



UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

# WORLD HERITAGE

Convention CONCERNING  
THE PROTECTION OF THE  
World Cultural AND Natural  
Heritage



# REPORT

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
NINETEENTH SESSION  
BERLIN  
GERMANY - 4-9 DECEMBER 1995



Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.203/16  
31 January 1996  
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Nineteenth session  
Berlin, Germany

4-9 December 1995

REPORT

Photo: All rights reserved

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. OPENING SESSION	1
II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	2
III. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, RAPPOREUR AND VICE-CHAIRPRSONS	3
IV. REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT SINCE THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE	3
V. REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE NINETEENTH SESSION HELD IN 1995 BY THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND THE REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE TENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES	6
VI. SETTING UP OF WORKING GROUPS	7
VII. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES	7
VIII. INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE LISTS AND EXAMINATION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER	38
IX. REPORT ON THE DECISIONS OF THE TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION AND THE DECISIONS OF THE 28TH GENERAL CONFERENCE	50
X. BALANCED REPRESENTATION OF NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	51
XI. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE "GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THEMATIC STUDIES"	55
XII. REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED TRAINING STRATEGY	57
XIII. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE	60
XIV. PROMOTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES	64

XV.	EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND, AND APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET FOR 1996 AND PRESENTATION OF A PROVISIONAL BUDGET FOR 1997	68
XVI.	IMPROVEMENT OF THE WORKING METHODS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	72
XVII.	REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES	74
XVIII.	DATE AND PLACE OF THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	79
XIX.	DATE AND PLACE OF THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (DECEMBER 1996)	79
XX.	OTHER BUSINESS	79
XXI.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE AND CLOSURE OF THE SESSION	80

## **ANNEXES**

- I. List of participants
- II. Address by Mr Helmut Schäfer, Minister of State
- III. Message of the Director-General of UNESCO
- IV. Provisional agenda of the twentieth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee

## **I. OPENING SESSION**

**I.1** The nineteenth ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee was held in Berlin, Germany, from 4 to 9 December 1995. It was attended by the following members of the Committee: Australia, Benin, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Philippines, Spain and United States of America.

**I.2** The following States Parties to the Convention which are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey and Uruguay.

**I.3** Representatives of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of the Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The meeting was also attended by the representatives of the the Arid Climate Adaptation and Cultural Innovation in Africa (ACACIA), International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA), the Islamic Conference Organization (ICO), the Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO), The J. Paul Getty Trust, the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), the Organization of World Heritage Cities (OWHC), the Union Internationale des architectes (UIA) and the World Monuments Fund (WMF). The complete list of participants, including the representatives of other nongovernmental organizations, is given in the **Annex I**.

**I.4** The outgoing Chairperson of the Committee, Dr Adul Wichiencharoen, (Thailand) opened the session by thanking the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, namely the Minister of State of the German Federal Foreign Office, Mr Helmut Schäfer, for its generous invitation to host the nineteenth session of the Committee in Berlin. He then invited Mr Schäfer to address the Committee on behalf of the Government of Germany.

**I.5** The Minister of State, Mr Helmut Schäfer, welcomed the delegates and other participants on behalf of the Federal Government to the nation's capital Berlin and, more specifically, to the "House of the World's Cultures" in which the session took place. This building, which was offered to Berlin by the American people, and the purpose

of which was to familiarize the general public with the cultural achievements of other nations, was recognized by UNESCO as Germany's contribution to the World Decade for Cultural Development. Having pointed out its closeness to some of the city's historical places, the Reichstag and the Brandenburg Gate, Mr Schäfer stated that nowhere else was the historical transformation, the end of the Cold War and the division of Germany and Europe, as tangible and graphic as it was here.

**I.6** Having expressed his belief that the preservation of the world's cultural and natural heritage is one of UNESCO's best-known programmes, the Minister of State pointed out that the German media and public take a keen interest in these activities. This is reflected, among other, in the new German television series which presents 100 of the world's outstanding cultural properties through 15-minute programmes. It is also reflected in the attention given to the World Heritage properties located in Germany such as the Schloss Sanssouci and Cecilienhof, the Völklingen Ironworks and other. Protecting the natural heritage, however, is an area covered by the World Heritage Convention whose importance is easily underrated and should therefore become increasingly the focus of the Committee's attention. It is essential to understand in this sense, Mr Schäfer underlined, that a culture of peace could be achieved only through sustainable development. Such development, however, requires a sparing use of our ever scarcer natural resources. In view of that, concluded the Minister of State, Germany sees the Committee's activities as a central responsibility of UNESCO. The text of Mr Schäfer's intervention is given in **Annex II**.

**I.7** The Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mr Bernd von Droste, in his capacity as the Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO, thanked the Government of Germany for the excellent arrangements and proceeded to read out the message of the Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Federico Mayor, addressed to the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The full text of the message is given in **Annex III**.

## **II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**II.1** The Committee adopted the provisional agenda as amended by the Delegate of Niger, and endorsed by Malta, proposing that item 6 of the provisional agenda (Constitution of working groups to examine specific items on the Committee's agenda) be replaced by a new item: Report on the decisions taken by the General Assembly of the States Parties (Tenth session) and by the General Conference of UNESCO at its 28th session.

### **III. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, RAPPORTEUR AND VICE-CHAIRPERSONS**

**III.1** As proposed by the Delegate of the United States of America, and endorsed by the Delegates of Niger, Japan, Italy, Lebanon, Canada and France, Mr Horst Winkelmann (Germany) was elected by acclamation as Chairperson of the Committee. Mr Lambert Messan (Niger) was elected also by acclamation as Rapporteur, and the following members of the Committee were elected as Vice-Chairpersons: Australia, Italy, Japan, Lebanon and Mexico.

**III.2** The newly-elected Chairperson thanked warmly the outgoing Chairperson, Dr Adul Wichiencharoen, for his dedicated work in the past year. Having underlined Dr Wichiencharoen's great experience and passionate commitment to World Heritage, Dr Winkelmann then outlined the challenges that lie ahead of the Committee and which can be met only through a coordinated effort of all parties concerned. The full text of his speech is given in **Annex III**.

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

**IV.1** Mr Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, reported in his capacity as Secretary of the Committee on the activities undertaken since the eighteenth session of the Committee. Referring to information document **WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.5**, he limited himself to highlighting some of the achievements as well as some of the problems encountered by the Secretariat in the past twelve months.

**IV.2** He first mentioned the adherence of three new States Parties since the Committee's eighteenth session, namely those of Latvia, Dominica and the Kyrgyz Republic, which has brought the total number of States Parties to 143. He touched briefly upon the Centre's co-operation with the Secretariats of related international conventions, which is developing successfully. He furthermore mentioned the situation regarding the tentative lists; the progress of the work on a global strategy; the situation of the seventeen sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger; the efforts undertaken by the Centre and a number of States Parties to develop systematic monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties with full respect for the sovereignty of each State Party; training, international assistance and emergency assistance provided in the past year.

**IV.3** Highlighting some of the projects undertaken in

each of the regions, Mr von Droste mentioned particularly the agreement signed in June 1995 by the Director-General of UNESCO and the Government of Norway by which the World Heritage Office for Nordic countries has been established with staffing and funding provided by the Nordic countries. Other promising initiatives include the restoration of the Old Town of Vilnius in Lithuania, the preparation of a restoration master plan for the World Heritage sites in Georgia.

**IV.4** In Asia, the application of the Geographical Information System (GIS) as a tool to enhance site management; the sustainable tourism development workshop in Hue, VietNam; the adoption of World Heritage preservation by the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC) as a part of its tourism development programme, as well as the completion of systematic monitoring carried out in eight States Parties were reported.

**IV.5** The first meeting of Directors of Cultural Heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean, was organized by the Colombian Institute for Culture (COLCULTURA) and is developing into a permanent networking on the regional level, as well as the meeting of site managers of natural World Heritage sites in collaboration with FAO in October 1995 at the La Amistad World Heritage site in Costa Rica.

**IV.6** As regards the Arab States, Mr von Droste underlined the holding of the seminar "Heritage and Urbanism", organized in Fez, in January 1995, which was instrumental in addressing the problems caused by certain road projects in the Medina. Another successful undertaking was the expert mission to Egypt to assist the Egyptian authorities in defining a new route in order to avoid the Pyramids from Guizeh to Dahshur. The third training seminar for natural heritage preservation in the Arab region, held at the Cairo University (Egypt) in June 1995 and attended by experts and managers from sixteen Arab countries, was also cited as a successful undertaking.

**IV.7** Finally, as regards Africa, Mr von Droste stated that the Centre had been more active than ever. Its efforts had focused particularly on the preparation of tentative lists and the ratification process. Lists have now been submitted by Gambia and Nigeria, and sixteen more were expected in 1996. He also mentioned the satisfactory progress of some of the projects such as the restoration of the three mosques in Timbuktu, Mali, and the conservation and management of the Royal Palaces of Abomey, Benin. Likewise, the promotion of regional monitoring for natural heritage focused in 1995 on the African region as a follow-up to the meeting for site managers which gathered at Krüger National Park, in South Africa, in October 1994.

**IV.8** Speaking of the budget and financial issues, Mr von Droste drew the Committee's attention to document WHC-95/CONF.203/12, the interim financial statement, which shows that the payment of obligatory contributions under the World Heritage Fund raises considerable concern. The total outstanding arrears in obligatory and voluntary contributions amount to more than US\$ 3 million. As for the expenditures of the current biennium, nearly 100% of the authorized budget had been spent on implementing the programme. He then paid special tribute to the Centre's partners in the developing countries for their efforts in meeting emergency situations affecting cultural and natural sites. In this regard, Mr von Droste mentioned the Fund's Emergency Reserve which made it possible to give catalytic funds to assist the States Parties in mitigating the damages caused by natural and man-made disasters. However, this Reserve, which had one million US \$ when it was created by the World Heritage Committee (Cartagena, 1993), has now gone down to US \$ 316,840 and therefore needs urgent replenishment. Concluding this part of his presentation, Mr von Droste expressed special gratitude for the voluntary contributions, over and above the assessed amount, provided this past year by China, Norway, the Republic of Korea and Thailand. Appreciation was also expressed to the non-governmental and private sector donors, namely the Soka Gakkai of Japan, the American Express Foundation, the Kobi Graphics of Japan and the Rhône-Poulenc Foundation.

**IV.9** Regarding staff resources, Mr von Droste reminded the Committee that approximately 60% of the staff costs of the World Heritage Centre (10 professional posts and 3 General Service posts) are financed under UNESCO's Regular Programme budget while some 25% of it is covered through the World Heritage Fund. The remaining 15% are financed from other sources (mostly the Associate Expert scheme). As regards those financed by the Fund, he recalled the Committee's decision, at its session in Phuket, to approve financing for one year for one senior specialist for Natural Heritage given the fact that the Centre had so far only one P-3 post for Natural Heritage. The term of this senior post had now come to its end. Speaking further, he acknowledged gratefully the provision of two young Associate Experts, from Sweden and Japan respectfully, one Associate Expert (3 months) from the Netherlands and the funds provided by Austria for a P-3 level specialist for 12 months.

**IV.10** Before concluding his report, Mr von Droste presented briefly also the Centre's achievements in World Heritage promotion and education. He underlined the success of the "Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion" six-year project, which was undertaken jointly with the Education Sector and other

partners, such as the Rhône-Poulenc Foundation, ICOMOS, IUCN and the Organization of World Heritage Cities (WHCO). He also mentioned accomplishments in the audio-visual area and in publications such as the ZDF/ARD/NFP and Brockhaus' 104 TV-films, the World Heritage series of books by the German Stuttgart Verlaghaus and the Spanish-Italian firm Planeta, various publications by INCAFO, the National Panasonic calendar and other. In this context, Mr von Droste briefed the Committee also on the results of the Centre's consultations with the advisory bodies and other organizations regarding the development of a consolidated World Heritage Information Network. The Centre's basic documents are now available on Internet and the World Wide Web, while they continue to be distributed worldwide also by conventional means. A detailed report on this was available to the Committee in Document WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.10.

**V. REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE NINETEENTH SESSION HELD IN 1995 BY THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, AND THE REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE TENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES**

**V.1** In the absence of Mr ZHANG Chongli (China) who was the Rapporteur of the nineteenth session of the Bureau, which took place in Paris from 3 to 8 July 1995, the former Chairperson of the Committee, Dr Adul Wichiencharoen, accepted to present briefly this report to the Committee. As the detailed report was available in document WHC-95/CONF.203/3, he limited himself to outlining the items discussed by the Bureau, namely: the draft report of the World Heritage Committee that was presented to the General Conference of UNESCO at its 28th session; the draft workplan proposed by the World Heritage Centre for 1996-1997; the state of conservation reports; examination of the new proposals for nomination; examination of the World Heritage Fund: accounts for 1994, and provisions for 1995; international assistance requests; proposals for improved working methods of the Committee, revision of the operational guidelines and items pertaining to the preparation of the nineteenth session of the Committee.

**V.2** The Report of the Tenth session of the General Assembly of States Parties, held in Paris on 2 and 3 November 1995 was presented by the Rapporteur of the General Assembly, Mr Janos Jelen (Hungary). A particular emphasis was placed on paragraph 31 of the Report of the Tenth General Assembly of States Parties:

"31. As a conclusion, the General Assembly decided to continue the debate on the systematic monitoring and

reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties at the eleventh General Assembly of States Parties that will be held in 1997. The General Assembly requested the World Heritage Committee to prepare a report and a proposed resolution for the eleventh session of the General Assembly of States Parties taking into account the discussions and experiences gained over the past years as well as the documents that had been presented to the Tenth General Assembly and the discussions thereon."

Mr Jelen, however, underlined that the delicate relationship between the Committee and the General Assembly should be handled with care during the implementation of the decision of the General Assembly.

## **VI. SETTING UP OF WORKING GROUPS**

**VI.1** The Chairperson having suggested the setting up of possibly two working groups in order to facilitate the work, the Committee decided, on the proposal of Italy which was endorsed by Japan, Mexico and Niger, to set up a working group to discuss the International Assistance requests, and to organize, if necessary, the Committee's debate on the budget. It was likewise decided that this, as any other working group, would be open to all delegates and observers alike.

**VI.2** The Committee also decided to create a working group which would prepare sub-items (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Agenda item 7 (reports on the state of conservation) for their subsequent discussion in the Committee in light of the debate at the Tenth session of the General Assembly of States Parties. It was also agreed that this working group, as proposed by Australia, would prepare for the Committee a set of options on the policy and methodology of systematic monitoring.

## **VII. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES**

**VII.1** The Committee having decided to have during this session a working group on monitoring and reporting, this item is reported in two parts:

- Reports on the state of conservation of specific properties;
- Report of the working group on monitoring and reporting.

This question also appears in Chapter IX in the framework of the presentation of the Report of the General Assembly of States Parties.

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

**VII.2** The Committee examined reports on the state of conservation of eight natural and seven cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Furthermore, the Committee examined state of conservation reports on thirteen natural, one mixed cultural and natural site and nineteen cultural World Heritage sites.

### **A. NATURAL HERITAGE**

#### **A.1 Natural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

##### **VII.3 Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)**

The Committee recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 and that the Bureau at its nineteenth session examined a substantive state of conservation report, prepared by the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Bulgaria.

The Representative of IUCN informed the Committee that a monitoring mission was undertaken by the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention and a detailed monitoring report was prepared. This report indicates that the new water control structure allows an inflow of water on a small scale, and that a small colony of the Dalmatian Pelican had been reestablished. The integrity of the site, however, has not yet been adequately restored.

The Committee took note of the report received from the Ramsar Secretariat and the comments made by IUCN. The Delegate of France supported the report presented.

The Committee encouraged the Bulgarian authorities in their continuing efforts to restore the site, including increasing the water intake and the preparation of a management plan for the site. The Committee furthermore requested that a status report be presented in three years time. Meanwhile, the Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

##### **VII.4 Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)**

The Committee recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 and that information was received from both the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Croatia to UNESCO and the Croatian

National Commission for UNESCO, indicating that damage from the period of occupation was evident. The Committee furthermore noted that the site was reopened to the public on 10 August 1995 and that the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee approved a request for emergency assistance (communications equipment) for an amount of US\$ 30,000. Upon the granting of US\$ 30,000, the State Party agreed to provide a contribution of US\$ 60,000 for a total of US\$ 90,000. The Centre informed the Committee that a management and planning meeting for the Park is scheduled for spring 1996.

The Committee took note of the report presented by the Secretariat and commended the State Party for its special contribution and endorsed the management and planning meeting for the Park scheduled for spring 1996. The Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the region stabilizes.

#### **VII.5 Sangay National Park (Ecuador)**

The Committee 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 due to threats from poachers, boundary encroachment and unplanned road construction. It took note of the preliminary report by INEFAN (Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Areas Naturales y Vida Silvestre) on the environmental impact of the construction of the Guamate-Macas road in the Park, and an extensive report of October 1995 provided by the IUCN Office in Ecuador. This report indicates that the road continues to be the main threat and has caused irreversible damage to the natural environment, both through direct (pollution, dynamite use, loss of biological corridors etc.) and indirect impacts (new settlements, poaching, cattle ranching etc.).

The Delegate of Ecuador provided further information on the situation at the site, underlining that measures are being taken to modify the situation and to reduce the impacts. He emphasised that the State Party will make more efforts to halt the damage in the future.

The Committee commended the State Party for the reports provided, however, expressed its continuing concerns about the construction work causing negative environmental impacts. It requested the Centre to send a letter to the Minister for the Environment for an environmental impact study and to urge the State Party to take steps to ensure much stricter environmental regulations. The Committee furthermore, requested the Centre to write to INEFAN commending them for their actions for modifications of the road, the tenure study and the initiative for an updated management plan. The Committee decided to retain on the

List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.6 Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire)**

The Committee recalled that the site was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 because of negative impacts from a proposed iron-ore mining project and threats due to the arrival of a large number of refugees from neighbouring countries. It furthermore recalled that an extensive report was presented to the Bureau at its nineteenth session in July 1995.

The Committee noted that in response to the Bureau's request for clarifications on the legal protection and classification of the site, the Ministry for Energy and Environment, by letter of 15 September 1995, indicated that the Government had taken several measures to develop and protect the site. This included the creation of a Management Centre, "Centre de Gestion de l'Environnement des Monts Nimba (CEGEN)", responsible for all environmental and legal questions, as well as the international classification of the site, the monitoring of the water quality in the region and integrated rural development and socio-economic studies.

The Committee commended the States Parties for their efforts. Given the uncertainties and the shortcomings in on-site management, the Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.7 Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The IUCN Representative informed the Committee that recent information on the site indicates that the civil unrest continues to restrict management efforts. Habitat conditions in a portion of Manas were still intact, but numbers of large fauna species were particularly low due to commercial poaching.

The Committee recalled that it had on numerous occasions expressed its concerns on the state of conservation of the site and requested the State Party to provide detailed information.

The Committee took note of the intervention by the Observer of India regarding Manas Wildlife Sanctuary and welcomed the offer of the Government of India to provide a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site. The Committee recalled and thanked the Government of India for its invitation to representatives of the World Heritage Committee to undertake a mission to New Delhi, Assam and

Manas, for discussions and to visit the site. The Committee requested the Centre to cooperate with the Indian authorities in arranging for this visit as soon as possible and report back to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee.

#### **VII.8 Aïr-et-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)**

The Committee recalled that at the request of the Niger authorities, the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 as it was affected by civil disturbances. A Peace Accord was signed in October 1994.

The Delegate of Niger took the floor and recommended that an evaluation mission be organized to review the situation at the site.

Meanwhile, the Committee decided that the site would remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The situation will be reviewed by the Committee at its twentieth session in the light of information provided by the mission.

#### **VII.9 Everglades National Park (United States of America)**

The Committee 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 World Heritage List in 1979 and that Federal State and local governments, as well as private foundations, had joined forces in providing significant financial support for the management of the site and its long-term restoration.

The World Heritage Centre presented a monitoring report, received from the State Party in November 1995, indicating that the rehabilitation of the Everglades ecosystem (restoration of water regime) would take 17 years at a cost of US\$ 2 billion. The Committee commended the State Party for the actions taken to redress the situation.

The Committee, however, concluded that the site remains seriously threatened and decided that it be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.10 Virunga National Park (Zaire)**

The Committee recalled that Virunga National Park was included on 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 influx of refugees from that country. It noted that the site is seriously threatened by the uncontrolled

arrival of refugees, causing deforestation and poaching at the site.

