. Information should be given about pressure for demolitions or rebuilding: the adaptation of existing buildings for new uses which would harm their authenticity or integrity; habitat modification or destruction following encroaching agriculture, forestry or grazing, or through poorly managed tourism or other uses; inappropriate or unsustainable natural

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Monitoring/ Inspection

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

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

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

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

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

7. Documentation

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

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

8. Conclusions and recommended actions

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

9. Signature on behalf of the State Party

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