The Committee took note of the reports provided both by the Secretariat and IUCN, as well as the responses received by the Ministry for the Environment of Zaire on the concerns raised by the Bureau at its nineteenth session. The Committee also took note that the European Union, the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) and UNHCR are currently carrying out projects mainly to strengthen the management of the site.

The Committee, taking into account the presence of thousands of refugees in and adjacent to Virunga, expressed its serious concerns about the continuing degradation of the Park and decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee requested the Centre to support the work of IGCP and other organizations and asked both the Centre and IUCN to continue to liaise with various donors and agencies. It requested the Centre to organize a mission to the site and asked that a report be provided to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Bureau.

## **A.2. Natural Properties on the World Heritage List**

### **VII.11 Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)**

The Committee 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. It furthermore recalled that two concerns were raised: (a) that there is forested land outside the site which may have World Heritage values, and (b) that logging and roading activities adjacent to the site could have an adverse impact on the existing World Heritage site.

The Committee noted that the national authorities have provided information to the effect that negotiations to alleviate possible impacts are still underway.

The Committee, took note of the action by the State Party to strengthen the protection of the site and that negotiations were still underway, and requested the Centre to contact the State Party to obtain a report on the situation as soon as possible.

### **VII.12 Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada)**

The Committee recalled that the site was inscribed in 1984

(extension in 1990) and took note of the report presented by IUCN. The report underlines the infrastructural development of the "Bow Corridor", which is intensely used and developed. The Canadian authorities have set up a task force to look into this issue and the ecological integrity of the site. The Delegate of Canada took the floor and underlined that the Government of Canada recognizes the importance to study the problem and invited IUCN to cooperate with the task force by making submissions through its Canadian office. She furthermore emphasized that the results of the study will be brought to the attention of the Committee.

The Committee requested IUCN and the Centre to cooperate with the Canadian authorities and asked to be kept informed of the findings of the Bow Valley Task Force and its implication on the future of this part of the Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks World Heritage site.

#### **VII.13 Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)**

The Committee took note of a report presented by IUCN on the site. This report outlined, while acknowledging efforts by the Ecuadorian authorities concerning legislation and cooperation with local authorities, the threats this site is currently facing. These are mainly:

(a) threats to the terrestrial biodiversity with the introduction of species of vertebrate animals endangering endemic flora and fauna, as well as the growing human population, which has severe impacts for example for solid waste disposal,

(b) threats to the marine biodiversity with illegal and increasing export fisheries (lobsters, sea cucumbers, sharks, tuna, etc.).

Action should be sought to solve the problems of immigration, of introduction of foreign species, to obtain more funding, to prepare a strong management strategy and its effective implementation for both the terrestrial and marine habitats as well as to control tourism.

The Representative of IUCN concluded that in light of the serious threat of species introduction and increasing population the Committee may wish to consider to place the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegate of Ecuador took the opportunity to explain the situation at the site and presented a letter to the Committee outlining the Ecuadorian position regarding the situation of the Galapagos.

He underlined:

(a) the inadequate legal and administrative structure, the population growth, the illegal fishing in the Marine Resources Reserve of the Galapagos, unbalanced tourist activities and the impact of foreign species introduced to the island;

(b) that Galapagos - according to scientists - continues to be an exceptional treasure of the world from which no species has been lost;

(c) that the global community make a precise and objective diagnostic of the situation in the light of available information;

(d) that numerous measures to safeguard the Galapagos have been taken, including constitutional reforms, management plans and international assistance projects by GEF, UNDP, USAID and others.

He concluded that the site should not be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Director of the Centre offered that assistance be given to the Galapagos National Park as one of the precious sites of worldwide significance, which deserves special attention. After considerable discussion on the issue of placing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger by the Delegates of Germany, the United States, Canada, Niger, Cuba and Australia, the Chairperson requested that the Delegates of Australia and Ecuador work out a proposal to be presented to the Committee.

The Committee reviewed the text proposed jointly by the Delegates of Australia and Ecuador.

The Delegate of the United States recalled the Articles 77-90 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention and underlined, while recognizing the sensitivities of this question, the Committee should consider the threats to the site. The Delegate of Germany supported this remark and suggested to create an ad hoc aid commission for the Galapagos as international assistance would be needed. The Delegate of Niger supported the suggestions made by the United States and Germany, and underlined that international help would be needed in this case. The Delegate of Japan proposed to review point 3 of the text concerning actors operating in the area.

The Delegate of Ecuador thanked the Delegate of Germany for his suggestion of an aid committee, but however emphasized, that this would be an issue to be decided by his Government. Ecuador would be grateful for any help through official channels. He furthermore underlined that the

proposed text was a consensus text and that it should be adopted.

The Chairperson, taking note of the concerns raised by Ecuador, asked the Committee to adopt the following text by vote. (14 Delegates voted for the text and there were 5 abstentions):

1. The Committee notes the five greatest problems threatening the conservation of the Galapagos Islands identified in the statement presented by the Delegate of Ecuador.
2. The Committee also notes the various legal and technical efforts made by the State Party to overcome these problems.
3. The Committee takes note of the State Party's opinion that some of the threats to the Galapagos have been caused by international factors, such as overfishing by foreign fleets for foreign markets, and seeks international cooperation in reducing these threats.
4. The Committee also agrees with the State Party that tourism to the site should focus on education, photography, observation and appreciation of heritage values.
5. The Committee recommends that the Director of the World Heritage Centre accepts the invitation from the State Party to visit the Galapagos Islands, with the Chairperson of the Committee and appropriate technical advisors, to discuss the pressures on and present condition of the World Heritage site and to identify steps to overcome the problems.
6. The Committee invites the State Party and the Director to report on the outcome of the visit for further consideration by the Bureau at its twentieth session, including the question of whether or not the property should, at that stage, be recommended for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.14 Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)**

The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its nineteenth session took note of a report received from the Fundación Rio Platano concerning the site, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982. The report concerned the agricultural intrusion at the south and western borders of the site and on the land reform programme and its implementation in north-eastern Honduras. The Bureau at its nineteenth session requested IUCN to verify the situation

and to report back to the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. Subsequently, the Centre received a letter from the Minister for the Environment requesting a mission to the site to evaluate the situation.

The mission was carried out by the IUCN Regional Office based in Costa Rica in November 1995. The report of the mission outlines the major threats and concludes with eleven follow-up actions, including the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee took note of the report and requested the Centre to contact the authorities to obtain an official letter on the actions to be taken to protect the site.

#### **VII.15 Komodo National Park (Indonesia)**

The Committee took note that a mission to consider the state of conservation of Komodo National Park took place in July 1995 under the leadership of the Chair of the Indonesian World Heritage Committee, accompanied by representatives of the national authorities and the UNESCO Office in Jakarta. The Committee expressed its concern for the four officials of the Indonesian World Heritage Committee still missing at sea after a tragic accident during the course of a monitoring mission to Komodo. The Committee paid tribute to their dedication to the cause of World Heritage protection and preservation.

#### **VII.16 Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno (Mexico)**

The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its last session took note of the report on the site, presented by the IUCN Representative, indicating that the Mitsubishi Corporation in partnership with the Mexican Government, has a project to convert a part of the lagoon into salt ponds for industrial salt production. A one-mile long pier is proposed, which could disturb the grey whales within the lagoon. The Committee noted that no response has yet been received to a letter written to the authorities indicating the concerns raised at the nineteenth session of the Bureau. The Delegate of Mexico took the floor and informed the Committee that the project is still under study.

#### **VII.17 Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)**

The Committee recalled that at its eighteenth session it requested IUCN 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. The World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that it has received

a "Preliminary Land Use and Management Plan" of November 1995 which the Centre has transmitted to IUCN for review.

**VII.18 Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)**

The Committee recalled that the site was inscribed under natural criteria on the World Heritage List in 1990 and as a cultural landscape in 1993. The Centre informed the Committee that it received information from a member of the local Maori community about the dropping of 1080 poison on Mount Tongariro to combat the possum browse which threatens indigenous flora, and that the Department of Conservation had held consultations with the community, which agreed to a time-limited operation, which would not contaminate waterways. The Committee took note of the report.

**VII.19 Huascarán National Park (Peru)**

The Committee recalled that the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1985 and that a report on the site was presented to the nineteenth session of the Bureau. In addition, the IUCN Representative informed the Committee about (a) the need for an inventory of cultural heritage within the Park to be undertaken, and (b) road proposals which might become a serious threat to the integrity of the World Heritage site.

The Committee thanked the Peruvian authorities for the arrangements made to facilitate the IUCN mission to the Huascarán National Park World Heritage site.

The Committee commended the commitment of the Chief of Huascarán National Park and the Director-General of Protected Natural Areas and Wildlife for their stewardship of the site.

The Committee, however, expressed concern at the low level of financial support for the site's management and urged the authorities to allocate additional resources in recognition of the importance of the Park as a World Heritage site and its value for education and tourism.

The Committee recommended that an archaeological/historical heritage inventory be compiled to facilitate conservation of the cultural elements of the site.

The Committee noted with concern reports that there are proposals to develop roads within the site and invited the Peruvian authorities to provide clarification on this issue.

**VII.20 Skocjan Caves (Slovenia)**

The Committee recalled that the site was inscribed on the

World Heritage List in 1986 and took note of the report by IUCN on the field mission outlining that the size of the site had been expanded from 200 to 400 ha to better control the surface area of the underground caves. Actions by the State Party included expenditure of US\$ 22 million on upstream pollution control, strengthening legislation, consideration of a buffer zone and proposals for new park offices and visitor facilities. The Delegate of Germany asked for clarification concerning the extended boundaries of the site.

The Committee commended the Slovenian authorities for taking significant actions to protect the site. The Committee requested the Centre to contact the authorities to provide a map of the revised boundaries and to encourage the State Party to finalize the new legislation and to begin the preparation of a management plan.

#### **VII.21 Redwood National Park (United States of America)**

The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its nineteenth session reviewed a preliminary monitoring report and further information on the proposed realignment of Highway 101 near Cushing Creek in Del Norte County to correct safety and operational problems. The World Heritage Centre informed the Committee about new information received from the State Party that the proposed realignment of Highway 101 through Redwood National Park, as described in a new alternative by the California Department of Transportation, will result in the removal of no more than five coniferous trees including redwoods (*Sequoia sempervirens*) greater than 36 inches in diameter. The modification of the original proposal, in which 750 old-growth redwoods would be removed, illustrates a success in protecting World Heritage values and integrity.

The Committee commended the State Party for the action taken to prevent the destruction of about 750 redwood trees requested that the World Heritage Centre be kept informed of future developments with respect to the project.

#### **VII.22 Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)**

The Committee recalled that Yellowstone National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978 and that it is the first National Park in the world. It furthermore recalled that the Bureau discussed the potential threats to Yellowstone at its last session in July 1995. The Bureau had requested a joint mission to the site to review the situation. The mission was carried out in September 1995 by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, representatives of the World Heritage Centre, and a

representative of IUCN's Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas (CNPPA). During this mission, three days of public discussions took place and many technical reports were received from industry, governments and NGOs.

The Representative of the United States noted that the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in a letter dated 27 June 1995, wrote that "the Committee should be informed that the property as inscribed on the World Heritage List is in danger." In a follow-up letter dated 1 December 1995, the Assistant Secretary provided an update on the situation. The Representative of the United States further noted that the State Party is taking a number of positive steps to address key issues. The National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) requires a thorough and detailed environmental impact study (EIS), of the mine proposal by a multi-national corporate consortium.

At the moment nine possible alternatives are being considered. The EIS draft is expected in late January 1996 and further public and government review will last another year. He stated that the State Party does not consider action by the Committee to be an intervention in domestic law or policy. The State Party agreed to keep the Committee fully informed with respect to actions to be taken.

During the site visit it became clear that threats to the Park were ascertained in relation to endemic Yellowstone cut-throat trout as well as with respect to the sewage leakage and wastes contamination in certain areas of the Park. Other issues were related to road construction and year-round visitor pressures. In addition, potential threats included impacts on the quantity and quality of surface and ground-water and other past and proposed mine-related activities. A potential threat to the bison population is related to proposed control measures to eradicate brucellosis in the herds. The State Party noted that all of these concerns would be thoroughly analyzed and mitigation measures and management plans developed as appropriate. Corrective actions will be taken as necessary.

During the discussion it was noted that whether the State Party should grant a permit to the mining company or not is entirely a domestic decision of the State Party. It was further stated that there is no wording in the Convention or the Operational Guidelines which could lead to an interference in sovereignty. It was also noted that even if the State Party did not request action, the Committee still had an independent responsibility to take action based on the information it had gathered. The Convention was referred to as an emergent tool to assist all States Parties in conservation.

After considerable discussion the Committee decided the following:

On the basis of both ascertained dangers and potential dangers, the Committee decided that Yellowstone National Park be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that the Committee should request continuing reports on the results of the EIS and mitigating actions being taken to ensure in due course the removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **VII.23 Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)**

The Committee recalled that the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994 and took note of a report presented by IUCN. The report outlines two potential threats to the site: (a) a new port is to be developed in the Bay which would route large transport ships through the site, and (b) a license for a large floating hotel at the site which would have further impacts on the heavy tourist pressures in the Bay.

The Delegate of Japan provided further information concerning financial support for the project from Japanese aid agencies for an amount of US\$ 100 million. He underlined that the case is still under consideration and that ecological impacts of this project will be evaluated. The final decision has not been made, however, the project is seen as important for the further economic development of Vietnam. The Delegate of Canada outlined the problem of private companies involved and referred to Article 6.3 of the World Heritage Convention, that "Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to take any deliberate measures which might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage ... situated on the territory of other States Parties to this Convention." She inquired if an intervention could be made to mitigate the threats to the site.

The Committee requested the World Heritage Centre to contact the Vietnamese authorities for further information on the potential threats and the measures being taken to ensure that they are minimized.

## **B. MIXED NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**

### **B.1 Mixed Natural and Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List**

### **VII.24 Willandra Lakes Region (Australia)**

The Committee took note of a new boundary proposal which

will reduce the total area by about thirty percent. The Committee decided to take this issue up under item VIII "Nominations".

## **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

### **C.1 Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

#### **VII.25 Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin)**

In accordance with the recommendation adopted by the Bureau at its eighteenth session in July 1995, the Committee was informed of a mission organized by the World Heritage Centre to Abomey to complete and update the nomination documents and prepare a state of conservation report. The mission recommended to the authorities concerned:

- 1) to identify more precisely the boundaries of the site and enhance the respect of the buffer zone which should take into account the enclosing walls and the old entrance doors;
- 2) establish a global conservation and management plan which should take account of the fragility of the material and immaterial structures;
- 3) foresee a management structure under the authority of the Cultural Heritage Directorate and in which the partners involved in the enhancement of the site, notably representatives of the Royal families and the development associations would be participating.

The Committee took note of the recommendations contained in the report and commended the Benin authorities and invited them to prepare, in cooperation with CRATerre - EAG and ICCROM, a conservation and management plan to be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session (December 1997) at the latest. The Committee decided to maintain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.26 Angkor (Cambodia)**

The Secretariat recalled that at the time of inscription of Angkor on the List of World Heritage and on the List in Danger at the sixteenth session of the World Heritage Committee in Santa Fe, on 14 December 1992, the Committee set forth five obligations it requested the Cambodian authorities to fulfil within a period of three years. This period coming to its term at the end of December this year, H.E. Mr Vann Molyvann, Minister of State of the Royal

Government of Cambodia, took the floor at the invitation of the Chairperson to inform the Committee on the progress made in the fulfillment of these commitments since his last detailed report to the eighteenth session of the Committee last year.

Noting that three of the Committee's requests, i.e. the establishment of permanent boundaries; establishment of meaningful buffer zones; and establishment of monitoring and the coordination of international conservation effort, have been accomplished in 1994, the Minister reported that in 1995, the Authority for the Protection of the Site and the Development of the region of Angkor (APSARA) was officially established by Royal Kret (decree) on 19 February 1995. Having thus completed the fourth request set out by the Committee, Mr Vann Molyvann, stated that the last obligation, that of the enactment of adequate protective legislation will soon be met. A very complete corpus of laws on cultural protection and related matters drawn up with the support of UNESCO and other international partners, which have been approved by the Council of Ministers, is expected to be enacted by the National Assembly before the end of December.

The Committee thanked the Observer from Cambodia for his detailed report and congratulated the Cambodian authorities on the progress which has been made, under difficult circumstances, to safeguard the Angkor World Heritage Site and to meet the recommendations made by the Committee in this regard during its 16th Session in Sante Fe (1992). The Committee also recognized the contribution made by those States Parties which have responded to the UNESCO Director-General's appeal for the safeguarding of Angkor. In particular the Committee commended the achievements made to date to define precise boundaries for the site and its buffer zones, to establish a national protection authority and to set-up a mechanism for the coordination of international assistance. The Committee noted that the legal protection which has been given to the site under Royal Decree has been adopted by the Royal Cambodian Government and is under consideration by Parliament. The Committee invited the Cambodian authorities to provide information at its next session of the follow-up to the legal process. Recognizing the still-prevailing exceptional conditions at the site, the Committee decided to retain Angkor on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.27 Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)**

The Committee, having taken note of the difficulties which hindered the execution of the programme for which it had approved funds in 1994, requested the Secretariat to continue monitoring its implementation and to present a progress report to the Bureau at its twentieth session. The

Committee decided to retain this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**VII.28 Timbuktu (Mali)**

The Committee was informed of the state of progress of the pilot project for the preservation of the three mosques of Timbuktu inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The first phase, which was carried out by the national authorities, will be followed in 1995 by the intervention of experts from ICCROM and CRATerre - EAG. This second phase should receive support from the World Heritage Fund.

Having noted that the Mali authorities granted emergency assistance from the national budget to finance conservation work, the Committee endorsed the launching of a pilot project. It commended the Mali Government for its commitment in defining a coherent conservation policy, adapted to each one of the mosques, and for having financed emergency work. The Committee decided to maintain this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**VII.29 Bahla Fort (Oman)**

The Committee was informed that since its eighteenth session two expert missions had visited the site. The observations and recommendations of the first mission are set out in a Consolidated Report transmitted to the national authorities, confirming that the work being carried out was of a clearly "renovation" type, risking to irretrievably compromise the authenticity of this historic monument. The second mission, carried out from 27 May to 11 June 1995, with the financial support of Oman, by a specialist in mud-brick architecture, provided valuable advice on the methods and choice of material to be used. It also noted the involvement of the national authorities in the safeguarding of the authenticity of the monument and the neighbouring buildings.

The Committee thanked the Omani authorities for their active collaboration with UNESCO towards the preservation of Bahla Fort. They particularly appreciated their willingness to follow the advice of the experts, specialists in mud-brick architecture, who were sent to the site. This action seemed to be the only way to preserve the authenticity of the monument, to which continued importance is accorded. It thanked the authorities for their financial support towards the safeguarding of this heritage and recommended that the outer mosque and the ancient residence of the Governor be also considered for restoration in accordance with the international recommendations for the preservation of authenticity.

The Committee suggested to the Omani authorities that a

further mission of two experts be organized in 1996 under the same cost-sharing conditions, in order to evaluate the work and the state of conservation of the monument and to examine whether Bahla Fort may be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in the future. The Committee requested the Secretariat to present a report on this at its twentieth session.

### **VII.30 Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)**

The Committee decided to wait for the results of the assessment of the conservation policies and practices at the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, to be undertaken in the context of the course on adobe conservation that will be held at Chan Chan, in late 1996. The Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **VII.31 Wieliczka Salt Mines (Poland)**

The Committee took note of the information provided by the Secretariat that UNESCO had taken all the necessary measures for the implementation of the technical cooperation project that was approved by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session but that it had not received to date the consent of the Polish authorities as to UNESCO's proposals regarding the purchase of the equipment. In the absence of any further clarification from the State Party concerned, the Delegate of the United States of America informed the Committee that the Polish authorities had just recently communicated to his country that they had received additional funds from the Marie Curie Fund and that the purchase of the equipment would soon be forthcoming. The Committee thereupon requested the Secretariat to take the necessary measures for the prompt implementation of the assistance and to keep the Committee informed of its results. The Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the results and a report of the impact of the equipment on the conditions of the site are known.

## **C.2 Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List**

### **VII.32 Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria)**

The Committee was informed of the Algerian authorities' firm intention to continue their efforts in preserving the World Heritage values of the Kasbah of Algiers, and that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had sent to the World Heritage Centre a "Report on the Actions for the Safeguarding of the Kasbah for 1995", in accordance with

the request of the Committee during the inscription of the site in 1992.

The Committee thanked the Algerian Government for having provided the information concerning the high priority given to this site and the actions foreseen for its restoration.

### **VII.33 City of Potosi (Bolivia)**

The Committee took note of the information provided by the Secretariat on the potential degradation of the Cerro Rico mountain by continued mining operations. Considering that the Cerro Rico forms an integral part of the World Heritage site, the Committee invited the Bolivian authorities to inform the Secretariat of the measures it has taken for its preservation and management.

### **VII.34 Memphis and its Necropolis -- the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)**

It was recalled that the Committee had been informed during its eighteenth session in Phuket of the very serious problems which threatened the site. Following an exchange of correspondence between the Director-General of UNESCO, the Government of Egypt and the World Heritage Committee, a UNESCO expert mission visited Egypt from 1 to 6 April 1995, at the invitation of the national authorities. Its terms of reference were to propose safeguarding measures for the World Heritage site of the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur, after studying with the Egyptian authorities the possibilities of adopting a new route for the motorway under construction, which at that time cut across the site, as well as for other threats.

The Committee was informed that after in-depth discussions and field visits, an agreement was reached with all parties concerned with regard to the choice of a new route for the motorway completely avoiding the World Heritage site, the suppression of the two refuse dumps, the halting of all new housing constructions at Kafr-el-Gabal and the suppression of numerous encroachments on the site and its buffer zone.

The UNESCO mission report was transmitted to the Bureau during its nineteenth session in July 1995.

Following the proposal of the Delegate of Germany, the Committee decided to write to the Egyptian authorities regarding this World Heritage site and that of **Islamic Cairo**. This text appears further in this report.

**VII.35 Islamic Cairo (Egypt)**

The Committee was informed that precise and concordant information from several sources was brought to the attention of UNESCO that the restoration work at the three Fatimid mosques of Al Aqmar, Al-Guyushi and Lu-lu-a (among the most ancient in Cairo dating from the 11th and 12th centuries), carried out by the Bohra community had in fact resulted in the destruction of most of their historic elements and an almost total reconstruction, causing the loss of their authenticity and World Heritage values. In fact, the plaster, woodwork and ancient painted walls, inside and outside, have been destroyed and replaced by new material, concrete has been used as a substitute for the old structures, and even the shape and configuration of the monuments have been completely transformed, in breadth and height, through the addition of levels and rooms. Furthermore, the traditional techniques have been totally ignored.

A report was requested in June 1995 from the Supreme Council of Antiquities, but had not been received by the beginning of the nineteenth session of the Committee.

The Committee therefore requested the Secretariat to transmit to the Egyptian authorities the following text concerning the **Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur** and the **Islamic Cairo**:

Having noted the results of the mission 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 Committee congratulated and thanked the Egyptian authorities for the decisions taken to date and for the action 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 available, either the Mariouteyya Canal, the Mansoureyya Canal, or both of them;
- 2) work already undertaken to improve one of the rubbish dumps and the work foreseen to abolish the second;
- 3) actions 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 requested the Egyptian authorities to keep the Committee informed, through its Secretariat, of the progress made in the implementation of the safeguarding measures already undertaken or foreseen, and more particularly the question concerning the encroachment of military camps on the World Heritage site and its buffer zone.

However, the Committee regarded the renovation and reconstruction works which have destroyed the authenticity of the three Fatimid mosques of Al Aqmar, Al-Guyushi and Lu-lu-a, situated within the World Heritage site of Islamic Cairo, with grave concern. It drew the attention of the Egyptian authorities to Articles 4 and 5 of the World Heritage Convention by which States Parties should endeavour to ensure the protection and conservation of their heritage, and that this conservation should be carried out in accordance with international standards, such as the Charter of Venice, in order to ensure respect of authenticity. It also recalled Article 24(b) of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention regarding the respect of authenticity of inscribed properties, and requested that, in the future, the authorities should conform to Article 58, inviting States Parties to inform the Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention, major restorations or new constructions.

It finally reminded the Egyptian authorities that UNESCO is always willing to provide, whenever necessary, international expert advice prior to any restoration work and those who are sent on a regular basis to the site, are at their entire disposal to provide advice whenever necessary.

### **VII.36 Churches of Lalibela (Ethiopia)**

The project for the "Restoration and Preservation of the Churches of Lalibela" was conceived and formulated in the framework of the International Campaign for the Conservation and Preservation of the Monuments of Ethiopia, and implemented by the Division of Cultural Heritage. It illustrates the complementarity and the dynamism of the activities carried out for heritage by the UNESCO Secretariat as a whole. This project, which receives support from the European Union and the Finnish Ministry of the Environment, will establish on the basis of extremely precise diagnostics, a conservation and maintenance programme for each of the churches and will propose a plan for the rehabilitation and preservation of the entire site.

This project will also define an action programme which will take into account its environmental dimension.

The Committee congratulated the Ethiopian authorities for their efforts which have led to a restoration and conservation project for the entire site, which takes account of its environmental dimension.

#### **VII.37 Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)**

The Committee took note of the report provided by the Secretariat and invited the German authorities to provide a full state of conservation report on the site, including statements concerning legal protection, current planning and development of Potsdam, as well as information on possible extensions of the site and/or buffer zones adjacent to the site.

#### **VII.38 Borobudur (Indonesia)**

The Committee noted with appreciation the submission of the state of conservation reports on Borobudur and Prambanan, both inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991 and commended the Indonesian World Heritage Committee for the importance it has attached to the systematic monitoring exercise and rapid completion of the state of conservation reports on the cultural properties.

With regard to Borobudur, the Committee expressed its wish to receive the detailed plan of the "sound and light" theatre at this site, prior to its construction in view of the important universal cultural values that need to be maintained at this World Heritage site.

#### **VII.39 Meidan Emam of Isfahan (Iran)**

The Secretariat informed the Committee that it received the draft report of a mission carried out in September 1995 to assess the state of conservation of the Meidan Eman of Isfahan by the Iranian Cultural Organization in association with ICCROM following the concern raised by the Bureau in July 1995 on the impact of the new road projects on this site. The Committee took note of this and decided to study the reports at the next Bureau meeting before formulating its recommendations.

#### **VII.40 Petra (Jordan)**

The Secretariat recalled that during its eighteenth session, the Committee was informed of the different

threats (hotel constructions near the site, insufficient waste water evacuation systems, uncontrolled urban development, proliferation of shops) menacing the preservation of the integrity of the site.

It informed the Committee that by letter of 13 March, the Permanent Delegation of Jordan had sent the Centre a proposal for an extension of the site under the name Petra Natural and Archaeological Park, which was subsequently withdrawn pending completion of the proposal. Furthermore, by letter of 18 March, the Minister of Tourism and Antiquities had informed the Centre of a certain number of measures undertaken to improve the protection of the site: limiting the daily intake of visitors and horses, improvement of sanitary arrangements, regrouping of street stalls, recruitment of a refuse team, creation of a centre for stone conservation and a team to study rock erosion, the improvement of some sites through descriptive panels and trails, establishment of a special bureau to follow up these different projects.

On 14 September the Director of the UNESCO Office in Amman was informed by the Ministry of Antiquities and Tourism, that the Jordanian authorities were also fully aware of the problems caused by the construction of new hotels and that the deliverance of building permits had been halted. The Minister had emphasized the importance of establishing zoning regulations and guidelines for constructions at Wadi Musa which would be prepared with assistance from The World Bank.

If several of the short-term recommendations contained in the Management Plan had already been implemented, the long-term recommendations will be the subject of further studies. A Regional Planning Council for the Petra Region was established, chaired by the Minister of Antiquities and Tourism. It is responsible for all action in the region, including that for Petra. A Technical Committee was established to draw up the zoning regulations, as the first step towards the creation of an independent authority for the site.

The Committee thanked the Jordanian authorities and in particular the Minister of Antiquities and Tourism, for all their efforts and the measures undertaken to ensure the long-term preservation of Petra. It gave them its full approval to proceed as quickly as possible with the establishment of zoning regulations and construction guidelines in order to avoid the proliferation of hotels and buildings, as well as the setting up of an independent local protection and management body endowed with the necessary authority. It invited them to continue to devote their efforts towards the active implementation of the Petra Management Plan prepared with the help of UNESCO experts, and to the extension of this World Heritage site,

with the necessary means for ensuring its preservation. It invited the national authorities to keep the Committee informed by April next, through its Secretariat, of progress accomplished.

#### **VII.41 Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania)**

The Committee took note of the report on the comprehensive rehabilitation programme for the City. It commended the Government of Lithuania and the municipal authorities of Vilnius for their timely and appropriate initiative.

#### **VII.42 Ihle de Mozambique (Mozambique)**

The Committee was informed that the World Heritage Centre undertook a mission last July in order to:

- define the necessary measures to prepare an integrated rehabilitation programme for the Ihle;
- establish the list of urgent conservation work.

The report of this mission was discussed last November in Paris, with the Minister of Culture who asked the Director-General of UNESCO for a Funds-in-Trust to be administered in Maputo by a Steering Committee. The UNESCO Representative in Mozambique would be a member of this Committee. The Mozambique authorities and UNESCO plans to allocate resources which will be used to implement the integrated rehabilitation programme defined in the report.

The Committee noted the creation of a Fund-in-Trust to finance conservation projects in the framework of the rehabilitation programme of the Ihla as prepared by UNESCO.

The Committee requested the World Heritage Centre to prepare in collaboration with the authorities of Mozambique conservation projects with cost estimates in order to submit them to potential donors.

#### **VII.43 Tyr (Lebanon)**

The Committee was informed of a land fill project in part of the bay adjacent to the old port north of Tyr, in the immediate vicinity of the World Heritage site, in order to build a tourist complex. If implemented, such a project would irretrievably destroy the underwater archaeological remains located near the old port and would be a major threat to the immediate vicinity of the listed site.

UNESCO organized a mission of two experts to the site; however, the results of this mission had not been received at the beginning of December.

The Committee thanked Mr Michel Eddé, Minister of Culture and Higher Education for his letter dated 20 November 1995,

in which he reiterated the will of the Lebanese Government to preserve the site of Tyr and its cultural and natural environment.

It took note of the information of an earlier UNESCO mission which visited Beirut from 27 November to 2 December 1995 and welcomed the decisions taken by the Lebanese authorities to postpone this land fill project which would have destroyed the underwater archaeological remains of this area, and would have been a major threat to the immediate environment of the World Heritage site.

Furthermore, the Committee requested that the results of the mission of the two experts to Tyr be communicated by UNESCO.

Finally, the Committee requested the Lebanese authorities to provide all information concerning the protection of the archaeological site of Tyr, for which an International Safeguarding Campaign has also been launched.

**VII.44      Megalithic Temples (Malta)**  
**Hal Saflieni Hypogeum (Malta)**

The Committee was informed, during its eighteenth session, and the Bureau at its nineteenth session, of the very serious situation with regard to these monuments.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that since that time, the Permanent Delegation of Malta had transmitted a detailed report dated 4 September 1995 from the Director of the Museums Department of Malta on all the measures already undertaken or foreseen to ensure the long-term safeguarding of these sites, and indicating that high-level funding had been provided by the Government to finance this work.

The Committee thanked the Government of Malta and in particular the Minister of Culture, for the considerable financial and human commitment undertaken for the preservation of these prehistoric and protohistoric sites inscribed on the List, as well as to the Museums Department for its continued commitment and for the quality and success of its work. It congratulated the authorities on the complete and coherent management plan being undertaken and that the Megalithic temples are going to benefit from long-term preservation measures, whilst the Hal Saflieni Hypogeum should soon be reopened to the public. It invited the Maltese authorities to keep the Centre informed of progress accomplished, by 1 April 1996.

**VII.45 Medina of Fez (Morocco)**

The Committee followed with interest the Moroccan Government's efforts for the preservation of the Medina of Fez, which made it a model for the protection of Islamic cities.

Nevertheless, according to the Secretariat's report, it appears that the urban development projects undertaken in 1994 and 1995 and which consist among others of demolishing parts of the Medina to make way for tarmac roads, completely ignore the principles for preservation as defined in the World Heritage Convention. Consequently, the Committee expressed its grave concern with regard to these projects which appear still to be underway and for the destruction of the Ain Azliten area.

Having taken note of the oral information given by the Delegate of Morocco according to whom no other action of this kind has since been carried out, the Committee recalled the terms of the Declaration of Fez, adopted during the 146th closing session of the Executive Board of UNESCO, held in Fez, on 3 and 4 June 1995, which stressed that too many examples throughout the world have unfortunately shown that the brutal intrusion of the automobile has had an irretrievably destructive effect on the social and urban fabric of historic cities.

Consequently, the Committee expressed its wish that the national authorities would undertake all necessary measures to immediately halt all new demolition projects. It announced its willingness to encourage the setting up, with the help of international experts if necessary, of an integrated plan which would take account of the different cultural, architectural, sociological, technical and financial aspects for urban rehabilitation, and measuring the potential impacts on the multiple aspects of world heritage values in the Medina.

The Committee invited the national authorities to keep them informed, through its Secretariat, before 1 April 1996, of the situation and the measures undertaken to ensure the long-term preservation of the cultural heritage in all its dimensions in the Medina of Fez.

**VII.46 Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)**

The Secretariat reported that the technical cooperation grant approved by the Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994, enabled the deployment in October 1995 of an International Technical Adviser (ITA) to Kathmandu for a period of five months to assist the authorities in the preparation of project proposals for international funding and to establish a development control unit within the

Department of Archaeology. In addition to the three national professionals who will be trained as development control officers by the ITA, three persons are also being trained as documentalists.

The Committee noted that the official gazette of the revised boundaries of the monuments zones has not yet been issued despite repeated indication by the Department of Archaeology of its imminent publication and expressed its concern over the continued demolition of and inappropriate alterations to historic buildings within the World Heritage protected zones.

The Committee reiterated the Bureau's request to His Majesty's Government of Nepal to provide a report on the progress in the implementation of the November 1993 UNESCO/ICOMOS recommendations.

#### **VII.47 Taxila (Pakistan)**

The Committee noted that the Bureau at its nineteenth session requested the Department of Archaeology & Museums, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, to (i) carry out the required scientific studies on vegetation control to minimize the damage to the masonry and structure of the monuments, and (ii) appraise the impact of the heavy industries and the stone quarrying in the Taxila Valley areas, identified during the systematic monitoring mission carried out in March-April 1995.

It noted that the Government of Pakistan submitted a technical cooperation request to carry out the vegetation control study and that the Centre had assisted the DOAM to prepare a project proposal to address the issues referred to under (ii) above which includes activities to redefine if necessary, the boundaries of the Taxila World Heritage Site and a thorough study of the legal regimes protecting the Taxila Valley.

The Committee commended the Department of Archaeology and Museums and other concerned bodies of the Government of Pakistan for their enthusiastic undertaking of the systematic monitoring exercise which enabled the joint DOAM-UNESCO teams to complete within 1995, the state of conservation draft reports on five of the six World Heritage cultural properties in Pakistan. It invited the Pakistani authorities to submit a proposed revision of the Taxila site in due course.

#### **VII.48 Taos Pueblo (United States of America)**

The Committee 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 Committee that it had received preliminary monitoring reports notably from the US National Park Service. These 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 Taos Pueblo's complaints about expected impacts related to this sensitive area.

The Committee 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 in cooperation with ICOMOS and IUCN, and that a report be submitted to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee. The Committee also invited the State Party to consider the possible extension of the World Heritage site to include the culturally valuable areas related to the Taos Pueblo under the cultural landscape criteria.

#### **VII.49 Hue (VietNam)**

The Committee noted with satisfaction the Secretariat's report on the considerable efforts made by the Vietnamese authorities in the conservation of the Complex of Hue Monuments and the achievements made by the Hue-UNESCO Working Group in revitalizing the International Campaign for the Safeguarding of the Hue World Heritage Site.

The Secretariat reported on the formation by the Vietnamese authorities of an inter-ministerial coordination mechanism to monitor and ensure the safeguarding of Hue and the Committee shared the Vietnamese authorities' concern that rapid economic, infrastructure and tourism development could adversely affect the site.

The Committee took note of the strategic *Workshop on World Heritage Preservation and Sustainable Tourism Development-Planning for Hue*, organized in May 1995 by the Government in cooperation with the UNESCO Bangkok Office and the World Heritage Centre with funding support from UNDP, Norwegian Development Agency (NORAD) and the UNESCO Regular Programme.

The Committee received with satisfaction the assurance from the Vietnamese authorities, as reported by the Secretariat, that the many projects proposed for the upgrading and construction of new roads in, around and through the Hue area will in no way intrude on or otherwise negatively affect the area protected as the World Heritage site.

The Committee expressed its concern over the future possible impact of road upgrading and rapid tourism development on the Hue World Heritage site and commended the Vietnamese Government for the integrated development approach it is adopting to address both the safeguarding and development concerns of the region.

#### **REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON MONITORING AND REPORTING**

**VII.50** The Working Group on monitoring and reporting was chaired by Mr Barry Jones (Australia). Mr Harald Plachter (Germany) served as the Rapporteur of this Working Group.

**VII.51** The report of the Working Group was presented by its Chairperson to the Committee's plenary session on Friday, 8 December 1995. He informed the Committee that the Working Group recognized that the issue under consideration consists of two steps:

1. the monitoring by the States Parties of the state of their World Heritage sites;
2. the regular reporting on the state of these sites in accordance with the Convention.

**VII.52** He furthermore indicated that a small group of States Parties (Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Hungary and India) upon the proposal of the Delegate of Cyprus, had prepared a preliminary version of a draft resolution for the eleventh General Assembly. This text was discussed at length and amended accordingly, with important suggestions made by the Delegates of Hungary and Italy. A final draft was prepared for discussion at the plenary session of the Committee which read as follows:

*The General Assembly,*

1. *Noting that the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage has recognized that the cultural and natural heritage 'are increasingly threatened with destruction, not only by traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction';*

2. Reaffirms that 'deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world';
3. Considers that the Convention should be interpreted in the light of twenty-three years of experience in its implementation.
4. Considers that such interpretation recognizes the sovereign right of the State Party concerned over the World Heritage sites situated on its territory;
5. Considers that a well-reflected and formulated common policy for the protection of cultural and natural heritage is likely to create a continuing interaction between States Parties;
6. Emphasizes the interest of each State Party to be informed of the experience of others with regard to conservation methods and the possibilities so offered, through voluntary international cooperation, for the general improvement of all actions undertaken;
7. Reaffirms its role and the role of the World Heritage Committee as standard setting organizations;
8. Concludes that monitoring is the responsibility of the State Party concerned and that the commitment to provide regular reports on the state of the site is consistent with the principles set out in the Convention in
  - (i) the first, second, sixth, seventh and eighth preambular clauses,
  - (ii) Art. 4
  - (iii) Art. 6.1. and 6.2.
  - (iv) Art. 7
  - (v) Art. 10
  - (vi) Art. 11
  - (vii) Art. 13
  - (viii) Art. 15
  - (ix) Art. 21.3
  - (x) Art. 29;
9. Emphasizes that monitoring by the State Party is part of the site management which remains the responsibility of the States Parties where the

site is located, and that regular reports may be submitted in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention;

10. Recalls that Article 4 of the Convention provides that 'Each State Party...recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage...situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State'.
11. Recalls that Article 6 lays down the concept of world heritage 'for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate', and that Article 7 requires the establishment of a 'system of international co-operation' and assistance 'designed to support States Parties' efforts to conserve and identify that heritage.
12. Emphasizes that regular reporting should be part of a consultative process and not treated as a sanction or a coercive mechanism;
13. Notes that within the broad responsibility of the World Heritage Committee in standards setting, the form, nature and extent of the regular reporting must respect the principles of State sovereignty.

The involvement of the Committee, through its Secretariat or advisory bodies, in the preparation of the regular reports would be with the agreement of the State Party concerned. 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.

14. Suggests the General Conference of UNESCO to activate the procedures in Art. 29 of the Convention and to refer to the World Heritage Committee the responsibility to respond to the reports.
15. Encourages States Parties to take advantage of shared information and experience on World Heritage matters;
16. Invites other States to become States Parties to the Convention.

**VII.53** The Committee adopted the draft resolution by acclamation and decided that the Committee at its twentieth session should examine and adopt a report prepared by the Bureau for submission to the eleventh General Assembly of States Parties. The Committee also decided to include it in its Report to the 29th session of the General Conference of UNESCO.

**VII.54** As regards points 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') and D ('Progress report on the preparation of regional synthesis reports') of the agenda item, the Committee decided to defer its decision until the next session and invited the States Parties to comment in writing on the appropriate working documents on each point.

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

**VIII.1** The Secretariat informed the Committee that all cultural properties nominated for inscription were included in the tentative lists of the respective countries. The Committee took note of information document WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.7. The Delegates of Germany and Niger stated that they had recently sent up-dated tentative lists which, however, had not been taken in to account in document INF.7.

**VIII.2** Upon the proposal of the Delegate of Canada, the Committee decided that the presentation of the cultural sites should include citations, as is the case with the presentation of the natural sites.

##### **A. NATURAL HERITAGE**

**VIII.3** The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its last session in July 1995 examined ten natural nominations and referred three properties back to the States Parties and one to IUCN.

**VIII.4** The Bureau examined at its December session four nominations of natural properties, of which it recommended the inscription of two properties. Two nominations were deferred as further information was needed. The Committee also discussed one proposed extension to a World Heritage

site and one revision of the boundaries of a World Heritage site.

#### **A.1 Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

<b>Name of Property</b>	<b>Identification Number</b>	<b>State Party having submitted the nomination (in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention)</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
<b>Waterton Glacier International Peace Park</b>	<b>354Rev</b>	<b>Canada/United States of America</b>	<b>N(ii)(iii)</b>

The Committee took note of the evaluation presented by IUCN and that the site meets criteria (ii) and (iii) because of its distinctive climate, physiographic setting, mountain/prairie interface and tri-ocean hydrographical divide as well as its scenic values and the cultural importance of its International Peace Park designation. IUCN further recommended that a single "Biosphere Reserve" should be created from the three Biosphere Reserves already existing in the area.

The Committee decided that the site be listed under criteria (ii) and (iii) and requested the World Heritage Centre to write to the States Parties with respect to the Biosphere Reserve proposal. In addition, the Committee recommended that the site be eventually expanded to include the adjacent protected area in the Akamina/Kishinena.

<b>Messel Pit Fossil site</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>N(i)</b>
-------------------------------	------------	----------------	-------------

The Committee inscribed 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 Eocene, when mammals became firmly established in all principal land ecosystems. Furthermore, the Committee commended the German Government for their support of the high standards of palaeontological research undertaken.

<b>The Caves of the Aggtelek Karst and the Slovak Karst</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>Hungary/Slovak Republic</b>	<b>N(i)</b>
---	------------	--------------------------------	-------------

The Committee inscribed 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 112 caves contain the geologic history of the last several millions of years with an unusual combination of climatic effects and paleokarst features.

The Committee requested the Centre to write to the national authorities to recommend that control is needed over surface activities such as agricultural pollution, deforestation and soil erosion that could effect the independent resources.

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

The Committee inscribed 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 Committee decided to inscribe an area of 3.28 million ha, which is fully protected as a National Park, Zapovednik and buffer zone. It requested the Centre to write to the national authorities to encourage them to upgrade the legal status of an additional 700,000 ha so that this adjacent area could be incorporated in the site. It furthermore commended the national authorities for their conservation efforts as well as those of Greenpeace, WWF and the Swiss Government for their assistance in strengthening the management of this area.

**Gough Island Wildlife Reserve**                      **740**                      **United Kingdom**                      **N(iii)(iv)**

The Committee noted that the British authorities had confirmed that the marine area (three nautical miles) is included in the nomination and the site is to be known as the "Gough Island Wildlife Reserve", of which 6,500 ha is terrestrial area.

The Committee decided to inscribe the site under criteria (iii) and (iv) as one of the least disturbed major cool-temperate island ecosystems in the South Atlantic, one of the most important seabird colonies in the world and high scenic qualities with spectacular sea-cliffs. The Committee noted the existence of a commercial fishery in the marine area and requested the Centre to write to the State Party with respect to the need for continuous monitoring to ensure that the fishery is sustainable and respects the World Heritage values.



### **Galapagos Islands)**

The Committee recalled that it deferred the inscription of the Galapagos Marine Reserve at its eighteenth session due to serious threats to the site and in accordance with the IUCN recommendation and the wish of the Observer of Ecuador.

The Delegate from Ecuador requested that the marine extension of the site be deferred until the twentieth session of the Committee. This was agreed by the Committee.

### **A.5 Property inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger by the Committee**

During its examination of monitoring reports, the Committee noted threats to **Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)**. On the basis of both ascertained dangers and potential dangers, the Committee decided that Yellowstone National Park be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

## **B. MIXED NATURAL AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

### **B.1 Revision of boundaries of a World Heritage site adopted by the Committee**

**Willandra Lakes            167 Rev.    Australia            N(i)C(iii)**  
**Region**

The Committee recalled that the site was included on the World Heritage List as a mixed site in 1981. The Committee took note of the new boundary proposal and the information by the Delegate of Australia that the reduction in the size of the area would enhance the World Heritage values of the site.

The Committee, furthermore, having taken note of the fact that the new boundary will reduce the total area by about thirty percent, adopted the revised boundaries, as they better define the area containing the World Heritage values and will considerably facilitate the management of the property.

## **C. CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**VIII.5** After having examined at its nineteenth session in July 1995, 28 nominations for inscription of cultural properties and one for a mixed property, the Bureau

recommended the inscription of 17 properties. Four nominations had been referred back and six were deferred. The Bureau had also decided to postpone the debate on one proposal for inscription until the session of the out-going Bureau.

**VIII.6** In December 1995, eight nominations of cultural properties were examined by the Bureau, of which six were recommended for inscription. One nomination was not recommended and another deferred.

**VIII.7** The Committee decided to inscribe 23 properties on the World Heritage List.

#### **C.1 Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

<b>Name of Property</b>	<b>Identifi- cation No.</b>	<b>State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
<b>Lunenburg Old Town</b>	<b>741</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>C(iv)(v)</b>

The Committee concluded that Lunenburg Old Town is an outstanding example of the planned European colonial settlement in North America, in terms both of its conception and its remarkable level of conservation.

The Committee decided to inscribe Lunenburg Old Town on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (v).

<b>Rapa Nui National Park</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>Chile</b>	<b>C(i)(iii) (v)</b>
-----------------------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------------

The Committee 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 Committee decided 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)**

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

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

The Committee 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 Committee decided 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)**

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

**Kutná Hora: The Historical Town Centre with the Church of St.**                      **732**                      **Czech Republic**                      **C(ii)(iv)**



<b>The Historic Centre of Siena</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>C(i)(ii)(iv)</b>
---	------------	--------------	---------------------

The Committee decided to inscribe the property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv), considering that Siena is an outstanding medieval city that has preserved its character and quality. The city is a work of dedication and imagination in which the buildings have been designed to fit into the overall planned urban fabric, and also to form a whole with the surrounding cultural landscape.

<b>The Historic Centre of Naples</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>C(ii)(iv)</b>
--	------------	--------------	------------------

The Committee decided to inscribe the property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv), considering that the site is of exceptional value. It is one of the most ancient cities in Europe, whose contemporary urban fabric preserves the elements of its long and eventful history. Its setting on the Bay of Naples gives it an outstanding universal value which has had a profound influence in many parts of Europe and beyond.

<b>Crespi d'Adda</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>C(iv)(v)</b>
----------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (v), considering that it is an exceptional example of a working village of Europe and North America, dating back to the 19th and 20th centuries, and reflecting the predominant philosophy of enlightened industrialists with respect to their employees. Although the evolution of economic and social conditions constituted an inevitable threat to the survival of Crespi d'Adda, its integrity is remarkable and it has partly conserved its industrial activity.

It also congratulated the Italian authorities for the coherence of its conservation programme which had preserved the architectural and social qualities of this property.

<b>Ferrara: City of the Renaissance</b>	<b>733</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>C(ii)(iv)(vi)</b>
---	------------	--------------	----------------------

The Committee decided to inscribe the 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 Historic Villages of Shirakawa-go and Gokayama**                      **734**                      **Japan**                      **C(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe the site under criteria (iv) and (v) as the villages are outstanding examples of a traditional human settlement that is perfectly adapted to its environment. The Committee noted the successful adaptation to economic changes and that survival can only be assured through constant vigilance on both sides, the Government authorities and the inhabitants.

**The Town of Luang Prabang**                      **479Rev.**                      **Lao People's Democratic Republic**                      **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (v). Luang Prabang represents, to an exceptional extent, the successful fusion of the traditional architectural and urban structures and those of the European colonial rulers of the 19th and 20th centuries. Its unique townscape is remarkably well preserved, illustrating a key stage in the blending of two distinct cultural traditions.

**Schokland and its surroundings**                      **739**                      **Netherlands**                      **C(iii)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the basis of criteria (iii) and (v), considering that Schokland and its surroundings preserve the last surviving evidence of a prehistoric and early historic society that had adapted to the precarious life of wetland settlements under the constant threat of temporary or permanent incursions by the sea. Schokland is included in the agricultural landscape created by the reclamation of the former Zuyder Zee, part of the never-ceasing struggle of the people of the Netherlands against water, and one of the greatest and most visionary human achievements of the twentieth century.

**The Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras**                      **722**                      **Philippines**                      **C(iii)(iv)(v)**

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the

World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv) and (v), based on the joint evaluation by ICOMOS and IUCN. The rice terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras are outstanding examples of living cultural landscapes. They illustrate the traditional techniques and a remarkable harmony between humankind and the natural environment.

The Committee also congratulated the Philippine authorities for having proposed this example of a cultural landscape, thereby contributing towards improving the representative nature of this type of property on the World Heritage List.

<b>Sintra</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>Portugal</b>	<b>C(ii)(iv)</b>
<b>Cultural</b>			<b>(v)</b>
<b>Landscape</b>			

The Committee considered that the site is of outstanding universal value as it represents a pioneering approach to Romantic landscaping which had an outstanding influence on developments elsewhere in Europe. It is an unique example of the cultural occupation of a specific location that has maintained its essential integrity as the representation of diverse successive cultures.

The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (v) and under the following name: **The Cultural Landscape of Sintra.**

<b>Sokkuram</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>Republic of</b>	<b>C(i)(iv)</b>
<b>Grotto</b>		<b>Korea</b>	

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (i) and (iv) as a masterpiece of Far Eastern Buddhist art. The complex that it forms with Pulguksa Temple is an outstanding example of the religious architecture of the region and of the material expression of Buddhist belief.

<b>Haeinsa Temple</b>	<b>737</b>	<b>Republic of</b>	<b>C(iv)(vi)</b>
<b>Changgyong P'ango,</b>		<b>Korea</b>	
<b>the Depositories for</b>			
<b>the Koreana Woodblocks</b>			

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (vi), in recognition that the Korean version of the Buddhist scriptures (Tripitaka Koreana) at the Haeinsa Temple is one of the most important and most complete corpus of Buddhist doctrinal texts in the world, and is also outstanding for the high aesthetic quality of its workmanship. The



<b>The Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento</b>	<b>747</b>	<b>Uruguay</b>	<b>C(iv)</b>
---	------------	----------------	--------------

The Committee concluded that the historic quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento bears remarkable testimony in its layout and its buildings to the nature and objectives of European colonial settlement, in particular during the seminal period at the end of the 17th century.

The Committee decided to inscribe the Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iv).

**IX. REPORT ON THE DECISIONS OF THE TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION, AND THE DECISIONS OF THE 28TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE**

**IX.1** Upon the request of the Delegate of Malta, the Chairperson of the Committee asked the Rapporteur of the Tenth session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention (Paris, 2-3 November 1995) to present again the summary of the report adopted by the General Assembly. The Rapporteur, Mr Janos Jelen (Hungary), outlined the major trends characterizing the discussion during the General Assembly and the consequences of the decision adopted regarding monitoring (see paragraph 31 of Document WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.6). A summary of this figures in paragraph V.2 of this report.

**IX.2** In the ensuing debate, the Delegate of France underlined that although the General Assembly expects to receive from the Committee, for its Eleventh session in 1997, a report on systematic monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, there is no immediate urgency. It is, above all, of fundamental importance that a consensus be reached on this matter before presenting it to the General Assembly.

**IX.3** This view was fully shared by the Chairperson of the Committee and Mr. Jelen, as Rapporteur. However, the Chairperson stressed the need that the Committee gives appropriate political and procedural guidance in the period between the two sessions of the General Assembly to those who will be preparing the proposals for the General Assembly.

**IX.4** The Delegate of Australia, being also the Chairperson of the Committee's ad hoc drafting group on monitoring, endorsed the clarification made by the

Chairperson. Responding to the suggestion made by the Delegate of Cyprus regarding the possible setting up of an ad hoc drafting group on this subject, he informed the Committee that he had undertaken individual consultations with members of the ad hoc working group on this matter and that some progress had been made to produce a written text containing draft proposals to that end.

**IX.5** The Delegate of Germany endorsed the proposal made by Cyprus to create an ad hoc drafting group. The Delegate of Benin, on the other hand, wondered if it was not premature to set up such a group. The Observer of Algeria, having underlined that the Committee already had at its disposal at least two important documents on this issue, produced by the delegates and the President of the Tenth General Assembly, and expressed the wish that if an ad hoc drafting group is created, it should reflect all the different views that exist on this subject among the States Parties.

**IX.6** Concluding the debate on this topic, the Chairperson reassured the Committee once again that everything will be fully discussed and in total transparency. The Committee, however, should try to define at this session some general guidelines on how to proceed, so that a report and a proposed resolution could be prepared for the next session of the General Assembly.

**IX.7** The Chairperson then invited the Committee to examine the decisions taken by the General Conference of UNESCO, at its 28th session, regarding the status and the Workplan of the World Heritage Centre. The delegates received to that effect copies of the following texts, as amended and approved by the General Conference of UNESCO, and as transmitted by the office of the Assistant Director-General of Bureau Studies, Programming and Evaluation: Resolution 3.1; Resolution 3.10 and paragraphs 03101 to 03112 of the Draft Programme and Budget for 1996-1997.

**IX.8** The Committee, having heard a brief explanation of these documents by the Director of the World Heritage Centre, took note of them without discussion.

**X. BALANCED REPRESENTATION OF NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**X.1** The Committee examined the working document prepared by the Secretariat and recalled paragraph 122 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention reflecting previous discussions held at sessions of the Committee and its Bureau, which focused on:

- the concept of universal value and standards to be applied;
- the interpretation of universal value by the advisory bodies;
- the number of natural and cultural specialists present at sessions of the Committee and its Bureau;
- priorities for granting international assistance.

**X.2** The Committee furthermore recalled that the question of balance relates also to the "Strategic Goals for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention" adopted by the sixteenth session of the Committee. It also recalled that at the same session the categories for cultural landscapes were adopted which are considered under the cultural criteria only.

**X.3** Several delegates raised concerns about the imbalance between natural and cultural heritage. The Delegate of Australia underlined the concerns with regard to the natural heritage posts within the Centre and recommended that this should be outlined in the strongest terms.

**X.4** The Delegate of Germany, supporting the position of Australia, emphasized that this has also an impact on the relations with the States Parties. He furthermore underlined that awareness-building among States Parties is crucial and said that his Delegation would welcome an overall Global Strategy.

**X.5** The Delegate of Niger also raised the question of a Global Strategy for Natural Heritage. He furthermore added a number of items to be considered, including the number of sites rejected by the advisory bodies, the difference of the application of the criteria of both advisory bodies, the question of an inventory for natural heritage and the harmonization between the natural and cultural part.

**X.6** The Delegate of Canada highlighted the importance of this item and the interest of her country in encouraging more nominations of natural heritage properties. She asked other States Parties to send natural heritage specialists to Committee sessions and emphasized that the Global Strategy should be seen as one overall action.

**X.7** The Chairperson, taking up the recommendation to strengthen natural heritage within the Centre, underlined that he would like to meet with the Director-General to discuss this item.

**X.8** The Delegate of Benin stressed that "the balance should not be analysed from a purely statistical aspect, as the objective is not to envisage an equal number of

cultural and natural sites.

For all that, even with regard to cultural properties, it may be noted that certain regions, such as Africa, are not well represented on the World Heritage List.

In order to remedy the situation with regard to this continent, improved training for specialists of this continent should be assured, as well as the attendance at the Committee sessions by those countries which are elected members, represented by a delegation of two specialists, in accordance with the Convention".

**X.9** The Delegate of France indicated that "the balance between natural and cultural properties was of no significance as they were not comparable. Criterion (ii) concerning "the interaction between man and nature" had been very rarely used and was deleted during the sixteenth session at Santa Fe. During the same session, the notion of cultural landscapes which include important natural elements, was adopted by the Committee. The fundamental objective of the Convention was to protect the properties of greatest importance, the loss of which would affect all humanity. In his view, in order to end this unproductive competition, a list of common criteria might be envisaged covering cultural properties, cultural landscapes and natural sites."

He renewed the invitation of his country to host in 1996 an expert meeting on integrity and other related questions."

**X.10** The Delegate of Lebanon raised the question of whether the natural criteria are applied too strictly, in particular with regard to the conditions of integrity. The Delegate of Cyprus recalled the large size of most natural World Heritage sites.

**X.11** The Delegate of Malta suggested "that more emphasis should be given to natural site nominations by the Centre to rectify the imbalance".

**X.12** The Delegate of Italy recalled "that 'the balance' is an old debate, that this question could not be considered on a numerical basis and, in his view, the advisory bodies apply the criteria in an objective manner."

**X.13** The Delegate of Japan shared the concerns of other delegates of how to remedy the imbalance, adding that the question regarding imbalance should be discussed elsewhere.

**X.14** The Delegate of China supported the idea of an integrated notion of cultural and natural heritage as outlined in the Convention.

**X.15** The Representative of IUCN thanked the Secretariat for the background document and welcomed the lively debate by the delegates. He emphasized that the States Parties have to identify properties and that IUCN can play an important role of promoting the Convention through its networks. He recalled that the cooperation with ICOMOS is already strengthened through a number of regional thematic meetings and the cultural landscapes nominations and that a global overview is needed, as the 1982 publication is outdated. He welcomed the French proposal for an expert meeting and suggested that this could provide a forum for an overall discussion.

**X.16** The Representative of ICOMOS recalled the criteria set out in the Operational Guidelines and their objective application. He underlined that the balance between different parts of the world is important as well as the harmonization of applications. He indicated that an overall Global Strategy is a good starting point, as nature and culture cannot be separated, in particular in Africa.

**X.17** The Chairperson welcomed the lively and positive debate on this issue and asked for the adoption of the recommendations set up in Document WHC-95/CONF.203/7 with changes suggested by several delegates.

The Committee, in the light of earlier discussions:

- invites States Parties to nominate types of sites presently under-represented on the World Heritage List;
- invites States Parties attending the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau to be represented by both cultural and natural heritage specialists ;
- requests States Parties to communicate regularly to the Centre updated addresses of the national institutions primarily responsible for cultural and natural heritage;
- asks the World Heritage Centre to undertake efforts to strengthen the links to natural heritage institutions in States Parties to the Convention;
- requests the Centre to work on an overall global strategy for natural heritage in close cooperation with IUCN and ICOMOS;
- prior to the establishment of a post, by UNESCO, of at least one specialist for natural heritage in the World Heritage Centre and considering the importance of this field, the Committee requested the Chairperson to emphasize to the Director-General of UNESCO the need to strengthen cooperation between the Centre and the Division of Ecological Sciences;
- requests both advisory bodies to adhere to strict and harmonized evaluation procedures in order to ensure

representivity of the World Heritage List for the diversity of the world's heritage;

- commends the French authorities for their efforts to host a small natural heritage specialists meeting on the "notion of integrity", and requested that this meeting reviews the Global Strategy for Natural Heritage and the question of a global indicative inventory.

## **XI. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE "GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THEMATIC STUDIES"**

**XI.1** The Delegate of Malta underlined the positive reactions of the Committee to the initiatives undertaken by the Secretariat in 1995 and the proposals for 1996 in the field of Global Strategy and thematic studies.

### **A. CULTURAL HERITAGE**

#### **1. Global Strategy**

**XI.2** The Secretariat presented the results of the first subregional meeting on Global Strategy organized with ICOMOS, in Harare (Zimbabwe) from 11 to 13 October 1995. This meeting, prepared with the assistance of the NMMZ, brought together 35 African experts from thirteen States Parties and States not yet party to the Convention, from the region and helped to define and identify the types of African cultural properties little or not represented on the World Heritage List, and to initiate the preparation of new tentative lists.

**XI.3** The Committee considered that in 1996 priority should continue to be given to African cultural heritage and a second subregional meeting would be held in Ethiopia concentrating on the Sudano-sahelian world and the Horn of Africa. The Committee took note that in 1997, the cultural heritage of the Caribbean would be the subject of a subregional meeting.

**XI.4** The Delegate of Benin greatly appreciated the report on the Harare meeting. The report of the Secretariat clearly indicated the manner in which the question of balance between cultural and natural heritage should be envisaged, but also demonstrates that in cultural heritage there exists also an imbalance in the representation of the types of properties and cultures, which must be remedied. He fully endorsed the Harare meeting as well as the second meeting foreseen in Ethiopia in 1996 and suggested that IUCN be associated.

**XI.5** The Representative of ICOMOS made three remarks: he was pleased with the excellent collaboration

established between the Centre and ICOMOS, particularly for the Harare meeting. He supported collaboration in the framework of the Global Strategy between natural and cultural heritage specialists, as proposed by the Representative of IUCN. He insisted that efforts should continue to be made for Africa and strongly supported the holding of the second subregional meeting proposed by the Secretariat in Ethiopia in 1996.

**XI.6** The Chairperson agreed to the importance of continuously recognizing African cultural heritage.

## **2. Thematic studies**

**XI.7** The Secretariat presented the regional thematic studies carried out in 1995 and the Committee took note of the detailed reports contained in information documents INF.8 and INF.9.

- \_ "Regional Thematic Study Meeting on Asian Rice Culture and its Terrace Landscapes (Philippines, 28 March to 4 April 1995)
- \_ "Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop on Associative Cultural Landscapes " (Australia, 27 to 29 April 1995).

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a meeting on European cultural landscapes will be held in Vienna in April 1996, and that future meetings will be organized for the Andean region, and on the theme of Sacred Mountains in the Asia-Pacific region.

**XI.8** The Delegate of Italy emphasized that the specialists in his country wished to participate in the meeting foreseen in Vienna (Austria) in April 1996 on European cultural landscapes.

**XI.9** The Delegate of Lebanon underlined his interest in the Secretariat's report on the Harare Meeting. He asked when the Harare report would be available and hoped that it would be widely distributed. He thought that more attention should be given to thematic studies on non-European cultural heritage, for example terrace cultures.

## **B. NATURAL HERITAGE**

**XI.10** The Committee took note of the action taken by both the Secretariat and IUCN concerning fossil and geological heritage within an overall Global Strategy for natural heritage. The Committee furthermore took note of a "World Heritage session" foreseen during the International Geological Congress to be held in Beijing in 1996. Several delegates noted the importance of linking the Global

Strategy for natural and cultural heritage.

**XI.11** The Representative of IUCN supported these projects. He remarked that the Caribbean and Pacific region (in evoking an international assistance request presented by Fiji for a regional meeting) is composed of numerous States many of which are not yet party to the Convention, and where there also cultural heritage should be considered as being closely linked to nature. The participation of natural heritage specialists would therefore be useful during Global Strategy meetings.

**XI.12** The Delegate of France recalled that his country will host an expert meeting on integrity and issues related to the Global Strategy for natural heritage, and that both advisory bodies should be associated in these reflections. In addition, the Delegate of Niger highlighted the links between cultural and biological diversity.

## **XII. REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED TRAINING STRATEGY**

**XII.1** The Centre presented Document WHC-95/CONF.203/9 in which Section A focused on Natural Heritage and Section B focused on Cultural Heritage sites.

### **A. Natural Heritage**

**XII.2** An Information Document "Strategy for Training in the Field of Natural Heritage" WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.11A was tabled. The session began with a background statement referring to State Party responsibilities in Article 5 (e) of the Convention and to the assistance available for training in Article 22(c). Training is defined as a broadly encompassing term that includes education, training and promotion.

**XII.3** The Centre noted that while there has been general satisfaction with Convention-sponsored training programmes there was a need to put forward a coherent and pro-active programme. The purpose and objectives were established as follows:

"the purposes and objectives of the natural heritage training strategy is to enhance the capacity of all States Parties to identify, protect, conserve and present the natural heritage."

Five objectives were noted.

**XII.4** The Centre presented four strategic actions which are spelt out in detail in Document WHC-95/CONF.203/9. It was noted that curricula and other training materials were the major shortcoming in the field of natural heritage. During

the discussion it was further noted that there was a need to train teachers and to train the trainers, so as to gain maximum effectiveness. There was also an expression for the need to address the integration of cultural and natural values in training programmes. An additional point was the need for regular, regionally-based seminars, and the Delegate of Niger made a proposal for such a seminar in Africa.

**XII.5**A concern was also expressed that care should be taken to ensure a geographic balance in training commitments. There was further concern that training modules must address consideration of ethical, environmental, economic and social relationships between nature conservation, sustainable resource use and local peoples. A text was prepared on this subject and agreed to by the State Parties concerned.

**XII.6**At the close of the session the strategy was adopted as a basis for future development of the programme in cooperation with the advisory bodies. A budgetary proposal was presented and was considered under that item of the agenda.

## **B. Cultural Heritage**

**XII.7**When presenting the Document WHC-95/CONF.203/9, it was recalled that at the request of the World Heritage Committee, the Bureau during its eighteenth session (July 1994) examined expenditure incurred in the field of training from 1988 to 1992 and concluded that the World Heritage Centre should organize an evaluation seminar to define a new training strategy in the field of cultural heritage conservation. However, no budgetary provisions had been foreseen for this activity and the World Heritage Committee, during its eighteenth session in December 1994, did not recommend this proposal, although it had approved US\$ 30,000 for the preparation of a training strategy for managers of cultural sites.

**XII.8**Faced with this situation, the Director of the Centre asked ICCROM to prepare a proposal, which was distributed during the nineteenth session of the Bureau in July 1995, then transmitted to a certain number of partners of ICCROM and the Centre. The Document WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.11B, which reflects the results of these consultations, establishes the conceptual and methodological framework which will serve as a basis for the elaboration of a training strategy. It analyses the content of the training programme and career structures, in relation to the types of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, without however proposing platforms for actions adapted to each geocultural region. However, the Centre and ICCROM considered that the training strategy for cultural

properties should take account of the analysis of the specificities of each region and should be based on an evaluation of their needs. It therefore proposes to begin in 1996 an information gathering process at the national and regional levels, in order to better identify the priorities and the regional and sub-regional institutions with which partnership links could be established.

**XII.9** In his presentation, the Representative of ICCROM emphasized the complexity of the field of conservation of cultural heritage which is due to its great diversity of cultural heritage in the different parts of the world and which was discussed during the Nara meeting on authenticity in 1994. Among the target groups that should be involved in education and training programmes, he mentioned conservation professionals, technicians and craftpersons, politicians and decision-makers, as well as the public at large and the media, particularly television and the press.

**XII.10** He emphasized the necessity to ensure the participation of the States Parties through a process which should include a survey that would be carried out by the States Parties, of their training needs, as well as discussions on regional meetings in order to identify the role of international collaboration in this context. The current programme of ICCROM aims, in fact, at the capacity-building of institutions and professional networks all over the world. ICCROM's aim is to identify areas with similar problems and concerns in order to launch thematic programmes. An example is a programme being developed by ICCROM on the conservation management of historic towns; an international training programme on the conservation of World Heritage Cities shall be organized in 1997.

**XII.11.** During the course of the debate thirteen members of the Committee and the Representative of ICOMOS intervened and expressed their satisfaction with both documents, prepared respectively by the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM. They underlined the importance of training, being a necessary and indispensable condition for the conservation of cultural heritage and approved the regional and thematic approach that was being proposed. Having regretted the imbalance of training programmes between Europe and the rest of the world, they expressed their concern that this situation be remedied, which in the view of one member of the Committee, is one of the reasons of the weak representation of Africa on the World Heritage List. Two delegates requested that the Mediterranean as a region should receive greater attention. Some speakers also mentioned the complementarity of international courses for the training of trainers, regional courses for conservators, architects and other specialists and national courses for the training of technical personnel. They encouraged the Centre to pursue the in situ training and to

include the craftsmen who are the holders of precious and indispensable knowledge in conservation of more fragile structures, such as earth or wood. Some interventions highlighted the use of educational videos and long-distance teaching.

**XII.12** The Committee supported the proposals for the establishment of an inventory of conservation needs based on questionnaires which will be sent to national authorities responsible for heritage protection, and requested that regional training institutes be identified and participate in the elaboration of programmes which combine theoretical and practical approaches adapted to local realities. Moreover, the Committee requested the Centre to adopt an "integrated" approach, and elaborate training programmes for both managers of natural and cultural sites. This reflection should be carried out in cooperation with the advisory bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM). A member of the Committee, having noted that the World Heritage Fund was unable to respond to all the training needs, requested that efforts be made to seek additional funding for training activities. The Committee supported the proposals for 1996 and expressed the wish that a budgetary allocation be made for the implementation of this strategy.

**XII.13** At the end of the debate, the Chairperson requested the Director of the Centre to rectify the imbalance in the field of training, and to grant substantial assistance to African States Parties. The Director of the Centre undertook to request the advisory bodies, during the meeting which will be held in February 1996 at the Centre, in Paris, to make proposals for training programmes for managers of cultural and natural sites. He said that a budgetary line would be foreseen to implement a veritable training strategy for cultural properties.

### **XIII. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

Upon considering the financial accounts as at 31 October 1995 and the cash flow situation, the Committee decided to increase the budgetary allocation for international assistance to US\$ 1,500,000 with the following breakdown:

- \* US\$ 175,000 for preparatory assistance;
- \* US\$ 685,000 for technical cooperation,  
1/3 for natural and 2/3 for cultural heritage;
- \* US\$ 550,000 for training,  
half for natural and half for cultural heritage.

The Centre informed the Committee that out of the 51 requests, 14 cases (3 for natural heritage and 11 for cultural heritage) were for sums above US\$ 30,000, for the Committee's examination. In addition, there are 10 preparatory assistance, 2 training and 4 technical cooperation requests for examination by the Chairperson; and another 9 training and 10 technical cooperation requests for decision by the Bureau.

**A. NATURAL HERITAGE**

**A.1 Requests approved by the Committee**

**A.1.1 Technical Cooperation**

**Komodo National Park (Indonesia) (US\$ 64,500 requested)**

The Committee reviewed the request for the purchase of a fibreglass catamaran boat and additional accessories for the GIS system for a total of US\$ 64,500. However, in the light of the amount of funds already provided for the purchase of boats for the site, the Committee approved this project for a reduced amount of **US\$ 30,000**, under the condition that the Indonesian authorities find an additional US\$ 30,000 from other sources for its purchase. It furthermore suggested that the boat be insured by the Indonesian authorities as a matter of general policy.

**Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi) (US\$ 30,000 requested)**

The Committee approved **US\$ 30,000** for a technical assistance project for the site. The project includes a comprehensive biological inventory of the Park, which contributes to the preparation of a new management plan, local awareness programmes and community projects, boat purchase and refurbishment, and an alternative income-generating study for the local population.

**A.1.2 Training**

**College of African Wildlife Management, Mweka (Tanzania)  
(US\$ 30,000 requested)**

The Committee approved an amount of **US\$ 30,000** for three students to attend the one-year course (1996/97) at the College of African Wildlife Management, Mweka, Tanzania, and requested the Centre to contact the Principal of the School to provide a detailed financial breakdown for each of the students.

**B. CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**B.1 Requests approved by the Committee**

**B.1.1 Technical Cooperation**

**Preparation of Guidelines for Risk Preparedness for World Heritage Sites (request presented by ICOMOS) (US\$ 30,000 requested)**

The Committee approved the request of **US\$ 30,000** for the preparation and publication of the "Guidelines for Risk Preparedness for World Cultural Heritage Sites" in 1,000 copies. IUCN should be associated. US\$ 15,000 would be provided to ICOMOS from the 1996 budget and the remaining amount would be included in the 1997 budget.

**Jesuit Missions of the Chiquitos (Bolivia) (US\$ 30,000 requested)**

The Committee approved an amount of **US\$ 30,000** for the preparation of a strategic plan and the formulation of projects for the Missions (US\$ 22,000) and for urgent technical advice (US\$ 8,000). The Centre, in cooperation with the Bolivian authorities, was requested to seek additional funding for this project from donors.

**Purchase of equipment to improve the security of the site Museum of the Mountain Resort and its Outlying Temples of Chengde (China) (US\$ 34,150 requested)**

The Committee approved an amount of **US\$ 34,150** for the purchase of equipment in the framework of a co-financing programme on the understanding that the training request for US\$ 20,000 for the same site be sought from other sources.

**Thracian Tomb of Kazanlak, Madara Rider, Boyana Church, Rock-hewn Churches of Ivanovo, Rila Monastery, Ancient City of Nessebar, Thracian Tomb of Sveshtari (Bulgaria) (US\$ 39,000 requested)**

The Committee approved this request for an amount of **US\$ 30,000**. The Secretariat was requested to contact the State Party to reexamine the list of equipment in the light of the approved amount.

**Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (US\$ 50,000 requested)**

Although the restoration of an isolated monument may not be considered as a priority when taking account of other needs

expressed this year, the Committee recognized the high quality of restoration work already carried out during the first stage of the project serving as an example and inspiration for other ongoing restoration activities at this site, and therefore approved **US\$30,000** for this activity which perfectly illustrates UNESCO's mission in mobilising national and international, public and private funds for the safeguarding of heritage.

**Timbuktu (Mali) (List of World Heritage in Danger)** (US\$ 41,850 requested)

Given the commitment of the Mali authorities, the quality of the ICCROM/CRATere partnership and the innovative character of the project which had received the recommendation of the Committee at its eighteenth session, the Committee approved an amount of **US\$ 40,000** for this project.

**Historical Centre of Mompox (Colombia)** (US\$ 30,000 requested)

The Committee approved the requested amount of **US\$ 30,000** for a study on the impact of tourism on this site on the understanding that this would be contracted on the basis of a tender.

#### **B.1.2 Training**

**Inter-regional Postgraduate Course in the Conservation of Monuments and the Rehabilitation of Historical Cities (CECRE) (Salvador de Bahia, Brazil, March-December 1996): Request for international professors submitted by Brazil** (US\$ 45,000 requested)

The Committee approved an amount of **US\$ 30,000** for six international professors.

**Inter-regional Postgraduate Course in the Conservation of Monuments and the Rehabilitation of Historical Cities (CECRE) (Salvador de Bahia, Brazil, March-December 1996): Request for fellowships for ten international students submitted by Brazil** (US\$ 70,000 requested)

The Committee approved an amount of **US\$ 35,000** for international fellowships.

**James Island and Albreda, Juffure, San Domingo: Prehistoric Stone Circle [sites inscribed on the Tentative List] (The Gambia)** (US\$ 98,000 requested)

Pending the formal inscription, the Committee approved **US\$ 10,000**. ICCROM was requested to be associated with the implementation of this project to reevaluate the training needs, both in situ and abroad.

**Central America: Training Seminar for Site Managers of Archaeological World Heritage Sites in Central America (Tegucigalpa/Copan, Honduras, 1996) (request submitted by Honduras) (US\$ 35,000 requested)**

The Committee approved an amount of **US\$ 35,000** for this training workshop/seminar.

#### **C. OTHER REQUESTS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE**

While noting that the authority for approving international assistance requests under US\$ 30,000 is delegated to the Bureau and those under US\$ 20,000 to the Chairperson, the Committee also approved the following training requests discussed during the session:

##### **C.1 Training (Cultural Heritage)**

**Master Programme in Heritage Conservation (Request submitted by Argentina) (US\$ 20,000)**

The Committee approved the requested amount of **US\$ 20,000** to finance the participation of six international experts in a series of six workshops to be organized in 1996 by the International Centre for Heritage Conservation in several locations in Argentina.

##### **C.2 Training (general)**

The Committee accepted the Secretariat's proposal to include the amount of US\$ 20,000 to finalize the training strategy for cultural heritage in close cooperation with ICCROM to be presented to the Committee at its 20th session. A sum of US\$ 50,000 was also approved for the production of a video film on the World Heritage Convention for training purposes.

#### **XIV. PROMOTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES**

**XIV.1** Introducing this item, the Secretariat recalled Chapter VI (Educational Programmes) of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the goal of which is to alert and educate the public in favour of the preservation of World Heritage

properties. The work of the Centre is organized around three major axes: (i) World Heritage information networks; (ii) production of promotional material, and (iii) the use of national education systems and other networks of young people in favour of World Heritage goals. As this was explained in more detail in the working documents received by the delegates, notably the WHC-95/CONF.203/11 and the WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.10, limiting itself to underlining only some of the salient points.

**XIV.2**As regards the first axis, the Secretariat drew the Committee's attention to the report of the first meeting of experts on a World Heritage Information Network (Document WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.10), which was organized by the Centre in September 1995 in cooperation with other units of the UNESCO Secretariat, the advisory bodies and several other international organizations. In this regard, the Committee was informed that by now all the basic World Heritage documents have been made available on INTERNET and the World Wide Web. Furthermore, the Centre plans to produce in 1996 in cooperation with the advisory bodies a "starter kit", addressed to site managers and national focal points for World Heritage, in order to help them connect to the system. The Committee's attention was drawn to paragraphs 20 and 21 of WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.10 in which a number of important issues have been raised by the Group of Experts, notably questions regarding confidentiality, copyright and decentralization of information. These issues continue to be discussed by the Group through electronic means, and a set of proposals is expected to be addressed to the Bureau of the Committee for its next meeting (Summer 1996).

**XIV.3**The production of World Heritage promotion material covers a wide range: it includes the production of photo exhibits, two of them within the framework of UNESCO's 50th anniversary; a CD-ROM to be launched in January 1996; contributions on World Heritage in a number of popular journals and on TV programmes (Jeune Afrique, Paris-Match, CNN World Report, ZDF, etc.); calendars with a large distribution (National Panasonic, Rhône-Poulenc, UNESCO ASP Calendar, UNESCO's World Heritage Diary); publications such as the two encyclopedias (Spain and Germany); cooperation with Patrimonio 2001. While the past year was rather fruitful in these regards, there is urgent need to improve the situation regarding the sign-plates (plaques) at World Heritage sites. These, the Secretariat reminded, are the responsibility of each State Party. While at some sites the local/national authorities have put up excellent signs, there are still many sites that have none. The Secretariat hopes to redress this situation in 1996 and would welcome suggestions on that account from the Committee. Likewise, the Committee was requested to give the Secretariat their comments in the next few weeks on the draft text of the basic, easily adjustable World Heritage Information Kit,

prepared by the Centre and UNESCO's Office of Public Information and distributed at this session.

**XIV.4** Finally, regarding the third axis (World Heritage education) the Secretariat drew the Committee's attention to the detailed report on UNESCO's First World Heritage Youth Forum (presented as Annex I of WHC-95/CONF.203/11) which took place in Bergen, Norway, in June 1995. The success of this project, which was undertaken jointly with the Education Sector, the Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO, the City of Bergen, the Organization of World Heritage Cities and the Rhône-Poulenc Foundation, along with a number of other partners, has prompted several other initiatives, which have been approved by the General Conference of UNESCO at its 28th session. Namely, the production of a World Heritage Teaching Kit for secondary-school teachers, to be done in cooperation with ICCROM, ICOMOS and the IUCN, and the organization of regional meetings for students, teachers, conservation specialists and policy-makers ("mini-Bergens") to be held in Europe, Latin America, Africa, Asia and the Arab States in the next two-three years.

**XIV.5** The Committee was informed by the Director of the Division for Physical Heritage, Culture Sector, on the progress of the preparation of an exhibit "From Abu Simbel to Angkor", which was planned as part of the 50th anniversary events, and for which the Committee had approved US\$ 45,000 at its eighteenth session.

**XIV.6** In the ensuing debate, the Delegate of Niger, having congratulated the Centre on its work, wished to know what benefits the Centre received when, as in the case of the National Panasonic calendar, a private firm is allowed to use the World Heritage logo. The Director of the World Heritage Centre responded that all such income is clearly marked in the budget document. He invited Niger to participate in the promotional and communication activities of the Centre regarding African countries given his competence. The Delegate of Brazil, "having congratulated the Centre for developing World Heritage education, expressed the belief that the logo could be used for didactic purposes by teachers in classrooms and therefore proposed that their point of view be debated in the teachers' meetings mentioned in paragraph XIV.4 above." The Brazilian Delegation also suggested that an article by the author of the logo, Mr Michel Olyff, or an interview with him, be published in one of the issues of the World Heritage Newsletter.

**XIV.7** The Delegate of France stressed the importance of the cooperation established in the past year between the Centre, the Education Sector and the Social Sciences Sector. He wished, however, that such relations be

strengthened also with the other Sectors. Underlining his Delegation's satisfaction with the World Heritage Newsletter, which is appreciated by a large number of readers, including site managers, he expressed his wish that the Newsletter continues in the future. As for the World Heritage Information Network, he expressed his concern that "this may lead to a two-speed (à deux vitesses) World Heritage information service, and marginalize the technologically less advanced countries. He also expressed his concern regarding a possible rigidity in the way WHIN is applied, as could be seen in the case of the proposed form for monitoring. In that case, he advised, one should strive for the provision of minimum rather than maximum information; all research should be on an experimental and non-prescriptive basis."

**XIV.8** The Delegate of Germany addressed the question of site inscription plates, mentioned in the introductory statement. These are necessary and, indeed, the responsibility of local authorities. However, as they are quite expensive, it is not surprising that many sites do not have one. He therefore endorsed the Secretariat's view that something should be done to encourage States Parties to put up inscription plates. On another subject, he asked the Centre to be more careful when dealing with publishers in order to avoid the use of wrong photos.

**XIV.9** The Delegate of China, having thanked the Secretariat for the detailed report, and having expressed full support for the Centre's orientation in this area, proposed that the report include also an information on the current project of the Chinese television PTV, which received support from the World Heritage Fund. Finally, he congratulated the Centre on the success of the first World Heritage Youth Forum, held in Bergen in 1995.

**XIV.10** Referring to the comment made by France regarding WHIN, the Delegate of the Philippines emphasized the importance of reading and books as tools for education. Expressing her wariness regarding the use of the electronic media in education, she concluded that it was not an "either-or" situation, but rather a need to use both possibilities.

**XIV.11** The Delegate of Malta, having endorsed the statements by the Delegates of France and the Philippines respectively, stated that the WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.10 document was a good step towards greater visibility of World Heritage. She furthermore expressed her satisfaction with the draft text to be used in the basic Information Kit. Having expressed her regret that the World Heritage logo was missing as background decoration at this session, she suggested that this be done for future sessions. Finally, she questioned whether UNESCO had the copyright

for the World Heritage logo and whether the drawing of the "Patrimonito"-logo, made by students at the Bergen Forum, was legal.

**XIV.12** The Delegate of Lebanon, having pointed out that the name of the site in Lebanon, which figures in the ASP World Heritage calendar for 1996, was wrong and required correction, nonetheless expressed his satisfaction that two Lebanese students participated at the Bergen Forum. In conclusion, he expressed concern regarding the "promotional flagship projects" mentioned in document WHC-95/CONF.203/11. Such concern was expressed also by the Delegate of Benin, who asked the Secretariat for clarification.

**XIV.13** Having heard all the comments, including that of the Delegate of Italy who suggested that a review be made first in the States Parties of the activities that already exist for young people regarding World Heritage, the Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for its thorough presentation and asked it to take into account all the comments and suggestions made during the discussion of this item.

**XV. EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND, AND APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET FOR 1996 AND PRESENTATION OF A PROVISIONAL BUDGET FOR 1997**

**XV.1** The Committee approved the report of the Working Group on the World Heritage Fund, and after considerable discussion the 1996 budget was established at US\$ 3,000,000. Suggested revisions to the budget format and financial statement were noted and the Centre was requested to continue its efforts to develop more transparency in the presentations. The Committee decided to replenish the Emergency Reserve Fund to US\$ 500,000 at 1 January 1996 and 1 January 1997. The Committee, at its closing session, took note of an indicative budget for Chapters II to V for 1997 amounting to US\$2,520,000.

**XV.2** On more specific items, the Committee decided the following:

a) The Committee agreed, that depending upon the balance remaining in the Emergency Reserve Fund at the end of the fiscal year, the amount required to replenish this Fund to US\$ 500,000 at the beginning of the year be transferred from the Operating Reserve. Upon evaluating the actual emergency actions in 1996, the Committee noted that this ceiling of the Emergency Reserve for 1997 would be increased if needed.

b) For **Chapter I** of the budget, "**Overall functioning of**

**the World Heritage Convention"**, the Committee agreed to increase the appropriation for attendance of experts of developing countries to the statutory meetings to US\$ 80,000 to ensure the participation of two experts (one cultural and one natural) from States Parties requiring financial support and that in the future, this appropriation will be fixed on the basis of actual costs depending on the composition of the Committee and the Bureau, and the lieu of the statutory meetings.

c) "The Committee reiterated that the resources of the World Heritage Fund should be used solely for the purposes for which they were intended, such as international assistance, and not for financial support for personnel or functioning of the Secretariat. Nevertheless, it did approve an amount of US\$ 360,000 as an exceptional measure, to cover the costs of seven full-time secretarial posts and the remaining balance could partially finance a documentalist. Concerning the Secretariat's request for the continued funding of the P-5 post for a natural heritage specialist, the Committee refused to meet this request. Recalling that it was the responsibility of UNESCO to provide the personnel of the Secretariat in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention, the Committee requested the Chairperson to take this matter up with the Director-General of UNESCO on their behalf. The Committee stressed that the staff of the Centre are to enjoy the same status as any other member of the UNESCO Secretariat. It was noted, furthermore, that the resources of the World Heritage Fund should be used for the stated purposes, such as for international assistance and not to finance the administrative support cost of the Secretariat.

d) The Director of the Centre pledged to scrupulously respect the directives of the Committee to use these funds for seven temporary General Service posts in accordance with the terms of the UNESCO Staff Rules and Regulations and that he would provide a detailed report on the real costs and the actual use of these funds. One delegate requested that the Director also report on the standards or ratios of secretaries to professional officers practiced at UNESCO.

e) The budgetary appropriation under **Chapter II, "Establishment of the World Heritage List"** was approved as proposed, up to US\$ 592,000.

f) For **Chapter III**, the Committee noted that the **International Assistance** budget should continue to respect the decision taken at its session in Phuket with regard to the approval of requests, that is, to allocate at least one-third for natural heritage (US\$ 228,333) and two-thirds for cultural heritage (US\$ 456,667) for technical

cooperation; and equal division between the two types of properties for training, up to US\$ 550,000.

g) Following the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Monitoring, the Committee agreed to a new title for systematic monitoring under **Chapter IV** of the budget proposal, "**Support to States Parties for Monitoring and Reporting**". In order to reflect the decisions on this matter in the budgetary appropriations, the proposed Meeting of Experts on Monitoring and the activity on Methodological Development were not approved. However, to provide support to States Parties wishing to carry out the monitoring and reporting activities on voluntary basis, the Committee approved the budget for the proposed regional activities. Consequently, the budget was decreased to US\$ 260,000.

h) In the debate on **Chapter V** on Budget, the Delegate of Lebanon proposed the creation, under "**Promotion and Education**", which would be increased by US\$ 20,000, a budget sub-line for the extension to Africa and the Arab States of the Niger expertise in electronic communication, in order to create an electronic network of World Heritage sites and focal points in these two regions. The Committee decided therefore that out of the total of US\$ 298,000, US\$ 50,000 should be attributed to this project.

i) Noting the relative failure in fund-raising efforts, which resulted in the collection of very limited funds, the Committee stressed the need for the Director of the Centre to concentrate efforts to obtain the payment of the considerable arrears in States Parties' contributions and to report on the results to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee.

j) After considerable discussion with respect to the necessary coordination between the use of the World Heritage Fund and the budget of the UNESCO Regular Programme, it was agreed that the Centre would provide information to the Bureau at its next session on World Heritage activities undertaken by other sectors and units of UNESCO which are financed under the Regular Programme budget and by extrabudgetary contributions and that information be provided on the use of the Regular Programme.

k) The Committee congratulated Norway for its financial and moral commitment to world heritage. Some members of the Committee expressed strong concern about the creation of a network of World Heritage offices and invited the Director of the Centre to provide information on the creation of this type of office in Norway. The Chairperson, with the agreement of the Committee, invited the Observer of Norway to provide clarifications.

The Observer stated that the Office was established as a three-year pilot project on the basis of an agreement between the Government of the Kingdom of Norway and the Director-General of UNESCO. This office will be funded primarily by Norway with the support of other Nordic countries. The modest contribution from the UNESCO Regular Programme is to be used for joint operational projects to be undertaken by this Office and the World Heritage Centre. It was further noted that the Office was staffed by three Norwegian Public Service officers. Finally it was stated that the project would be re-evaluated in two-and-a-half years.

At the conclusion of the discussions a copy of the agreement was made available to the members of the Committee; but they did not have the opportunity to express their views on this text. The Director of the World Heritage Centre agreed to prepare a report for the next session of the Bureau on the subject of decentralization as it relates to World Heritage.

SYNOPTIC OVERVIEW OF THE BUDGET

	Approved 1994	Approved 1995	Approved 1996	Indicative 1997
<b>Chapter I.</b>				
<b>Overall functioning of the World Heritage Convention</b>				
- Attendance of experts in statutory World Heritage meetings	40,000	40,000	80,000	
- Support to World Heritage Secretariat	280,000	360,000	360,000	
<b>Chapter II.</b>				
<b>Establishment of the World Heritage List</b>				
- Global strategy	40,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
- Advisory services	520,000 <sup>1</sup>	522,000 <sup>2</sup>	522,000	522,000
<b>Chapter III.</b>				
<b>Technical implementation of the World Heritage Convention</b>				
- Preparatory assistance	150,000	150,000	175,000	160,000
- Technical cooperation	790,000	750,000	685,000	705,000
- Training	440,000	452,000	550,000	540,000

---

1. US\$ 20,000 shifted from Chapter IV (Monitoring) to Chapter II (Advisory services)

2. US\$ 22,000 shifted from Chapter V (Basic support for Information System) to Chapter II (Advisory services)

	Approved 1994	Approved 1995	Approved 1996	Indicative 1997
<b>Chapter IV.</b>				
<b>Monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites</b>				
- Reactive monitoring	85,000	68,000	60,000	60,000
- Support to States Parties for monitoring and reporting				
* Methodological development	80,000	50,000	--	
* Latin America & the Caribbean	65,000	50,000	40,000	35,000
* Africa	55,000	50,000	50,000	45,000
* Arab States & the Mediterranean	40,000	30,000	38,000	33,000
* Asia	55,000	60,000	42,000	57,000
* Europe	--	--	30,000	30,000
Total (Monitoring)	380,000 <sup>1</sup>	308,000	260,000	290,000
<b>Chapter V.</b>				
<b>World Heritage Clearing House, promotion and awareness building</b>				
Promotion and Education	270,000	268,000	298,000	263,000
Basic support for information system		15,000 <sup>2</sup>		
<b>TOTAL ANNUAL BUDGET WORLD HERITAGE FUND</b>	<b>2,910,000</b>	<b>2,935,000</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	
<b>Chapter VI.</b>				
<b>Emergency Reserve Fund</b>	1,000,000		(replenishment to US\$ 500,000) on 1/01/96 and 1/01/97	

**XVI. IMPROVEMENT OF THE WORKING METHODS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**XVI.1** The Chairperson introduced this item of the agenda on the basis of a discussion document prepared, upon his initiative, by three members of the Bureau, namely, the Delegates of Australia, Japan and Lebanon.

**XVI.2** Having underlined the necessity to modify the existing working methods of the Committee in light of the ever increasing number of States Parties to the Convention and the number of the inscribed World Heritage sites, the Delegate of Germany stated that the proposals in the discussion paper were a substantial contribution in that direction.

**XVI.3** In the ensuing debate in which the Delegates of France, Italy, Australia, Niger, Brazil and Malta took part, it became evident that the positions were too diverse to lead to a consensus. The Chairperson therefore decided to entrust the preparation of a second draft of the proposal to an ad hoc group made up of the Delegates of Australia, Japan, Lebanon, France, Germany, Malta and Niger.

**XVI.4** The second draft was examined by the Committee a day later. The Delegate of Germany proposed a modification of the text from paragraph 5 onwards, so that it reads as a decision by the Committee. The Delegate of Benin supported the proposed text as amended by Germany.

**XVI.5** Having reiterated that the proposed modifications of the Committee's working methods was to be considered only as a first step in the process, the Chairperson thereupon declared the consensus text adopted as amended by Germany.

**XVI.6** The adopted text reads as follows:

***"Working methods of the World Heritage Committee***

*1. Following discussions at its meeting in July 1995 the Bureau agreed that the matter of improving the working methods of the Committee should be considered by the Committee at its nineteenth session. The growing number of items on the agenda was considered to require a more rational use of the time available to the Committee.*

*2. It is recognised that any change to the working methods of the Committee are likely to also impact on the operations of the Bureau, the World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies. However, it is also recognised that the Committee is the primary decision-making body; the role of the Bureau is to coordinate the work of the Committee (to*

prepare the ground). In order to improve and streamline the implementation of the Convention, it is necessary that the Committee decides first how it wishes to discharge its responsibilities.

3. It is becoming increasingly difficult for the Committee, in the limited time available at its annual meeting, to conscientiously discharge its responsibilities to :

(i) examine and evaluate nominations to the World Heritage List;

(ii) decide on an appropriate response to the increasing number of state of conservation reports;

(iii) discuss and determine the budgetary allocations for the coming year; and

(iv) refine and further develop procedures for the efficient implementation of the Convention.

4. Whatever mechanism the Committee chooses to adopt to improve its working methods it should take into account the need for :

(i) transparency of process, such that States Parties and interested organizations are afforded every opportunity to observe and participate in the debate;

(ii) the Committee to be seen to take seriously its responsibilities for inscription of properties and consideration of reports on their state of conservation;

(iii) the time between submission of a nomination and a decision by the Committee not to be unnecessarily prolonged.

5. The Committee therefore decided that the following measures be applied at future meetings:

(i) "the working documents concerning the agenda items must be rapidly prepared and distributed. They must be concise, complete and readily understandable.

(ii) "in order to keep to the timetable, notably the dates set for debates, speakers must be concise in their presentations, not reading lengthy recommendations which members of the Committee have before them in their documents. They should make use of good quality visual aids such as slides and overhead transparencies.

(iii) *Delegations with minor corrections to the text of resolutions should submit these in writing to the Rapporteur, rather than making interventions during the debate."*

6. *The aspect of the Committee's work which is expanding most rapidly and can be expected to continue to increase is the consideration of state of conservation reports. One approach to streamlining how these reports are dealt with could be for the Committee to consider only those reports which deal with properties on the World Heritage List in Danger or proposed to be added to that List, with written reports on other sites being provided for the Committee for noting.*

7. *During the discussion of the budget at the current meeting it has been suggested that the decision-making process would be improved if the Committee was presented with well documented and clearly argued proposals for its consideration."*

## **XVII. REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

**XVII.1** The Secretariat introduced the Working Document and recalled that the Committee at its eighteenth session decided that the following specific revisions of the Operational Guidelines should be examined by the Bureau at its nineteenth session.

### **A. Chapter I, Section C of the Operational Guidelines: CRITERIA FOR THE INCLUSION OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES IN THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (DEFINITION OF AND CRITERIA FOR CULTURAL PROPERTIES)**

Based upon the results of four regional and thematic expert meetings that were held in 1994 and 1995 on 'Heritage Canals' (Canada, 15-19 September 1994), 'Routes as a Part of our Cultural Heritage' (Spain, 24-25 November 1994), 'Asian Rice Culture and its Terraced Landscapes' (Philippines, 28 March to 4 April 1995) and 'Identifying and Assessing World Heritage Cultural Landscapes (Associative Landscapes)' (Australia, 26 to 28 April 1995), the Bureau recommended the Committee to introduce revisions on the following items:

#### **A.1. The role of the local people in the nomination process (paragraph 14)**

Following the recommendation of the Bureau, the Committee adopted the following revised text to replace the existing paragraph 14:

*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 Committee endorsed the recommendations made by the Bureau and revised paragraph 24.(a) as follows:

**24.** (a) (i) (unchanged)

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

(iii) (unchanged)

*(iv) 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).

In view of the extreme importance of the criteria for inscription, several of the delegates requested the Secretariat to ensure the concordance of the above text in the French and the English versions of the Operational Guidelines.

In addition, it was recalled that at 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. The Delegate of France also proposed to add the notion of contractual protection and management. Consequently, the Committee decided to revise the text as follows:

**24.** (b) *(ii) have adequate legal and/or contractual 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 contractual or traditional protection as well as of adequate management and/or planning control 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 contractual and/or 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**

The expert meetings on canals and heritage routes had proposed definitions of these types of linear cultural properties. The Bureau recommended the Committee to make a reference to these two types of cultural properties in paragraph 40 of the Operational Guidelines and that a glossary of terms be prepared as an annex to the Operational Guidelines. The following definitions would then be included in the 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'.*

During the Committee's debate on the nature and contents of a glossary of terms, the Delegate of Canada stressed that the Operational Guidelines should provide a framework to the States Parties on the different types of properties that can be nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Delegate of France underlined that such definitions evolve and that, in order to avoid continuous revisions of the Guidelines, a glossary should

be kept apart from the Guidelines themselves. The Delegate of Italy pointed out that, in any case, the preparation of a glossary of terms could be very difficult and supported, therefore, the opinion expressed by the Delegate of France.

Concluding the debate, the Committee decided to request the Secretariat to initiate the preparation of a glossary of terms independantly from the Operational Guidelines.

**B. Chapter I, Section F: GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS (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 paragraph 59 so as to fully describe the evaluation process for both the natural and the cultural properties. Following an intervention by the Delegate of Cyprus, the Committee expressed its full confidence in the work of the advisory bodies and decided not to describe in detail the internal review procedures of the advisory bodies. The Committee decided to delete paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Operational Guidelines and to introduce the following before paragraph 59:

*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).*

*ICOMOS and IUCN present evaluation reports to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.*

*ICOMOS and IUCN, taking into account the decisions of the Bureau and additional information that might have been received from the nominating State Party, present 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.*

**C. Chapter IV, Section A: DIFFERENT FORMS OF ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE UNDER THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND (DEADLINES FOR PRESENTATION OF REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BUREAU AND THE COMMITTEE)**

The Secretariat 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 to enable it to prepare the necessary documents well in advance of the sessions of the Bureau and the Committee, the Committee decided to introduce strict deadlines for the submission of all requests for international 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 Committee decided 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.*

**D. Chapter I, Section G: FORMAT AND CONTENTS OF NOMINATIONS**

In view of the Committee's decision to defer the examination of the new nomination form to its twentieth session, the Committee equally decided to defer the revision of paragraph 65 of the Operational Guidelines ('Format and Content of Nominations').

**XVIII. DATE AND PLACE OF THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**XVIII.1** The Committee decided that the twentieth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee would be held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 24 to 29 June 1996, pending confirmation of the availability of UNESCO conference facilities for those dates.

**XVIII.2** The Provisional Agenda for the twentieth session of the Bureau as outlined in Document WHC-95/CONF.203.15Rev. was adopted without amendment and is attached as **Annex IV**.

**XIX. DATE AND PLACE OF THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (DECEMBER 1996)**

**XIX.1** The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that the Governments of Italy and Mexico have both officially expressed their readiness to host the Committee in 1996, while the Government of Finland would like to host such a meeting in 1998.

**XIX.2** The Delegate of Italy thereupon reiterated his Government's invitation to the Committee, indicating however that should the Committee hold its next meeting in Mexico, the 1997 session could possibly be held in Naples. The Delegate of Italy will inform the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible of the agreement of the Government of Italy.

**XIX.3** The Delegate of Mexico likewise reiterated his Government's invitation to host the twentieth session of the Committee. Thereupon, the Committee decided that its next session will take place from **2 to 7 December 1996**, and will be held, in principle, in Cancun, Quintana Roo, which is close to Sian Ka'an, a natural, and Chichen Itza, a cultural site, both inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegate of Mexico will confirm the venue of the meeting before mid-February 1996.

**XIX.4** The Delegate of Niger informed the Committee that his country would like to host the Committee in 1998.

**XX. OTHER BUSINESS**

**XX.1** Upon the request of the Delegate of Italy, the Committee decided to include in the provisional agenda of the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee an item on how to assure, after each General Assembly of the States Parties, the concordance of the outgoing Bureau and the newly elected Committee.

**XXI. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE AND CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

**XXI.1** Before proceeding to the examination and adoption of the draft report, the Chairperson, with the approval of the Committee, invited the Observer of Afghanistan to take the floor. In thanking the Committee for the emergency assistance granted by the Chairperson for the Minaret of Jam, he referred to the cultural properties of Afghanistan on the tentative list which continue to be threatened by war and illicit traffic. On behalf of his Government, he expressed his hope that these sites could one day be inscribed on the World Heritage List and appealed for international protection for their safeguarding.

**XXI.2** Thereupon, the Chairperson gave the floor to the Observer of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mr Muhamed Hamidovic, Director of the Institute for Protection of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, who informed the Committee that more than 2,500 cultural and historical monuments of his country have been recently destroyed by war. This, he said, has endangered a cultural identity that is more than one thousand years old. Having stressed that the heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina was inadequately treated in former Yugoslavia, he informed the Committee of the documentary preparations undertaken by his country's authorities in order to propose several properties for possible inscription on the World Heritage List. This would include: Old Sarajevo, the Historical Centre of Mostar and three natural sites. The first two nomination files are being prepared with the help of the UNESCO Office in Sarajevo. He concluded his statement by expressing his country's disappointment that the World Heritage Committee has so far done so little to help preserve the monuments and the culture of his country.

**XXI.3** Following a four-hour examination of the draft report, the Committee adopted it with the amendments noted during the debate. In order to provide as faithful an account as possible, all of the amendments that were received in writing have been included as quotes in the final version.

**XXI.4** The Rapporteur of the Committee expressed, in the name of the States Parties members of the World Heritage Committee, the States Parties having attended the nineteenth session of the Committee as Observers, and the representatives of the advisory bodies his thanks to the Government of Germany for its generous hospitality and the excellent arrangements which allowed the Committee to accomplish its work in a most satisfactory way.

**XXI.5** Before adjourning the meeting, the Chairperson thanked warmly all of the delegates and observers for their

valuable contributions to the debates. Particular thanks were addressed to the members of the Bureau and, above all, the Rapporteur. Finally, the Chairperson also thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mr Bernd von Droste, and the interpreters.

**ANNEX I/ANNEXE I**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

**I. STATES MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE/ETATS MEMBRES DU COMITE**

**AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE**

The Hon. Barry JONES  
Member of Parliament  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA, ACT 260

Dr David KAY  
Assistant Secretary  
World Heritage and Biodiversity Branch  
Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories  
GPO Box 787  
CANBERRA City 2601

Ms Joan DOMICELJ  
Vice-President, ICOMOS  
101/102 Alfred Street  
Milsons Point 2061  
SYDNEY

**BENIN**

M. Isidore MONSI  
Conseiller  
Délégation du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO  
PARIS

**BRAZIL/BRESIL**

M. Glauco CAMPELLO  
Président du Patrimoine historique et artistique national (IPHAN)  
Rua da Imprensa, 16  
RIO DE JANEIRO

Mme Maria Dolores PENNA DE ALMEIDA CUNHA  
Deuxième Secrétaire d'Ambassade  
Ministère des Relations extérieures  
Esplanada dos Ministérios Palácio do Itamaraty  
BRASILIA

**CANADA**

Ms Christina CAMERON  
Director General  
National Historic Sites, Parks Canada  
Department of Canadian Heritage  
25 Eddy Street  
HULL, Quebec K1A 0M5

M. Murray McCOMB  
Chief of Strategic Studies  
National Parks Directorate  
Parks Canada  
Department of Canadian Heritage  
25 Eddy Street  
HULL, Quebec K1A 0M5

Mme Gisèle CANTIN  
Chef des Affaires internationales  
Parcs Canada, Ministère du patrimoine canadien  
25, rue Eddy  
HULL, Québec K1A 0M5

Mme Gisèle TRUBEY  
Chargée de programme, Culture, Communication et information  
Commission canadienne pour l'UNESCO  
C.P. 1047  
OTTAWA,  
Ontario K1P 5V8

**CHINA/CHINE**

Mr CHENG Xiaolin  
Director  
Division of General Policy, Culture & Communication  
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO  
37 Damucang Hutong Xidan  
BEIJING 100816

Mr ZHAO Jianrong  
Deputy Director  
Division of Landscape Architecture  
Ministry of Construction  
BEIJING

Mr GUO Zhan  
Director of Cultural Relics, First Section  
The State Bureau of Cultural Property  
29, Wusi Street  
BEIJING 100009

**CUBA**

Dr Marta ARJONA  
Présidente  
Conseil du patrimoine culturel  
Calle 4 y 11, Vedado  
LA HABANA

**CYPRUS/CHYPRE**

Mr Christos CASSIMATIS  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Cyprus to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
PARIS

Dr Sophocles HADJISAVVAS  
Curator of Ancient Monuments  
Department of Antiquities  
Ministry of Communications and Works

**ECUADOR/EQUATEUR**

Dr Filoteo SAMANIEGO  
Director del Instituto Nacional del  
Patrimonio Cultural  
Calle Colon y 10 de Agosto (la Circasiana)  
QUITO

Ing. Luis CARRERA de la TORRE  
Presidente de la Comision Asesora Ambiental  
del Ecuador  
10, de Agosto y Canion  
QUITO

Lic. Diego MOREJON  
Consul General del Ecuador en Berlin  
Clara Zetkin Street, 89  
10117 BERLIN

**FRANCE**

Mme Françoise BERCE  
Inspecteur général du patrimoine  
Ministère de la Culture  
65, rue de Richelieu  
75001 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 à la Direction de la nature et des paysages  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
20, avenue de Ségur  
75007 PARIS

M. Léon PRESSOUYRE  
Vice-Président de l'Université de Paris I  
Vice-Président du Comité Culture de la Commission  
nationale française pour l'UNESCO  
17, rue de la Sorbonne  
75231 PARIS Cedex 05

#### **GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE**

Ambassador Dr Horst WINKELMANN  
Federal Foreign Office  
BONN

#### Deputy Delegates

Dr Hans CASPARY  
Office for the Conservation of Historic Monuments  
of the Land Rhineland-Palatinate  
Göttelmannstrasse, 17  
D-55130 MAINZ

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

Mr Heiner MODEL  
Counsellor  
Federal Foreign Office  
Postfach 1148  
D-53001 BONN

Mr Thilo KÖHLER  
Counsellor  
Federal Foreign Office  
Postfach 1148  
D-53001 BONN

#### Advisors

Professor Peter P. CANISIUS  
President of the German National Commission  
for UNESCO  
BONN

Mr Hartmut DORGERLOH  
Ministry of Science, Research & Culture  
of the Land Brandenburg  
POTSDAM

Dr Hans-Dieter DYROFF  
German National Commission for UNESCO  
BONN

Professor Hans-J. GIERSBERG  
Foundation for Castles and Gardens  
of Potsdam-Sanssouci  
POTSDAM

Professor Dr Detlef KARG  
Office for the Conservation of Historic Monuments  
of the Land Brandenburg  
BERLIN

Mr Klaus von KROSIGK  
Senate Administration for City Development  
and Environmental Protection  
BERLIN

Mr Dieter OFFENHÄUSSER  
German National Commission for UNESCO  
BONN

Professor Dr Michael PETZET  
President,  
German National Committee of ICOMOS  
MUNICH

#### Experts

Mr Reinhard DIETRICH  
Ministry for Science and Arts of the Land Hesse  
WIESBADEN

Dr Florian FIEDLER  
German National Committee of ICOMOS  
MUNICH

Ms GESCHWINDE  
German National Commission for UNESCO  
BONN

Mr Jörg MEYER-SCHOLTEN  
Messel GmbH  
WIESBADEN

Mrs Annegret PETSCHAT-MARTENS  
German National Commission for UNESCO  
BONN

Dr Stefan SCHAAL  
Senckenberg Research Institute  
FRANKFURT

Dr Traugott SCHÖFTHALER  
Secretary-General,  
German National Commission for UNESCO  
BONN

Mr Martin SCHWARZ  
Federal Foreign Office  
BONN

Dr (Mrs) Sabine SOLF  
German National Commission for UNESCO  
BONN

Mr Jörg-Ingo WEBER  
Senate Administration for Culture  
BERLIN

Mrs Sieglinde WEBER  
Protocol of the Berlin Senate  
BERLIN

Mr Niels GUTSCHOW  
Member of the German Delegation

Dr Hans LEISEN  
Professor, University  
KÖLN

Dr Jaroslav PONCAR  
Professor, University  
Alteburger Wall 31  
50678 KÖLN

Dr Helmut ENGEL  
Professor  
Landeskonservator  
Senate Administration for City Development  
and Environment Protection  
BERLIN

Ms Karin FRANK  
Assistant to the Chairperson  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
BONN

**ITALY/ITALIE**

S. Exc. M. Giancarlo LEO  
Ambassadeur  
Délégation permanente de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO  
PARIS

M. M. Francesco FRANCONI  
Professeur de droit International  
Université de Sienne

Mme Margherita SABATINI  
Attachée au Secteur UNESCO de la Direction générale  
des Relations culturelles  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Piazzale della Farnesina  
ROME

M. Pasquale Bruno MALARA  
Surintendant de l'Environnement et de l'Architecture  
TURIN

M. Luciano MARCHETTI  
Architecte-Directeur  
Surintendance de l'Environnement et de l'Architecture  
Piazza Pitti 1  
FLORENCE

Mme Roberta ALBEROTANZA  
Cabinet du Ministre des Biens culturels  
Service des Relations internationales  
27, via del Collegio Romano  
ROME

**JAPAN/JAPON**

Mr Akio KAWATO  
Deputy Director-General  
Cultural Affairs Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO

Mr Yasufumi SAKITANI  
Director-General  
Cultural Properties Protection Department  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100

Mr Kazunobu ASADA  
Deputy Director  
Monuments and Sites Division  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO

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

Dr Nobuko INABA  
Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties  
Architecture Division  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100

Ms Tokuko NABESHIMA  
Third Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
PARIS

Dr Hidetoshi SAITO  
Professor in Tokyo National University of Arts  
12-8 Ueno-Koen, Taito-ku  
TOKYO 100

Mr Masahiko YASUMURO  
Assistant Director, Management Planning Division  
National Forest Management Department  
Forestry Agency  
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100

Mr Tetsuro UESUGI  
Assistant Director, Planning Division  
Nature Conservation Bureau  
Environment Agency  
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100

#### **LEBANON/LIBAN**

M. Noël FATTAL  
Conseiller  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente du Liban auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO  
PARIS

**MALTA/MALTE**

Ms Tanya VELLA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Malta to UNESCO  
Ambassade de Malte  
Avenue des Champs Elysées  
75008 PARIS

**MEXICO/MEXIQUE**

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

**MOROCCO/MAROC**

M. Abdelaziz TOURI  
Directeur du patrimoine culturel  
17, rue Michlifen  
RABAT

**NIGER**

S. Exc. M. Lambert MESSAN  
Ambassadeur  
Délégation permanente du Niger auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO  
PARIS

M. Michel LE BERRE  
Conseiller  
Université Claude Bernard/IASBSE  
Socio-écologie et Conservation  
43, boulevard du 11 novembre 1918  
F-69622 VILLEURBANNE Cedex

**PHILIPPINES**

Ms Virginia MORENO  
Chairperson Culture Committee  
UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines  
1718 Vasquez, Malae  
MANILA

**SPAIN/ESPAGNE**

Mr D. Félix BENITO  
 Arquitecto del Instituto de  
 Conservacion y Restauración de Bienes Culturales  
 Ministerio de Cultura  
 C/Greco nº4  
 28040 MADRID

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

Mr John REYNOLDS  
 Deputy Director  
 National Park Service  
 Department of the Interior  
 P.O. Box 37127  
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20013

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

Mr E. Blaine CLIVER  
 Chief, Preservation Technology  
 National Park Service  
 P.O. Box 37127  
 WASHINGTON DC 20013-7127

Mr William McILHENNY  
 Permanent Observer  
 Permanent Mission to UNESCO  
 American Embassy in Paris  
 PARIS

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

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

Mr Jukka JOKILEHTO  
 Assistant to the Director General  
 Via di San Michele, 13  
 00153 ROME  
 Italy

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

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

Ms Carmen AÑON FELIU  
President of the Executive Committee  
Puerto Santamaria 49  
MADRID 28043  
Spain

Mr Henry CLEERE  
World Heritage Coordinator  
75, rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

Prof. Dr. Michael PETZET  
President ICOMOS-Germany  
80539 MUNCHEN

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

Mr Florian FIEDLER  
Deutsche National Committee  
GERMANY

Ms Irmela SPELSBERG  
ICOMOS/Germany  
14199 BERLIN

Prof. Hans Munk HANSEN  
Architect

Mr Peter STOTT  
ICOMOS-US  
23, Bellevue Street  
MEDFORD MA 02155  
USA

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

Dr James THORSELL  
Senior Advisor - Natural Heritage  
Rue Mauverney, 28  
CH-1196 GLAND  
Switzerland

Mr Adrian PHILLIPS  
 Chair, IUCN Commission on National Parks  
 and Protected Areas (CNPPA)  
 2 The Old Rectory  
 DUMBLETON  
 near Evesham  
 WR11 6TG  
 United Kingdom

Mr P.H.C. (Bing) LUCAS  
 Vice-Chair, World Heritage  
 IUCN Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas (CNPPA)  
 1/268 Main Road, Tawa,  
 WELLINGTON  
 New Zealand 6006

Mr James PAINE  
 Senior Research Officer  
 World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC)  
 219 Huntingdon Road  
 CAMBRIDGE CB22 3AL  
 United Kingdom

Mr Ole HAMANN  
 Member of IUCN Delegation in Denmark  
 Baunegårdsves 22  
 2820 GENTOFTE (Denmark)

### III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS

#### AFGHANISTAN

Mr Homayun PARVANTA  
 Lecturer  
 KABUL University

#### ALGERIA/ALGERIE

Mme Faouzia BOUMAIZA  
 Déléguée permanente adjointe  
 Délégation permanente de l'Algérie auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO  
 PARIS

Mme Houria BOUHIRED  
 Présidente,  
 Association "Sauvons la Casbah"  
 9, rue Buffon  
 St Raphaël El Biar  
 ALGER

M. Mohammed BENGHERABI  
Expert  
ALGER

**ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE**

M. Juan Carlos POLI  
Vice-Président de la Commission nationale des Monuments,  
des Musées et des Sites historiques  
Av. Callao 1405 (4°F)  
1024 BUENOS AIRES

Mme Maria Susana PATARO  
Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente de l'Argentine auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO, Paris

**AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE**

Mr Ernst BACHER  
General Conservator  
Bundesdenkmalamt  
Hofburg, Saülenstiege  
A-1010 WIEN

Mr Hans HORCICKA  
Director  
Minoritenplatz 5  
Federal Ministry for Education and Cultural Affairs  
A-1014 WIEN

**BAHRAIN/BAHREIN**

Mr Abdul Wahab ALKHAJA  
Curator of Popular Heritage  
Ministry of Information  
P.O. Box 2119  
BAHRAIN

**BELARUS**

Mr Vladimir SKVORTSOV  
Counsellor  
Fritz-Scheiffer Str. 20  
53113 BONN

**BOLIVIA/BOLIVIE**

Dr. Waldo ROSS  
Professor, Montreal University  
LA PAZ

**BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA/BOSNIE HERZEGOVINE**

Professor Mehmed HAMIDOVIC  
Director of the Federal and Republic Institute  
for the Protection of Cultural-Historical  
and Natural Properties of Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Akademija Nauka i Umjetnosti  
Bistrič 7  
71.000 SARAJEVO

**BULGARIA/BULGARIE**

Mr Gueorgui GUROV  
Ambassador  
Department of International Cultural Policy  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2, rue Al-Gendov  
SOFIA

**CAMBODIA/CAMBODGE**

Mr VANN MOLYVANN  
Minister of State in charge of Culture & Fine Arts  
Government of Cambodia

**CHILE/CHILI**

Mr Rodolfo BERLINGER LANDA  
Consul  
Consultat général du Chili à Berlin  
BERLIN

**COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE**

H.E. Mr Pablo Gabriel OBREGON  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
PARIS

Ms Isabel VERNAZA  
First Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
PARIS

**CROATIA/CROATIE**

Mr Vjekoslav VIERDA  
Director  
Institute for the Restoration of Dubrovnik  
C. Zuzoric 6  
20000 DUBROVNIK

**CZECH REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE**

Mr Michal BENES  
Secretary for Cultural Affairs of UNESCO  
Ministry of Culture  
110 00 PRAHA 1

**FINLAND/FINLANDE**

Ms Margaretha EHRSTROM  
Researcher  
National Board of Antiquities  
Department of Monuments and Sites  
P.O. Box 187  
00171 HELSINKI

Mr Jaakko ANTTI-POIKA  
Director  
The Governing Body of Suomenlinna  
00190 HELSINKI

Mr Eero NIINIKOSKI  
Chairman, Ticcih-Finland

**DENMARK/DANEMARK**

Professor Hans Munk HANSEN  
Architect  
Chairperson, National Committee of ICOMOS  
Kunstakademiets Arkitektskole  
Kongens Nytorv 1  
1050 COPENHAGEN

**GREECE/GRECE**

Mme Hélène METHODIOU  
Conseiller culturel  
Délégation permanente de la Grèce auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO  
PARIS

**HOLY SEE/SAINT-SIEGE**

H.E. Mr Ernesto GALLINA  
Archbishop, Apostolic Nuncio  
Delegate for International  
Governmental Organizations  
Vatican City  
ROME

Dr Christine GOETZ  
Archevêché de BERLIN

**HUNGARY/HONGRIE**

Mr Janos TARDY  
Secrétaire d'Etat adjoint  
Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement  
du Territoire  
BUDAPEST

Mr Janos JELEN  
Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Office of the State Secretary  
BUDAPEST

\* (Rapporteur of the 10th General Assembly)/(Rapporteur de la  
10ème Assemblée générale)

Mr Zoltan SZILASSY  
Sous-directeur  
Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement  
du Territoire  
H-1121 Költö u 21  
1121 BUDAPEST

Mme Kinga SZEKELY  
Chef de département  
Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement  
du Territoire  
H-1121 Költö u 21  
1121 BUDAPEST

Mr Gabor BAROSS  
Directeur  
Parc National d'Aggtelek

**INDIA/INDE**

H.E. Mrs Nina SIBAL  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
PARIS

**INDONESIA/INDONESIE**

Mr Kria Fahmi PASARIBU  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Indonesia to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
PARIS

**LITHUANIA/LITUANIE**

Mr Jonas GLEMZA  
Director of the Department of Cultural Heritage Protection  
& Secretary of the Ministry of Culture  
SNIPIISKIU 3, VILNIUS 2005

**MALAYSIA/MALAYSIE**

Mr Mohd. Ariff BIN YUSOF  
Head of Culture Division  
Ministry of Culture, Art and Tourism  
KUALA LUMPUR

**MONGOLIA/MONGOLIE**

Mr Dolgoryn SUKHBAATAR  
Head,  
Foreign Relations Department  
Ministry of Culture  
ULAN BATOR 11

**NEPAL**

Mr Shyamanand Das SUMAN  
Minister Counsellor  
Royal Nepalese Embassy  
45 bis, rue des Acacias  
75017 PARIS

**NORWAY/NORVEGE**

Prof. Dr. Oivind LUNDE  
Riksantikvar  
Directorate for Cultural Heritage  
Dronningens gt. 13  
Postboks 8196 Dep  
N-0034 OSLO

Ms Anne-Kristin ENDRESEN  
Deputy Director  
Ministry of Environment  
P.O. Box 8013 Dep.  
N-0030 OSLO

Mr Amund SINDING-LARSEN  
Senior Advisor, International Affairs  
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 VIKÅ  
N-0117 OSLO

#### **PAKISTAN**

Mr Arshad SAMI KHAN  
Secretary for Culture, Government of Pakistan  
ISLAMABAD

H.E. Khwaja Shahid HOSAIN  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegation of Pakistan to UNESCO  
UNESCO House  
PARIS

#### **PERU/PEROU**

José Antonio DOIG ALBERDI  
Consul général  
Consulat général du Pérou à Berlin  
Schadowstr. 6  
10117 BERLIN

#### **POLAND/POLOGNE**

Prof. Dr Andrzej TOMASZEWSKI  
Chief Conservator of Monuments of Poland  
Generalny Konserwator Zabytkow  
ul. Ksawerow, 13  
02-656 WARSAW

**PORTUGAL**

M. José Antonio Moya RIBERA  
 Ambassadeur  
 Délégation permanente du Portugal auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO  
 PARIS

M. Joao Estevao LOPES SERRADO  
 Secrétaire exécutif  
 Commission portugaise pour l'UNESCO  
 Avenida Infante Sante 42-5°  
 1350 LISBOA

M. Paulo PEREIRA  
 Vice-Présidente  
 Institut portugais du patrimoine archéologique  
 et architectural (IPPAR)  
 Ministère de la Culture  
 Palacio da Ajuda  
 ALA NORTE

Mr Edite ESTRELA  
 Mayor of Sintra

Mr Mario de FIGUEIREDO  
 Deputy Mayor of Sintra

Mr José Cardim RIBEIRO  
 Chief, Culture Division  
 Camara Municipal de Sintra  
 Largo Virgilio Horta  
 2710 SINTRA

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA/REPUBLIQUE DU COREE**

H.E. Mr Hyun-Gon KIM  
 Ambassador of the Republic of Korea to UNESCO  
 91, avenue Henri Martin  
 75016 PARIS

Mr Jin-Moo KIM  
 Director-General  
 Office of Cultural Properties  
 Ministry of Culture and Sports  
 Jung Gu Jung Dong  
 SEOUL

Mr Yong-Gi SHIN  
 Consul  
 Consultate General of the Republic of Korea in Berlin  
 BERLIN

Mr Woo Chang HAN  
Consul  
Consultate General of the Republic of Korea  
BERLIN

Mr Kwon HUH  
Director of Culture  
Korean National Commission for UNESCO  
SEOUL

Mr Jae-Soo KANG  
Assistant Director  
Tangible Cultural Properties Division  
Ministry of Culture and Sports  
SEOUL

Mr Won-Sik LEE  
Mayor of Kyong Ju  
KYONG JU City Hall

Mr Chang-Hwan KIM  
Assistant to the Mayor of Kyong Ju  
KYONG JU City Hall

Mr Chui-Ho MIN  
KYONG JU City Hall

#### **ROMANIA/ROUMANIE**

Mr Cristian MOISESCU  
Directeur général,  
Direction générale du patrimoine culturel  
Ministère de la culture

#### **RUSSIAN FEDERATION/FEDERATION DE RUSSIE**

Mr Ioulia SOUKHAREVA  
Premier Secrétaire du Ministère  
des Affaires étrangères  
Commission nationale de la Fédération de Russie  
pour l'UNESCO  
9, Vozdvijenka  
MOSCOU 121019

#### **SAUDI ARABIA/ARABIE SAOUDITE**

Mr Nasser AbdulKarim AL-ARIFI  
Archaeological Researcher  
Ministry of Education  
Department of Antiquities and Museums  
P.O. 22028  
RIYADH 11495

**SENEGAL**

M. Mbaye Bassine DIENG  
Directeur  
Patrimoine historique et ethnographique  
B.P. 4001  
DAKAR

**SLOVAK REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE**

Dr Jozef KLINDA  
Head of the Environmental Conception,  
Law and Organisation Division  
Ministry of the Environment  
BRATISLAVA

Mr Pavel TOMA  
Head of Environmental Planning and Conception Department  
Ministry of the Environment  
BRATISLAVA

Mr Peter KRAJCOVIC  
Expert, Ministry of Environment  
BRATISLAVA

Ms Viera DVORAKOVA  
Head of Division for Architecture & Urbanism  
Institute for Monuments  
BRATISLAVA

Mr Jozef HLAVAC  
Director  
Slovak Caves Management

Mr Pavel BELLA  
Slovak Caves Management

**SLOVENIA/SLOVENIE**

Mr Joze OSTERMAN  
State Secretary  
Ministry of Culture  
Cankarjeva 5  
61000 LJUBLJANA

**SRI LANKA**

Mr W. Ran Banda RAJAKARUNA  
Secretary  
Ministry of Cultural & Religious Affairs

**SWEDEN/SUEDE**

Ms Birgitta HOBERG  
International Officer  
Central Board of National Antiquities  
P.O. Box 5405  
S-11484 STOCKHOLM

Mr Lars-Erik ESPING  
Former Director  
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency  
S-10648 STOCKHOLM

Ms Marita JONSSON  
Director  
The County Administration  
Province of Gotland

Mr Per-Olof JACOBSSON  
Member of Planning and Heritage Committee  
GOTLAND

Ms Sonja LANDIN  
Vice Mayor  
Municipality of Gotland  
62181 VISBY

Mr Björn ERICSSON  
Chief, Executive Finance  
Municipality of Gotland  
62181 VISBY

**SWITZERLAND/SUISSE**

Dr. H. Aldo ANTONIETTI  
Vice-Directeur et Chef de la Division principale  
de la protection de la nature et du paysage  
Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et du paysage  
Département fédéral de l'intérieur  
3003 BERNE

Mme Hanna WIDRIG  
Conseillère d'Ambassade  
Chargée des Affaires culturelles  
Ambassade de Suisse - Bureau de Berlin  
Fürst Bismarckstrasse 4  
10557 BERLIN

**THAILAND/THAILANDE**

Dr Adul WICHENCHAROEN  
Chairman  
National Committee for Protection of the  
World Cultural & Natural Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy & Planning  
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment  
60/1 Phibulwattana 7, Rama VI Road  
BANGKOK 10400

Ms Srinoi POVATONG  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Thailand to UNESCO  
UNESCO House

Mr Weera SAKULTAB  
Director  
Public Education and Extension Division  
Department of Environmental Quality Promotion  
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment  
114 soi Tibordee, Pracharas II  
BANGKOK 10800

Mr Borvornvej RUNGRUJEE  
Director, Ayutthaya Historic City Project  
Office Ayutthaya Province  
Fine Arts Department  
Ministry of Education  
BANGKOK 10300

Mr Tawee NOOTONG  
Forest Technical Officer  
Royal Forest Department  
Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives  
Paholyothin Road  
BANGKOK 10900

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  
60/1 Phibulwattana 7, Rama VI Road  
BANGKOK 10400

**TURKEY/TURQUIE**

M. Ercan OZTEN  
Vice-Consul  
General Consultate of Turkey in Berlin  
Johann Georg Str. 12  
BERLIN

**URUGUAY**

Mr Antonio CRAVOTTO  
 Membre de la Commission du patrimoine historique,  
 artistique et culturel de la nation  
 Av. Sarmiento, 2360  
 11306 MONTEVIDEO

M. Carlos MOREIRA REISCH  
 Intendente  
 Rivera 213  
 COLONIA

**IV. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS/ORGANISATIONS NON-  
 GOUVERNEMENTALES**

**ARID CLIMATE, ADAPTION AND CULTURAL INNOVATION IN AFRICA (ACACIA)**

Mr Stefan KRÖPELIN  
 Expert on Saharan Protected Areas  
 Paleomonsoons Project Office  
 Podbielskiallee 62  
 D-14195 BERLIN

**COUNCIL OF EUROPE/CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

Mme Françoise BAUER  
 67000 STRASBOURG

**THE J. PAUL GETTY TRUST/FONDATION J. PAUL GETTY**

Ms Margaret MAC LEAN  
 The Getty Conservation Institute  
 Director, Documentation Program  
 4503 Glencoe Ave.  
 MARINA DEL REY, California  
 United States of America

Mr Timothy P. WHALEN  
 The Getty Grant Program  
 Senior Program Officer  
 401 Wilshire Boulevard,  
 Suite 1000  
 SANTA MONICA, California 90401-1455  
 United States of America

**INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS/FEDERATION  
INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHITECTES-PAYSAGISTES (IFLA)**

Mr Hans DORN  
First Vice-President  
4, rue Hardy - R.P. n° 914  
78009 VERSAILLES - CEDEX

Mr George ANAGNOSTOPOULOS  
President  
30 Rigilllis St.  
GR-10674 ATHENS

**ISLAMIC CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION/ORGANISATION DE LA CONFERENCE  
ISLAMIQUE (OIC)**

Mr Ahmed LAJIMI  
Research Centre for Islamic History, Art and Culture/  
Centre de Recherches sur l'Histoire, l'Art et la  
Culture Islamiques (IRCICA)  
ISTANBUL (Turkey)

**ISLAMIC EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION/  
ORGANISATION ISLAMIQUE POUR L'EDUCATION, LES SCIENCES ET LA  
CULTURE (ISESCO)**

Dr Omar EL KADY  
Department of Culture and Communication  
RABAT  
Maroc

**ORGANIZATION OF WORLD HERITAGE CITIES (OWHC)/ORGANISATION DES  
VILLES DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL (OVPM)**

M. Marcel JUNIUS  
Secrétaire général  
56, rue St. Pierre  
QUEBEC G1K 4A1  
Canada

Dr Céline SAUCIER  
Directrice des Projets spéciaux  
56, rue St. Pierre  
QUEBEC G1K 4A1  
Canada

**UNION INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHITECTES/ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES ARCHITECTES (UIA)**

M. Alberto GARCIA GIL  
 Coordinateur des GT régionaux de l'UIA  
 "Architecte et patrimoine"  
 c/o Section espagnole de l'UIA  
 Paseo de la Castellana, 12, 4°  
 28046 MADRID  
 Espagne

Mme Magdalena PEREZ-MINGUEZ GUTIERREZ-SOLANA  
 Paseo de la Castellana, 12, 4°  
 28046 MADRID  
 Espagne

**WORLD MONUMENTS FUND (WMF)**

Mr John STUBBS  
 Director of Programs  
 949 Park Avenue  
 NEW YORK  
 New York  
 N.Y. 10028  
 United States of America

**V. PRESS/PRESSE**

Ms Ana Maria SCHARFF  
*Diario Hoy (Bolivia)*  
 Kurfurstendamm 75  
 10709 BERLIN

Ms Marika VILLA  
*Estrische Medien*  
 BERLIN

Mr Jona AKAIKE  
*Mainichi Broadcasting System (Japan)*  
 Urbanstr. 50  
 BERLIN

Mr Jiro MINAMIKAWA  
*Mainichi Broadcasting System (Japan)*  
 BERLIN

Mr Itsuo KUMAKURA  
*Tokyo Jhimbun (Japan)*  
 53113 BONN

Mr Maik Hendrik SPOTTE  
*Tokyo Jhimbun (Japan)*  
53113 BONN

Mr Mohammed ASADULLAH  
*Asian Times (London)*  
Alexdanerstr. 4  
10179 BERLIN

M. Francisco ASSUNÇÃO  
Correspondant  
*Lusa News Agency (Portugal)*  
10365 BERLIN

M. Luis Filipo SEBASTIAO  
Journalist (Portugal)  
Rua Amilcar Cabral, 1  
LISBOA  
Portugal

Mr Johnny TARIGAN  
*Antara News Agency (Indonesia)*  
Hochstr. 15 A  
BERLIN

Mr Wolfgang KUMM  
Photograph  
10113 BERLIN

## **VI. SECRETARIAT**

Mr. Bernd von DROSTE  
Director  
World Heritage Centre

Mr Mounir BOUCHENAKI  
Director, Division of Cultural Heritage  
Culture Sector

Mr Richard A. ENGELHARDT  
Regional Advisor for Culture in Asia & Pacific  
920 Sukhumvit Road  
BANGKOK (Thailand)

Mr Daniel de SAN  
Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs/  
Office des Normes internationales et des Affaires juridiques  
UNESCO

Ms Breda PAVLIC  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Minja YANG  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mr Mark WARREN  
Accounts Division/Division de la comptabilité  
Bureau of the Comptroller/Bureau du Contrôleur financier

Mr Harold EIDSVIK  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mr Laurent LEVI-STRAUSS  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mr Herman van HOOFF  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Mechtild RÖSSLER  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Maria PERERS  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Jane DEGEORGES  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Jocelyne POUTEAU  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Marianne RAABE  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mr David MARTEL  
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

**Speech by  
Mr Helmut Schäfer,  
Minister of State,  
German Federal Foreign Office,  
at the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee  
Berlin, 4 December 1995**

**Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen,**

**I am both honoured and delighted to welcome you, on behalf of the Federal Government, here in the "House of the World's Cultures" in the nation's capital, Berlin.**

**The purpose of this house is to familiarize the general public with the cultural achievements of other nations. It has been recognized by UNESCO as Germany's contribution to the World Decade for Cultural Development. Part of that contribution is the house radio station named "SFB 4 - Multikulti", which transmits foreign-language programmes for Berlin's foreign community.**

**This building is closely associated with the city's post-war era. It is a gift to Berlin from the American people, who played a crucial part in ensuring the city's survival after the war and in safeguarding the freedom of what was then West Berlin. It was handed over to us on condition that we would use it as an international centre, and that we are doing.**

**Here we are right in the centre of Berlin, not far from the Reichstag and the Brandenburg Gate. Seven years ago the wall and barbed-wire still formed the barrier between two worlds. Nowhere else was the historical transformation, the ending of the Cold War and the division of Germany and Europe, as tangible and graphic as it was here.**

On Friday you will be visiting other testimonies to Germany's and Europe's past. We want to show you the World Heritage monument of Schloss Sanssouci, as well as the Cecilienhof, the venue of the Potsdam Conference, which set the seal on the postwar order in Europe.

There is, as you will notice, an air of expectancy in Berlin. The decision to transfer the seat of parliament and government from Bonn to Berlin is a huge challenge for the city's planners. A city divided for decades must now grow into one again and recapture the image and status of a capital and European metropolis.

Berlin's cultural and economic relevance will increase as the nations of Europe grow closer together. In the next few years the city will be a hive of activity, and Potsdamer Platz is already Europe's biggest building site. It will be the location of some of the world's leading corporations.

I am told you will be having an opportunity later this week to learn about the problems of planning on such a huge scale and also the opportunities afforded by this unique situation. But I would also suggest that you explore Berlin for yourselves and sample some of its impressive cultural and culinary attractions.

We are offering you an outline programme which also reflects the country's federal structure. This evening you will be the guest of Berlin's Governing Mayor, and on Friday of the Minister President,

the equivalent of a governor, of the state of Brandenburg. The federal states are actively involved in our national efforts to achieve the aims of the World Heritage Convention.

Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen,

Preserving the world's cultural and natural heritage is one of UNESCO's best-known programmes. The German media and public take a keen interest in the activities of the World Heritage Centre and in the decisions of this Committee. German television is currently showing a series of programmes prepared in cooperation with the Centre. It consists of 15-minute programmes introducing 100 of the world's outstanding cultural monuments. This is also a welcome publicity boost for UNESCO activities.

In my recent address to the 28th General Conference in Paris, I urged UNESCO to keep on giving priority to world heritage preservation. Germany is trying to make a tangible and creative contribution. The Committee has included the Völklingen Ironworks in the World Cultural Heritage List, the first time it has conferred this distinction on an industrial monument. We have also requested that the Bauhaus buildings in Dessau and Weimar be included in order to give more prominence to modern architecture. In the longer term we would also like to see more cultural monuments in eastern Germany forming part of Germany's world cultural heritage.

Protecting the natural heritage is one area covered by the World Heritage Convention whose importance is easily underrated and which should therefore increasingly become the focus of our attention. Many of the priorities which UNESCO has identified in its Medium-Term Plan for the period 1996 to 2001 are also reflected in the World Heritage Convention. One of the main conclusions is that we can only achieve a culture of peace through sustainable development. But such development requires us to use our ever scarcer natural resources sparingly.

None of the Committee's achievements in protecting natural resources is an end in itself. Mankind as a whole, including future generations, benefit from them. Germany sees the Committee's activities as a central responsibility of UNESCO.

I extend a cordial welcome to both the staff of the World Heritage Centre and to Mr Mayor's representative. This session's workload is, I believe, greater than ever. I hope the Committee will be able to master the growing challenge. We all feel strongly committed to the objectives of the World Heritage Convention. I am confident that this Berlin session will produce good and far-sighted decisions.

I wish your conference every success and hope you have a pleasant stay in Berlin.

**MESSAGE A LA 19EME SESSION DU  
COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL  
(Berlin, 4-9 décembre 1995)**

Comme je l'ai rappelé encore tout récemment lors de la vingt-huitième session de la Conférence générale, tous les programmes de l'UNESCO convergent vers un seul but: la construction de la paix. Toute notre action - qu'il s'agisse d'éducation, de science, de culture ou de communication - tend à faire progresser, par l'échange, le dialogue, la diffusion du savoir, la compréhension des identités, le respect mutuel et le partage, la culture de la paix dont les pères fondateurs de l'Organisation avaient si bien pressenti la nécessité.

Cette Maison des cultures du monde où vous vous réunissez concrétise la vocation même de l'UNESCO. Et Berlin, capitale de l'Allemagne unifiée, bâtie sur les décombres d'un mur symbole de la fracture du monde, est bien aujourd'hui le signe tangible qu'au delà d'idéologies longtemps affrontées, les esprits peuvent se rejoindre.

Protéger le patrimoine mondial, c'est identifier et préserver les trésors inestimables que nous ont légués depuis des millénaires la nature et les cultures. Toute action en ce sens mérite la plus grande reconnaissance et, à cet égard, parmi tous les pays qui ont participé généreusement et efficacement à la protection de notre patrimoine commun, l'Allemagne doit être particulièrement distinguée et remerciée. Mais la sauvegarde du patrimoine mondial

n'est pas seulement une entreprise contribuant à la conservation ou à la restauration du patrimoine physique. C'est aussi, et peut-être avant tout, l'un des axes majeurs de la construction de la paix. Il faut donc agir. Considérer que le patrimoine de chacun est aussi le patrimoine de tous, organiser la solidarité nationale pour le protéger, chercher à rassembler en une même Liste ce que la diversité de l'humanité a produit de plus remarquable à partir de ses aspirations matérielles et spirituelles, de ses techniques, de ses modes de vie, de ses organisations sociales, de ses croyances, de ses esthétiques. La Convention du patrimoine mondial n'est pas seulement un instrument de protection internationale de la qualité physique des biens. C'est aussi un outil intellectuel, scientifique et philosophique, dont deux initiatives récentes du Secrétariat illustrent bien la fonction.

L'une est la Stratégie globale établie pour améliorer la représentativité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Je souhaite vivement que la mise en oeuvre en soit efficace, car elle peut ouvrir de nouvelles perspectives à l'avenir de la Convention. Pour que celle-ci remplisse véritablement sa fonction, il faut en effet qu'elle vise vraiment à l'universalité, non seulement par le nombre d'Etats parties, mais aussi du point de vue de la reconnaissance mutuelle des cultures et des biens culturels dans toute la diversité de leurs formes.

L'autre initiative est le programme d'éducation des jeunes à la préservation du patrimoine et à la promotion de ses valeurs. En mobilisant les jeunes par l'intermédiaire des écoles et des associations, en leur faisant découvrir la richesse et la fragilité

du patrimoine, en les faisant parler, réfléchir, échanger, nous contribuons à construire un avenir porté par une jeunesse plus consciente des impératifs de tolérance, de compréhension et de paix.

Convaincu que vous n'épargnerez aucun effort, au cours de cette 19ème session, pour faire avancer l'oeuvre commune, je vous adresse mes plus sincères vœux de succès dans vos travaux.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Federico Mayor', with a prominent vertical stroke at the beginning.

Federico Mayor

Limited distribution

WHC-95/CONF.203/15Rev.  
Berlin, 9 December 1995  
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION  
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Nineteenth session  
Berlin, Germany

4-9 December 1996

Item 17 on the Provisional Agenda: Provisional agenda of the twentieth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. Report by the Secretary of the World Heritage Committee
4. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:
  - 4.1 Methodology and Procedures for the state of conservation
  - 4.2 Reports on the state of conservation of specific properties
5. Information on tentative lists and the examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger
6. Progress report on thematic and comparative studies
7. Synoptic presentation of the budget, including full information on World Heritage activities within the UNESCO Secretariat
8. Decentralization of World Heritage activities
9. Requests for International Assistance
10. Draft agenda for the extraordinary session of the Bureau (December 1996)

11. Preparation of the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee, including the draft agenda (December 1996)
12. Other business
13. Closure of the session.